

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MILITARY CUTS WOULD BE
"INVITATION TO WAR"

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the clamor of the antidefense spending lobby has grown increasingly loud and vocal in recent months and some press accounts tend to further distort the true picture of our Federal outlays for defense and domestic programs. Dr. Roger Freeman, Stanford University professor and former special adviser to President Nixon, made several cogent observations on this issue in his recent radio remarks. Professor Freeman's analysis casts a more balanced light on the military spending question and emphasizes how many overlook the serious consequences of a decline in our defense posture. I know my House colleagues will find the following article by Ray McHugh, Copley News Service, of particular interest:

TEACHER SAYS FURTHER DEFENSE BUDGET CUTS
WOULD BE "AN INVITATION TO WAR"

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—A Stanford University professor and former special advisor to President Nixon says further cuts in the nation's defense budget would be "an invitation to war."

He also attacks the premise that defense spending has crippled U.S. educational programs.

In remarks recorded for a national radio program today (Sunday), Dr. Roger A. Freeman denies claims by Pentagon critics that the tight national budget is a direct result of increased military spending and that if arms costs are reduced education spending can be increased.

In the 1968-1971 fiscal budget period, Freeman says, defense spending has been cut 9 per cent while outlays for education and other social programs have risen 47 per cent and all other federal expenditures are up 21 per cent.

The 49 per cent increase in defense expenditures since 1953, he says, is approximately equal to the increase in prices, wages and other national economic factors using the same period.

But during the same 17-year period, spending for Health, Education, Welfare and Labor increased 944 per cent, he says, and the cost for all other government operations has risen 82 per cent.

While the defense share of federal revenues and of the gross national product has been almost halved since 1953, Freeman claims, "most of the huge savings were applied to social purposes, with education one of the main gainers."

"To slash our badly depleted defense establishment even faster or further in this troubled world," he says, "would risk the nation's very existence in an irresponsible manner and be an invitation rather than a deterrent to war."

Freeman says unrest in the nation's schools has for the first time shaken "the profound faith of the American people in their educational institutions and their belief in the wisdom of our educational leaders and in the soundness of their goals and practices." Faith, he says, has turned to "doubt and even outright disapproval."

"If a vote of confidence were asked from the people across this nation in the management and policies of their educational institutions, it would in most states no longer be as favorable as it would have been twenty, ten, or even five years ago."

This applies, he adds, not only to some prominent universities and colleges, but also to high schools and elementary schools.

Pointing out that public school enrollment has increased 88 per cent, or from 25 million to 47 million students, since 1950, Freeman said that school financial support jumped from \$5.4 billion to \$38.5 billion in the same 20 years.

About 93 per cent of the \$33 billion of this increased financial support came from state and local governments.

"Nothing testifies more clearly to the continued effectiveness of the traditional American way of government by the consent of the governed," says Freeman.

Noting that enrollment growth in the public schools is ending in most U.S. cities, with little or no increase projected for the 1970s unless private schools are forced to close, Freeman says school funding problems should begin to ease "if the public schools can retain—or, in many cases, regain—the confidence and goodwill of the communities they serve."

JBS NO LONGER AN ISSUE IN 24TH

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, of the various political organizations in America identified over the years as part of the "right" sector of the political spectrum, I suppose I have disagreed more often than most with the positions taken by the John Birch Society. Indeed, I cannot recall a single one of the society's published political efforts with which I have concurred.

Nevertheless, a number of patriotic American citizens belong to the society, and particularly one of my close friends of many years, our colleague JOHN ROUSSELOT from California.

I have known JOHN as an honest, hard-working, and dedicated American since high school days and was accordingly pleased to note the following recent editorial about JOHN and the Birch Society in the San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune:

JBS NO LONGER AN ISSUE IN 24TH

Voters in the 24th Congressional District have resoundingly registered their support of John Rousselot. Tuesday they gave him a 2-1 margin at the ballot box and sent him on his way to Washington to represent them for the duration of Glenn Lipscomb's unexpired term.

It is not surprising that Rousselot won in the preponderantly Republican district. Nor is it surprising that voter turnout in the special election was relatively light.

If there was one thing to be learned from this special election, it is, we believe, that membership in the John Birch Society is no longer an issue as far as most voters in the 24th Congressional District are concerned.

Residents have been hearing this attack on Rousselot for a decade. We were among

those who questioned his ability to represent the interests of the district while having an allegiance to the JBS in 1961. But, since that time the people of the district have learned much more about what the JBS is and what it is not. This, we believe, has led most voters to discount JBS membership as a threat to responsible representative government.

If voters had retained a suspicion of the JBS and its effect on John Rousselot, there would have been a huge turnout at the polls, and the vote would have been much closer.

Admittedly, other factors entered into the voting and non-voting. But, in our opinion, Rousselot goes to Washington with the firm support of his district. During the next few months he can firmly entrench himself as unbeatable in November upset. At this time we see little likelihood of his stumbling.

BLATANT DOCTOR SHORTAGE
IN RURAL AREAS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems which afflicts many areas of rural America today is a shortage of trained medical practitioners.

The census figures show that in most rural areas, population is leaving and migrating to the cities, where employment opportunities are thought to be greater.

This has been especially true in the past few years with doctors.

The old family doctor, who used to be a fixture in the small communities of our Nation, is beginning to be rather hard to find.

In my home State of Utah, there is an area in the southern part of the State, comprising Wayne, Piute, Sevier, and Garfield Counties, which is large in territory but rather short of people.

Only a few years ago, this area had nine doctors. Today it has two. The doctor-population ratio in Utah as a whole is 1 to 1,160; in this four-county area it is 1 to 10,000.

Today I am introducing a bill which would provide scholarships and fellowships to medical students who pledge to spend some years after graduation working in the rural areas of our Nation.

I would also like to insert in the RECORD a telegram from the Standard-Examiner, in my home city of Ogden, which lauds a program which authorizes Federal funds for medical schools that establish separate departments for teaching family medicine.

As the editorial points out, the University of Utah College of Medicine has already established a new department of community and family medicine and is ready to take advantage of this Federal funding should it become available.

I would also like to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that two com-

munities, at least, in my State have also learned that community effort helps attract doctors to their area.

The towns of Roosevelt and Gunnison, both in rural sections of Utah, have worked to provide new and modern hospital and medical facilities in their cities—with the help of medical practitioners who already live there.

These new facilities have resulted in attracting other doctors to the area and will, in the future, attract more, solving one of the problems created by the shortage of medical skills in rural areas.

The Ogden Standard-Examiner editorial, to which I commend your consideration and attention, is as follows:

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Sept. 17, 1970]

CONGRESS AIMS FOR MORE FAMILY DOCTORS

The U.S. Senate this week approved a bill that would have a beneficial effect on the health of the United States, particularly for residents of sparsely populated areas like ours.

The aim of the legislation, the AP reports, is "to head off extinction of a vanishing American breed—the family doctor."

Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are now being asked to consider the measure. We strongly urge that our congressmen get behind the bill—SB3418—and insist that it be taken out from under the present log jam of pending legislation and receive a favorable vote at the current session.

The proposal would authorize the appropriation of \$425 million through fiscal 1975 for medical schools that establish "separate and distinct" departments for teaching family medicine.

It would provide a badly needed impetus for family doctors or, as they are frequently called, general practitioners. This field has, the senator rightly insists, been all but neglected over the past 30 years, an age of medical specialization.

Fortunately for Utah, if the bill does pass the House and necessary appropriations are made, our state is ready for this revival of family medicine.

Effective last July 1, the University of Utah College of Medicine established a new Department of Community and Family Medicine. This department ranks equally with the college's other three, traditional departments—those of surgery, medicine and pediatrics.

Under this framework, the University of Utah is already in an excellent, forward-looking position to participate in any federally encouraged training of family doctors. This is no coincidence.

The Governor's Conference on Health made this recommendation some time ago and the Utah Legislature provided necessary financing for the Department of Community and Family Medicine to be started.

The college, university and their advisors realized that a general practitioner—the family doctor—usually serves as the point of first contact for those who need medical assistance. About the only common exception is an accident where victims are taken to a hospital's emergency ward.

A family physician is trained to consider the total health care needs of all family members, referring them to specialists as appropriate.

"The family physician," explained one Utah expert in the field, "is the leader, the coordinator of the health care team. This type of physician normally manages 85 per cent of personal medical problems. He gets to know the family and considers all aspects of the individual environment in their treatment. And he knows their full medical history."

Many Utah communities now have no resident doctor. In the parts of our state—or Wyoming, Nevada, Idaho or Montana—where the distances between towns is considerable, this is a critical shortage.

Few young medical school graduates have wanted to practice in the small towns, when they saw the life style of the remaining general practitioners—busy from before dawn to after dark, frequently roused out at night but still making less money than their city colleagues.

So most new doctors have headed for the big cities.

If medical colleges produced more family physicians, the burden in the small towns could be shared. Each doctor could live a reasonable life and have time—not available now to the overworked general practitioners—to continue his medical education. They'd have a better income, too, because their fellow townsmen would be less inclined to seek "outside" medical help.

This renewed emphasis on family physicians in Congress, at the University of Utah College of Medicine and in cooperating hospitals could pay rich dividends.

The program will go forward without Congress' help, we recognize. But with enactment of the Bill and adequate financing of its provisions, the day will come even sooner when Americans can count on the services of a family physician when he—or she—is needed.

KLEO COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S KANSAS STATE SPEECH

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial comment aired on radio station KLEO Wichita, which appropriately discusses the recent speech by President Nixon at Kansas State University in Manhattan as contrasted to the first national wire service reports on the event. The editorial was written by Frank M. Edmondson, Jr., a member of the KLEO news staff.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON KLEO WICHITA, KANS.

President Nixon spoke in Manhattan today. Those who listened to the speech on radio, on television and in person—witnessed a strong speech delivered by him. Hecklers tried to drown out the President—there were about fifty in all—but the spontaneous ovations by the majority of the 15,000 plus persons at the Ahearn Fieldhouse on Kansas State's Campus drowned out the fifty easily. The enthusiasm was shared so much by the President, that at one time during the speech, he said this:

"The destructive activists at our colleges and universities are a small minority . . . My text at this point reads: ' . . . their voices have been allowed to drown out the responsible majority.' That may be true in some places but not at Kansas State."

The comment was followed by a standing ovation.

However, the first national story on the speech released by United Press International showed quite a different side to the scene. Here is the story in its entirety:

"MANHATTAN, KANS.—About 50 dissidents interrupted his speech with shouted questions and obscenities as President Nixon warned today that American colleges risk losing public support unless they curb vio-

lence by 'destructive activists.' Mr. Nixon made his strongest remarks so far about radical student dissent in a speech at Kansas State University. As the dissenters tried to shout him down, Mr. Nixon called on responsible students and faculty members to 'stand up and be counted.' And he urged the hecklers to be willing to listen to someone without trying to shout him down."

That United Press International news story didn't make this particular KLEO Newsman happy. A letter has been written by this reporter to be sent to the President of the United Press International, with copies also to be sent to President Richard M. Nixon, Governor Robert B. Docking, Senator Bob Dole, Senator James Pearson, Congressman Garner Shriver and other dignitaries in public office.

LAWS THAT DO NOT WORK

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Altoona, Pa., Mirror on Wednesday, July 22, 1970, pointing out the simple, self-evident truth that "gun control laws, of themselves, do little to retard the growth of crime."

I hope this will be of assistance to my colleagues in consideration of the continuing flow of legislation aimed at stripping law-abiding citizens of their right to possess arms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

The article follows:

LAWS THAT DO NOT WORK

Gun control laws, of themselves, do little to retard the growth of crime. Of the nation's 12 largest cities, four were covered by total firearms registration during the first half of 1969. Four more were under local or state laws requiring permits to buy or transfer handguns. One had an ordinance covering all firearms transfers. Three of the nation's largest cities, by contrast, had no local or state laws rigidly restricting the sale of firearms.

Among the cities with controls, New York City, Chicago, Washington, D.C. and San Francisco have, perhaps, the stiffest firearms laws. In these cities, the homicide rate during the first half of 1969 ranged from a six per cent increase in New York to a 102 per cent increase in San Francisco.

Five of the nation's largest cities with gun controls of varying stringency showed alarming increases in homicides, ranging from 53 per cent in Cleveland to 18 per cent in Philadelphia.

The other three of the nation's largest cities—Los Angeles, Houston and Milwaukee—having the least restrictive gun laws came up with these figures for the first half of 1969. Los Angeles, murders up 14 per cent; Houston, murders decreased five per cent; Milwaukee, murders decreased 18 per cent.

The foregoing are facts from figures compiled from the FBI Uniform Crime Report. They bear out the belief of Dr. Bruce Danto, director of the Detroit Suicide Prevention Center, that "gun control is not the answer" to the rising tide of violence in cities.

The sad truth is that many freedom-destraining laws aimed at law-abiding citizens are passed in an emotional fury; and, after passage, no one ever takes the time to appraise their effectiveness. It is much easier to pass another law than to remove a bad law from the statute books.

FAD DIETS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I included in the RECORD several statements submitted in writing to my able colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BAGGI), and me for a hearing we held earlier this month on fad diets, food myths, diet pill abuse and nutrition. Previously, I had placed into the RECORD the testimony of the witnesses who attended our hearing in New York City. Today, I would like to conclude this five-part series with the remaining statements submitted to us:

STATEMENT ON FAD REDUCING DIETS

(By Hazel Schoenberg, Good Housekeeping)

My name is Hazel Schoenberg. I am the Associate Director of the Bureau, a department of Good Housekeeping Institute. In this position I am involved in the editorial supervision of the *You & Your Diet* section of the magazine and I co-ordinate the test-kitchen and laboratory investigation of food products submitted for advertising. *You & Your Diet* is a monthly feature of Good Housekeeping devoted to information on family meal planning as well as low-calorie and therapeutic diets. I have a MS degree in nutrition and am a member of the American Dietetic Association. I have worked as a therapeutic dietitian in a teaching hospital and for five of my eight years at Good Housekeeping was the dietitian on the Bureau staff.

You have asked for my comments on the specific subject of fad reducing diets—the areas of greatest abuse and what should be done to correct these abuses. As a professional dietitian working for a women's service magazine, one of my main concerns is teaching homemakers to select well balanced meals that also meet their needs in terms of food preferences and cost as well as dietary problems. We at Good Housekeeping use the Basic Four as the meal-planning guide in developing all menus and meal plans. A tear sheet from the magazine explaining the Basic Four is attached. This standard is also used by governmental agencies, the American Dietetic Association, etc. to evaluate dietary adequacy.

The only difference between regular and low-calorie meals is in the calories; both should provide all needed nutrients. The Basic Four plan can be used for both regular and low-calorie diets. But a good reducing diet will, of course, contain few enough calories that the dieter will lose weight. At the same time caloric intake must be adequate to provide energy for basic metabolic needs. Twelve hundred calories for women and 1800 for men are commonly used levels.

A successful program should have three objectives, beyond the obvious one assuring weight loss.

1. It must produce weight loss at a safe, moderate pace.
2. It must offer variety, so that there's pleasure in dining as well as hunger satisfaction.
3. It must teach new and enjoyable eating habits, so that the dieter won't fall back into the old weight-gaining eating patterns. All the fad diets fall in these three additional objectives; many also fall in the primary goal of making the dieter lose weight.

All low-calorie fad diets currently popular are based on one of two principles: They are (1) low in carbohydrate and high in protein or (2) low in protein. The attachment, "Why Fad Diets should be Avoided," from the May 1970 Better Way section of Good

Housekeeping explains the basis of 10 most popular fad diets, and the prime nutritional deficiencies of each. Summing up from this article, the prime disadvantages of the low-carbohydrate, high-protein diet are as follows: Lack of carbohydrate can lead to a condition called ketosis caused by the improper metabolism of fats. Fats cannot be metabolized properly when they are eaten without carbohydrate. Perhaps the most immediate danger to one's health on these diets, however, comes from ingesting too much saturated fats found in meat and dairy products. Saturated fats tend to raise blood-cholesterol levels. More than half the total fat intake in a normal diet should come from vegetable sources, which contain carbohydrate and polyunsaturated fats. This requirement is difficult to meet on a low-carbohydrate diet.

Five examples of high-protein, low-carbohydrate diets are: The Doctor's Quick Weight-Loss Diet, Calories Don't Count Diet, Air-Force, Mayo, and Drinking Man's Diet.

In the case of low-protein diets the nutritional imbalances take a different form but still are potentially dangerous in the following ways, again paraphrasing from the Better Way article: Protein, found in every living cell, is needed for growth and to build and repair worn-out tissues. When there is too little protein intake, the body excretes more protein than it takes in. Then the protein from lean muscle tissue has to be used for body maintenance. On low-protein diet, most weight loss is due to loss of lean muscle tissue, not the fat the dieter should lose. High protein foods are also a prime source of many essential vitamins and minerals. One of the dangers of ingesting too few protein-rich foods is the possibility of anemia resulting from the lack of iron as well as lack of protein itself. Essentially, most low-protein diets are a form of malnutrition.

The low-protein diets include The Doctor's Quick Inches Off Diet, The Banana and Skimmed Milk Diet, The Famous Rice Diet and, of course, all starvation diets.

I agree that there are specific health dangers to fad reducing diets, but I am not aware of any data which show the amount of illness actually caused by the diets. Surely some diabetic conditions, heart attacks or bouts with gout must be precipitated by the fad diets but it is virtually impossible to pin down the causes. I know that at least one girl has starved herself to death on a fad diet. But for the healthy general population, the greatest danger of fad diets is not physiological. The greatest danger is in leading the dieter away from sensible, balanced meals.

By emphasizing speed and ease of weight loss, fad diets set unrealistic standards. The dieter is kept from recognizing and accepting the fact that losing weight requires eating less than the body uses, and that this is a slow and painful process. The constant emphasis on quick weight loss discourages the dieter from accepting the need to pace dieting so the body can adjust to the decreasing food intake and weight.

For those who tend to gain weight, dieting should be a style of living rather than an on-again, off-again project. Weight should constantly be kept within bounds. Physicians believe that wide weight fluctuations place great stress on the system and are more dangerous to the health than moderate overweight. Keeping the weight within bounds requires sensible eating habits that balance the caloric expenditure against daily activity.

Also, fad diets completely shift the emphasis to dieting and away from exercise. Americans have become so comfort and transportation oriented that they don't even walk around the golf course any more. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences recognized the need for more exercise in the explanatory information included with the Recommended Dietary Al-

lowances. They wrote: "It is likely that a higher level of health would be reached if the population were more physically active. There is growing evidence that a sedentary life contributes to degenerative arterial disease, as well as to obesity and its many complications, notably diabetes mellitus."

Thus the greatest problem with the fad reducing diets is the negative effect they have on teaching Americans to eat sensibly. Teaching nutrition—even at the fundamental level of the Basic Four—is extraordinarily difficult. And nutritionists have failed. We spend most of the time talking to ourselves. But every time a doctor or anyone else publishes his latest miracle diet, it becomes more difficult to get consumers to realize that calories do count or that eating fewer calories than the body uses is the only way to lose weight.

What should be done to correct these abuses?

The long-term solution is education of consumers to appreciate the workings of the body, and the system of checks and balances that function in weight maintenance. In general terms, this educational campaign must be carried on throughout the school years and featured in the media. Public relation experts need to take a hand. Making nutrition an "in" thing would be the easiest way to sell it.

The approach must be soft-sell and fun. For example, any sensible individual hates exercise for exercise's sake. My personal mental image of exercising is touching my toes to bagpipe music in a school gym. If exercising had been fun then, I would be more active now. Similarly, if the foods that were good for me tasted better then, I would be less interested in candy and empty calorie goodies now. But education is a long-term goal which hopefully has been given a new life through the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health and the new consumer awareness of nutrition.

But what can be done now?

The foods people are eating can be made more nutritious. I don't believe in indiscriminate fortification of foods. But we desperately need guidelines for fortification. These guidelines could lead to the improvement of foods in many ways. Perhaps the least controversial would be the enrichment of all bread and cereal products to the level of the whole grain. This would include crackers, cake mixes, pretzels, etc. Some foods might also be fortified to higher than "natural" levels. Cereals are a prime candidate because the technology is simpler and the cereal companies are already leaders in this field. But before these enrichment and fortification programs are started, we must have guidelines. Accelerating vitamin wars—"my" orange drink has 200 times the MDR for vitamin C and "yours" has only 100 times are absurd, expensive, and dangerous. Guidelines would allow the most efficient use of vitamins and mineral fortification without the dangers of overdosing.

I see no way of preventing the circulation of fad diets unless it is related to an undefined commercial tie-in. The Calories Don't Count Diet is the classic of this type. Our principles of free press and free speech prevent (and should prevent) the suppression of cockamamie diets. I think most nutritionists realize that we have to face this frustrating proliferation of fad diets because we have been unable to answer the diet needs of the public. We have awakened them to the need for good nutrition without showing them how to plan the diets.

Standards for low-calories foods would help the consumer select and evaluate foods. The proposed standard that a modified low-calorie version of a food provide a maximum of 50 per cent of the calories of the regular food is an excellent example of a useful standard. These standards should also cover the full range of diet terms. For example, many products are labeled "dietetic." The

consumer associates "dietetic" with low-calorie. These products may be low in sodium or be sugar-free, but not lower in calories. "Dietetic" products are needed but they should be labeled to make it obvious how they differ from regular foods.

It would be extremely helpful if the calories per serving were included on all food labels. This would allow the dieting consumer to select regular foods which are comparatively low in calories. And it would reinforce the concept that ordinary foods can still be used on a reducing diet. Special low-calorie products are valuable in supplementing the normal choice of foods available to the dieter. But they are usually more expensive because they are produced in a small volume and for a specialized market. The flavor sometimes is third-rate at best. Consumers prefer to use regular products on their reducing diets but they aren't told how to do it. Calories per serving on packaging would be a good start.

To sum up: Any program to limit fad diets must broaden its goals to consider the entire problem of nutrition education. Consumers desperately want information about foods and diets. A large percentage of the information they do find is inaccurate, incomplete, or slanted. Just a tiny fraction of the remaining accurate information is presented in a form the homemaker will understand or even want to read. We must start with the basic concept of variety in the diet. It can be called food families, a smorgasbord of foods, or the Basic Four but the purpose is the same: broaden the selection of foods made by the homemaker.

STATEMENT BY VARNUM D. LUDINGTON, VICE PRESIDENT, GENERAL FOODS CORP.

The dictionary defines "fad" as a "custom, amusement, or the like, followed for a time with exaggerated zeal; a craze." By definition, then, one expects fads to be interesting, to be fun, and to add zest to life; they season the monotonous daily routine. But the dictionary is no help in distinguishing one fad from another or in assigning relative values to different fads.

This can be serious, because faddism in some areas of life is dangerous and undesirable. One such important area is our food and eating habits. In these the pursuit of fads is totally out of place. Doctors, nutritionists, dietitians, and food scientists know this. Nevertheless, promoters of food and diet fads thrive in our society, magnifying the benefits of certain foods and reducing public confidence in conventional foods and dietary habits.

The reason food faddism is inappropriate lies in the 50 to 60 nutrients the human body needs to remain healthy and grow. They come from the food we eat. They should come in constant and regular supply. Their respective contributions to human health and growth must be judged in concert with each other. Thus it is not basically a question of what is ingested at one meal or another, or in one day or another. What is important is that the pattern of nutrients ingested is in balance. There should not be too much or too little of any nutrient for any length of time. The ideal healthy diet includes a variety of foods every day to maintain a balance of nutrients. This disqualifies at the outset the familiar claims of food faddists for the magical quality of certain foods. A helpful rule of thumb is this: If a little of a nutrient is good, it does not follow that a lot is better.

Indifference to this commonsense principle is probably one reason that food fads and food quackery have plagued mankind through the centuries. It is a little harder to understand why today, with the rising level of education, so many people continue to become the victims of food fads and faddists. And the volume of victims is high. About seven years ago it was estimated

that illegal medical and food quackery cost the American public about one billion dollars a year (*Fads, Myths, Quacks—and Your Health*, Jacqueline Seaver, Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 415, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.). It is surely higher today.

The food faddist's most vulnerable target is found among the people suffering from a seriously disabling or fatal ailment. They will often seize on almost any nostrum in the hope of finding relief; the exploitation they are subject to is scandalous. To make deception easier, some foods and diets do have definite restorative value in certain situations. They are prescribed by physicians or dietitians and their good effects are, of course, publicized. The fact is enough to lend credibility to the food faddist when he comes along with his "curing" food or diet. The chances are overwhelmingly in favor of it being one of the many hundreds without significant curative properties.

The great majority of the food faddist's victims, however, is a part of the general public. With them it is a simple question of nutrition and its connection with continuing good health. And what troubles large numbers of them is excess weight. Each year, hundreds of thousands of people undertake diets, with or without a physician's authority and advice, to reduce weight. Special diets and foods have been advocated for this purpose for years. Some of the people they are intended for will eat—or not eat—almost anything in order to lose weight. There's the low fat diet; the high fat diet; the high protein diet; the low carbohydrate diet; the no-potatoes diet; the drinking man's diet; the safflower oil capsule diet, and on and on. Not to mention a variety of pills and tablets assuring their purchasers of the desired end.

The public should be wary of any and all of these. There is no easy road to reducing body weight. A doctor is better qualified to speak to the individual consequences of any one of the available weight-reducing systems.

As a food scientist I know that calories do count and that it is hazardous to plan to reduce calories without carefully considering the overall supply of nutrients. The only reasonable solution to overweight is to go on a medically recommended regimen that includes a proper balanced diet, regular exercise, and other good living habits.

Another appeal of the food faddist is established by charging that our soil is wearing out through being depleted of nutrients—so thoroughly, it is said, that crops grown on such soil are nutritionally inferior. The charge is further extended. It says that manufactured fertilizers—chemical fertilizers, in other words—are poisoning the soil and crops grown under these conditions are not healthful. The recommendation is that only organic fertilizers should be used.

Our soils, however, are not tired or depleted. Crops grown on soil enriched by inorganic fertilizers are no less healthful than any other kind. The use of these manufactured fertilizers has enormously multiplied yield of food. It is also worth mentioning that organic fertilizers are also composed of chemicals—but not mixed in a laboratory or factory.

The suspicion of foods that have been processed in any way is quite unjustified. There is nothing damaging to health in canned or frozen foods, for example. Whole wheat bread is no more nourishing than enriched white bread; a nutritional analysis of the two foods show them to be almost identical in their composition and level of nutrients. Whole wheat bread is good. So is enriched white bread; a nutritional analysis of the foods and natural vitamins have no advantage over manufactured foods and vitamins. The "magical" potency of natural foods so-called is a myth without scientific substantiation.

The list of dietary panaceas is long, and

for every item discredited and stricken from it others are waiting to be added. There was Royal Jelly from bees for rejuvenation and sexual stimulation . . . honey to cure cancer . . . apple cider vinegar for weight reduction . . . alfalfa to cure arthritis. The list itself is a monument to human gullibility. This is not to say that these foods are without nutritional value. But it is seriously misleading to claim exceptional value for them over other nutritional foods in the diet. The public then is encouraged to substitute them for more healthful foods.

No favor is done anyone when food faddists convey such misinformation. Sound nutrition understanding is either retarded or undermined. There is also the matter of the exaggerated prices that are asked for health food products. Often the person who can least afford such prices is the most susceptible to the faddist's salesmanship. A corollary result follows, too. The case for special foods and diets is usually so skillfully put that the buyer, once persuaded about their value to him, becomes convinced normal foods are not good for him. He rejects them, and is thus cheated out of the good nutrition he could otherwise have had from a much less expensive diet.

There are widespread pockets of nutritional deficiency in the United States, occurring at all levels of society. One attack against this condition is to dispel the widespread ignorance of nutrition that exists. The public must be better informed about nutrition and about selecting a balanced diet. This goal will continue to be obstructed so long as faddist food diets enjoy their present popular acceptance and credibility.

STATEMENT OF COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE (By Joan Dunn, Dieters Notebook editor)

I think that the greatest area of abuse regarding fad diets is the alacrity with which the American public accepts them. These diets nearly always promise amazingly swift weight loss with little effort. They may be made dangerous by the concurrent use of so-called diet pills, which are amphetamines and should properly be taken only under doctor's care. Diet pills taken without proper medical supervision can be fatal.

The greatest area for improvement regarding dieting, I believe, is the proper education of the American public, particularly adolescents, on the subject of nutrition. American eating habits are atrocious. We consume an inordinate amount of fats, starches and useless calories—calories that are weight-forming, but not body-building. The eating is easy, so people think that the losing should be easy too. Enter the fad diet, the use of pills.

Finally, it should be widely and constantly publicized by the government, by the medical profession and the news media—that there is really only one way to lose weight: eat less and exercise more. And that means eating nutritionally while eating less, and exercising wisely and consistently.

Implicit in any serious weight loss is the individual's determination to change his eating habits forever. Only his own will power can effect that change, not any fad diet or pill.

STATEMENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Dieting Companies, Fad Diets and Diet Foods: An increasingly popular method of dieting, especially among women, is to enroll in the courses given by dieting companies. These usually involve the patient or customer paying a fee to obtain the special dietary regimen advocated by the company (which, by the way, is usually fairly sensible) and to have the privilege of attending weekly meetings giving her advice and counsel in dieting. Suitably monitored and regulated, such companies may serve a useful role in aiding some Americans in keeping their

weights in line; but I do feel some regulation of their activities is necessary to prevent possible abuses.

One problem is that certain persons who do not realize that they are ill might enroll in such programs thinking their problems were simply due to the fact that they were overweight, and as a result delay seeking medical advice or worsen their condition by going on the diet. I believe that laws at the state level requiring the companies to accept only persons who presented evidence of written approval from their physician might prevent such unfortunate incidents from occurring.

I am also disturbed by the claims which some of these companies' representatives or instructors make at meetings about the benefits of special low calorie food products made by them or by companies with which the dieting organizations have some sort of a tie-in. These claims are sometimes made in such a way that listeners are led to believe that these foods have special metabolic properties, outside of their low content of calories providing nutrients, which will speed weight loss. Scientifically inaccurate statements are sometimes also made by the instructors about the special virtues of the diets of such organizations. While in my judgment these statements are most often due to real lack of knowledge on the part of the instructors (who usually have little training in the science of nutrition) rather than as a deliberate effort to defraud clients, the instructors are looked upon as authorities and specialists in nutrition by their customers, so that their mistaken notions carry somewhat more weight than those of advice from friends. Since many of these claims are made verbally in meetings rather than on printed material or on package labels, this poses a difficult problem for any sort of regulation. One possible solution might be more adequate staffing of state health departments with public health nutritionists who could serve as a source of scientifically accurate information on nutrition questions. Your own State of New York has one of the finest nutrition divisions in its State Health Department of any state in the country, but most states have sadly neglected public health nutrition efforts of this sort.

STATEMENT OF SAMM SINCLAIR BAKER

As an associate of Dr. Irwin M. Stillman (and coauthor), he has asked me to respond to your letter of August 13th, and to convey his thanks for your attention and invitation.

At age 75, he is not taking on any arduous engagements, and cannot appear at your September 8th hearing on "fad diets, food myths, and diet pill abuse."

Regarding a statement on the issue, Dr. Stillman's views are expressed in detail in his book, "The Doctor's Quick Weight Loss Diet." He notes that probably the greatest "abuse" is the common, faulty concept that "balanced dieting" is the only "proper way" to reduce. This myth has kept tens of millions of Americans dangerously overweight—after they piled on burdensome, unhealthy excess pounds due to the heavily promoted fraud that big breakfasts, fat-loaded meals, buttery high-calorie recipes, and rich, sugary desserts are "good for you."

STATEMENT OF MOUNT SINAI SCHOOL OF MEDICINE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

I am happy to submit the following concise statement:

I believe that fad diets represent one of the most surreptitious nutritional problems facing the citizens of our country. People who should lose weight are susceptible to a continuous parade of nutritional and diet-pattern gimmicks.

It is accepted medical knowledge that weight reduction diets must be carefully designed to:

1. Provide all of the essential nutrients in required amounts while at the same time providing caloric deficit.

2. Assure that the dieting process contains elements of proper nutrition education so that dieting is also an educational experience.

3. Accomplish weight loss in such a manner as not to induce nitrogen loss or the loss of vital body electrolytes.

4. Not induce abnormal body chemistries such as high levels of serum cholesterol and triglycerides, which if increased due to prolonged fad dieting on high saturated fat or high carbohydrate diets, might contribute to the risk of the development of coronary heart disease.

To me, the greatest area of abuse is the steady diet of crash weight reduction regimens fed to the American public appearing in lay literature.

The correction of this abuse can be made through nutrition education programs by individual physicians and by professional and public health organizations warning the public against the use of "crash" and unscientifically-designed diets, while simultaneously teaching methods of proper dieting.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

(By Philip L. White, Sc. D., Secretary, Council on Foods and Nutrition, American Medical Association)

Mr. Chairman, the Council on Foods and Nutrition is an advisory Committee of the AMA Board of Trustees. In addition to providing policy recommendations to the Board, the Council and the AMA Department of Foods and Nutrition conduct programs in continuing medical education emphasizing clinical nutrition. The AMA is actively interested in public health nutrition and in matters of food composition and use. We welcome this opportunity to comment on certain aspects of fad dieting and weight control.

Among the obese population exists a higher incidence of hypertension, cardiovascular and renal diseases, disorders of the liver and gall bladder, and diabetes mellitus. Obese diabetic individuals, in particular, have a mortality rate almost four times that of non-obese diabetics. Obesity is also a considered hazard for the pregnant woman and for the surgical patient.

Insurance data indicate a positive correlation between weight gain in excess of ten percent over "best weight" and the corresponding mortality rate. The mortality rate increases proportionately to the degree of weight gain; e.g., the mortality is 13 percent greater for men who are 10% over "best weight" but rises to 40 percent for those who are 30% overweight.

Obesity is a disorder which is not easily defined. It is usually assumed that the "normal" or "best" weight for an individual is achieved between the ages of 18 and 25 years. Therefore, any significant positive departure from this "normal range" could be considered "obesity." Height-weight relationships do not always indicate fatness since an individual's build is not necessarily taken into consideration. The proportion of fat in relation to total body weight increases with age and may exceed 50 percent in very obese individuals. The degree of obesity of an individual may be a reflection of both the number of adipose cells in the body and their size. Some recent studies have shown that fat cells may multiply early in life in response to generous caloric intake. More research is needed, however, to determine if the number of fat cells in a person is related to genetics or early infant feeding practices.

To identify a single or simple causative factor for obesity would be an exercise in futility. An association of several factors is

likely whether they be genetic, psychological, physiological, or environmental. Regardless of the cause, obesity is a medical problem which requires proper medical supervision. The goal for treatment should be an appropriate weight loss and the maintenance of a desirable body weight thereafter. This can only be achieved if the individual is properly motivated to change his food habits in order to decrease caloric intake as well as to alter activities in order to allow for increased caloric expenditure. For treatment to be effective, the patient must learn to make adjustments and sacrifices and not to rely primarily on medications and other "crutches." Often when treatment is prolonged and dotted with failures, obese individuals will turn to a gadget, a "shed pounds quickly" diet, a pill, or a book which offers an easy and painless reduction of weight.

For this reason, the American Medical Association has attempted, through various media, to inform the profession and public of the latest scientific advances in the area of obesity control.

In a 1947 article published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, it was emphasized that control of obesity was difficult because patients usually demanded treatment that would produce immediate miraculous changes in appearance rather than adhere to a sound weight reduction diet. This type of obese patient is easy prey to anti-obesity drugs. The patient who lacks the motivation and self-discipline needed for the diet-exercise approach is a likely candidate for any drug regimen that promises a loss of weight without the necessity of changing his food and exercise habits. Anti-obesity medications that are made available by drug companies are generally classified into 6 groups: (1) hormones; (2) diuretics; (3) anorexants; (4) laxatives; (5) sedatives; and (6) anti-spasmodics. While some justification may exist for the short-term use of certain drugs in the management of obesity under medical supervision, the hazards associated with the use of a multiplicity of irrational drugs is not justified.

Recent action by the Food and Drug Administration has greatly reduced the number and nature of drug combinations used in the treatment of obesity. A few years ago digitals leaf alone or in combination with thyroid hormones was used extensively in the treatment of obesity. The combination has been discouraged and each preparation must carry precautionary labeling warning against its use in programs of weight control.

The treatment of obesity with thyroid hormone can also lead to undesirable effects: (1) thyroid hormone frequently increases the appetite and possibly the consumption of food over and above any beneficial effect of increased metabolic rate; (2) thyroid may precipitate dangerous symptoms associated with thyrotoxicosis, such as palpitation, tachycardia, nervousness, angina pectoris, diarrhea and insomnia; (3) administration of thyroid to a patient with a normal gland can produce undesirable, secondary glandular changes. In addition, prolonged thyroid treatment may lead to hypothyroidism.

There is no rational basis for the use of diuretic drugs in the treatment of simple obesity. The loss of weight produced by diuretics is mainly water which is promptly regained once the diuretic is discontinued.

Perhaps the use of anorexants in the treatment of obesity rests on a sounder scientific foundation. Most drugs of this type are amphetamine derivatives, the principal ingredient, which supposedly acts by suppressing the appetite. With long term use, anorexants tend to become less effective and can be habit-forming. These are potent drugs whose benefits should be weighed against these dangers.

The use of laxatives in the treatment of obesity cannot be justified. A constant in-

take of laxatives can lead to a great loss of potassium resulting in serious metabolic disturbances.

It would appear that antispasmodics, by reducing "hunger contractions" of the stomach, would be useful in the treatment of obesity. The side effects associated with a truly effective dose of this drug, however, would be unacceptable to the patient.

The proper diagnosis and treatment of obesity can best be accomplished through continued efforts to inform and educate. The American Medical Association frequently focuses attention upon those irregular practitioners and faddists who prey upon the unsuspecting public. Perhaps the most troublesome (and lucrative) practice in the area of fat weight reduction schemes is found in the publishing business. Overweight people, desperate to resolve their problems, fall prey to persuasive promises of quick, painless, and permanent weight loss. Books by physicians and laymen alike appear in regular cycles, each with some variation of the currently popular fad: low carbohydrate-high protein, low fat-high carbohydrate, high fat-high protein, high carbohydrate-low fat and low protein, etc. With all the possible variables it is no wonder that so many books have recently been published.

Other than to persuade publishers to seek competent medical opinion before accepting a manuscript, it seems that little can be done without infringing upon constitutional rights. However, advertising and other forms of promotion can be regulated within the framework of federal and/or state regulations. Unwarranted advertising claims for "successful weight reduction" can and should be prohibited in most cases. Usually there is little or no clinical evidence available to substantiate claims made. Physicians sometimes allude to case histories, but the histories are not available for impartial evaluation. "I have treated thousands..." is an often used reference to confirm the success of a current diet.

Presumably, responsibility for advertising evaluation falls within the purview of the Federal Trade Commission. The priority given to the regulation of such advertising is a mute question possibly best determined by the commissioners.

A subpanel of the recent White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health devoted its attention to deceptions and misinformation. This group, under the Chairmanship of Judge Felix Forte made a number of recommendations which we respectfully bring to your attention. We believe you will find much of interest in your review of food fads and nutrition chicanery.

STATEMENT OF CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL (By Mary B. McCann, M.D., of Health, Education, and Welfare Department)

Deception concerning the healing qualities of particular foods and nutrients has been perpetrated on the public for centuries. Anacharis, a Scythian philosopher who lived about 2500 years ago, recognized this and stated "The market is the place where men may deceive each other." Unfortunately, the medieval axiom "let the buyer beware" is as pertinent today as it ever was.

In fact, the increase in scientific knowledge of nutrition and medical science has, in many instances, served to augment food faddism and food quackery. Food faddists often associate the claimed "miracle results" of their food with the report of scientific facts taken out of context, thus lending an authentic air to their claims.

HEALTH FOODS AND ILLNESS

In some cases, purchases of "health foods" do no harm except to the pocketbook. However, their apparently curative effect in some seeming illness could be achieved with conventional foods. Many of man's illnesses are

psychosomatic, and an appropriate placebo—be it a sugar pill prescribed by a physician or a "miracle food" recommended by a vendor of health foods—can sometimes produce remarkable effects. These cases of "cured" psychosomatic illness undoubtedly account for many of the testimonials quoted by quacks and food faddists.

On the other hand, far too many persons with serious illnesses have been led by a hawk of health foods down a tragic path to an untimely death. Too many accept the claims of the food faddist and delay or avoid seeking proper medical care.

Misinformation or lack of knowledge of nutrition provides the foundation for food fads. Food faddists, and in fact many other individuals, do not realize that there is no best pattern of eating or eating, nor is any one particular food essential for good health. Good nutrition is dependent upon obtaining sufficient amounts of the specific nutrients in food. It makes little difference whether the protein is supplied by steak or fried ants, the calcium by cheese or fish bones, or the vitamin C by orange juice or rose-hips.

SOIL AND HUMAN HEALTH

One breed of food faddists, the "natural foods" advocates, states that our soil is worn out and our food worthless. These self-styled altruists insist that food must be grown on "natural" organically fertilized soil and condemn "processed" foods as "counterfeit", "prefabricated", "worthless", and "carbohydrate paste". They declare that Americans are sick people as a consequence of eating these "processed" foods.

The natural food devotees point to several reported cases of malnutrition occurring in animals fed on crops grown in limited areas where the soil, and therefore the crops, were deficient in some trace element such as copper or cobalt. From such reports they jump to the conclusion that human health is similarly affected. They fail to recognize the fact that Americans today eat a variety of food from many areas.

The only known instance where a relationship has been shown to exist between soil composition and human nutritional status is that between iodine deficiency and endemic goiter. Although it is believed that the chief factor responsible for the decline in endemic goiter in certain "goiter regions" was the use of iodized salt, other factors are also involved. Food processing and marketing systems have expanded and developed; foods grown in areas with adequate iodine were introduced into these "goiter regions". The introduction of a greater variety of foods also accounted for some changes in food habits, for example, an increased consumption of iodine-rich sea foods.

The genetic make-up of the seed, not fertilizer, is primarily responsible for the nutritional composition of foods. Corn can be bred to have more niacin, and apples bred to have more ascorbic acid, but the ascorbic acid of an apple will not be altered by a change in fertilizer. The chief effect of increased soil fertility is an increase in crop yield. There is little evidence that improvement in the amount of fat, protein, carbohydrate, or vitamins in any food is brought about by the fertility of the soil in which it is grown. The "organic gardener" and "natural food advocate" either do not know this, ignore it, or most likely simply overlook it.

However, the mineral content of plant products can be influenced to some extent by fertilizers. Thus, if a soil has more calcium, potassium, iron, or fluorine, it is possible that there will be more of these minerals in the plant materials, a desirable goal in those areas where these nutrients are low in average diets.

FOOD PROCESSING

The "natural food" vendor often argues that processed foods lose so much of their

nutrients in processing that they are literally worthless as compared with fresh foods. It is true that fruits and vegetables are at their best in flavor and nutrition when used one or two hours after harvesting. However, most produce in our markets is over a week old and has journeyed hundreds or thousands of miles before it appears on grocery store counters. Thanks to modern transportation and refrigeration, it is still nutritious, but fresh fruits and vegetables are not superior in food value to commercially canned and frozen foods. Foods packaged by commercial food companies are picked at the proper time and are quickly and carefully processed. Canned and frozen foods contain essentially the same food values as fresh produce.

A favorite topic of faddists for centuries has been the relative merits of white versus brown bread. The controversy between white and brown bread began in earnest in the United States about a century ago with a Massachusetts clergyman, Sylvester Graham. Whole meal bread was good, he said, because it was "natural" and "vital". He condemned the practice of separating the flour from the bran. Brown bread proponents still extol the merits of whole wheat or whole grain flours and predict dire fates for the users of white flour products.

The script of the twentieth century traducers of white bread hasn't changed noticeably since the time of Graham; this is the way the Boston Nutrition Society writes it:

"The enriched white bread fed to the American public is a national scandal. First of all, the wheat grown on poor soil and fertilized with water-soluble commercial fertilizer is of low protein content. . . . The modern flour mill removes the precious vitamins and minerals. This is then bleached with a powerful oxidizing agent, chlorine dioxide (which is a poison); and to this lifeless mess, a few dead synthetic chemicals (improperly called vitamins) and inorganic iron are added. We not only think these foodstuffs are worthless; we believe that many of them are positively harmful. . . . Our hospitals are crowded to capacity. All the metabolic diseases are increasing by leaps and bounds. . . . Cancer is the leading cause of death in children under fourteen. Diabetes and mental disease are on the increase even in children. And dental caries are rampant!"

The plea for whole wheat flour in the average American diet today does not have justification. It has not been proved superior to enriched, refined flour for the nutrition of man.

SUMMARY

The real damage "natural food" faddists do is not the promotion of "natural" foods, because "natural" foods are good foods. Rather, it is the misinformation they dispense and the exorbitant prices they may demand for the wares, often from the misguided, desperate persons in search of health who can ill afford them. They ascribe to "natural foods" the powers of curing and/or preventing disease. Their claims are based on "testimonials" from the people they say they have cured. They allege that the Food Processors, the Chemical and Drug Interests, the "Old-Guard-Fishbein-Type" leadership of the American Medical Association and the Food and Drug Administration are all tied into one giant unholy alliance to protect each other and to maintain themselves and their profits in utter disregard of the health of our nation.

SOLUTIONS

The problem of food faddism is a major one, and a variety of methods must be used to solve the problem. Legislation is helpful; court actions are also of aid. But food faddism is far too big a problem for the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission to handle. Education,

continuing education, is the weapon which will eventually prove effective against it.

Concerted efforts should be made to develop programs for public information. Nutrition education should be integrated into the school curriculum, at both primary and secondary grade levels. The teachers' colleges should have courses in nutrition. No one teacher, such as the homemaking teacher, should have the entire responsibility for nutrition education. Methods for the integration of nutritional information into various subjects in the curricula for different grade and high school subjects must be developed. The teacher should have access to current material. This material should be brief and factual. Nutrition workshops should be established for teachers and administrative personnel as well.

The public should be well informed about nutrition. Both the scientifically trained individual and the skillful professional writer can make valuable contributions to this effort. Voluntary organizations such as the Better Business Bureaus and local medical organizations can assist. The American Medical Association has worked for many years in their campaign against food faddism and has produced educational materials including a movie entitled "The Medicine Man", which is distributed by local medical societies for use in schools, clubs, and other public gatherings. The American Dietetic Association is also active in the field of nutrition education.

Physicians and scientists should assume more responsibility. It is not enough that important scientific contributions should be accurately reported to scientific groups but the investigator should take care that his

research is not misrepresented to the public. Above all, reputable physicians and scientists should not allow their names to be used in introductions or acknowledgements of fad-oriented books. Publishing companies should name scientific committees to advise them on books and advertisements.

Food companies and advertising agencies should continually examine their advertising claims and have them examined frequently by technically qualified outsiders. Food corporations should also assume more responsibility in presenting accurate information to the public which supports them. While we realize that this is a highly competitive world, we cannot excuse the claims that some food concerns make that the use of a particular product will result in good health. These are the claims of faddists, not of reputable manufacturers.

Nutrition is everybody's business. It is imperative and right that everybody should have access to correct nutrition information. Knowledge is the weapon that will prove most effective in limiting the food faddist.

rently holding hearings on legislation sponsored by myself and a number of our colleagues urging the United States to lead the way in negotiating unilateral treaties with as many nations as possible to provide for the mandatory extradition of airplane hijackers to the flag country of the aircraft hijacked so that the hijackers can be promptly prosecuted for the crime of hijacking.

The world is in a huge turmoil right now because of the most recent hijackings by Palestinian guerrillas, and there is special attention being paid to this problem.

I should like to place in the RECORD today analyses of all hijackings during the past 40 years so that we can better understand the urgent need for this legislation.

With the intensified activities in this whole field of hijacking, it occurs to me that we can wait no longer in adopting this legislation.

I should like to call attention to the House that the most staggering growth in hijacking has occurred since the Tri-Continental Congress was held in Havana, Cuba, in 1966 when Communist leaders from 83 nations in Asia, Africa, and the Americas agreed to export terrorism and subversion to an unprecedented scale.

The table of hijackings, as prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, follows:

RECORD OF HIJACKINGS IN THE LAST 40 YEARS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee is cur-

HIJACKINGS

Sequence No.	Date	Name	Airline	Type aircraft	Flight plan	Disposition
1.	1930		(F)		Peru	
2.	July 25, 1947		(F)		Rumania/Turkey	
3.	Apr. 8, 1948		(F)		Czechoslovakia	Landed in United States Zone of Germany.
4.	May 4, 1948		(F)		do	Do.
5.	June 4, 1948		(F)		Yugoslavia/Italy	
6.	June 17, 1948		(F)		Rumania/Austria	
7.	June 30, 1948		(F)		Bulgaria/Turkey	
8.	July 16, 1948		(F)		Hong Kong	
9.	Sept. 12, 1948		(F)		Greece/Yugoslavia	
10.	Apr. 29, 1949		(F)		Rumania/Greece	
11.	Dec. 9, 1949		(F)		Rumania/Yugoslavia	
12.	Dec. 16, 1949		(F)		Poland/Denmark	
13.	Mar. 24, 1950	2 Czechs	(F) Czech		Brno/Prague	Do.
14.	do	do	(F) Czech		Ostrava/Prague	Do.
15.	do	4 Czechs	(F) Czech		Bratislava/Prague	Do.
16.	Dec. 3, 1952		(F)		Philippines/Red China	
17.	Mar. 23, 1953		(F)		Czechoslovakia/West Germany	
18.	Feb. 16, 1958		(F)		South Korea/North Korea	
19.	Apr. 10, 1958		(F)		do	
20.	Oct. 22, 1958		(F)		Cuba	
21.	Nov. 1, 1958	5 men	(F) Cubana	Viscount	Miami/Veradero	Crash killed all.
22.	Nov. 6, 1958		(F)		Cuba	
23.	Apr. 16, 1959		(F)		Cuba/United States of America	
24.	Apr. 10, 1959		(F)		Haiti/Cuba	
25.	Oct. 2, 1959		(F)		Cuba/United States of America	
26.	Apr. 12, 1960	4 men	(F) Cubana	Viscount	Cuba	Landed in Miami.
27.	Jul. 5, 1970	2 men	do	do	Madrid/Havana	Do.
28.	Jul. 18, 1960	1 man	do	Viscount	Havana/Miami	Landed in Jamaica.
29.	Jul. 19, 1970	do	Trans-Australia	Electra		
30.	July 28, 1970	3 men	(F) Cubana		Cuba	Landed in Miami.
31.	Aug. 21, 1960		(F)		U.S.S.R.	
32.	Oct. 29, 1960	9 men	(F) Cubana	DC-3	Havana/Isle of Pines	Landed in Key West.
33.	Dec. 3, 1960	5 men	(F) Cubana			All executed.
34.	May 1, 1961	Corsisi, Elpirata	NAL	CV-440	Marathon/Key West	
35.	Julv 3, 1961	14 men	(F) Cubana	DC-3	Havana/Veradero	Landed in Miami.
36.	July 24, 1961	Oquendo, Wilfredo (Ortiz, Antulio)	EAL	L-188	Miami/Tampa	
37.	July 31, 1961	Britt, Bruce	PAC	DC-3	Chico/San Francisco	Prison term.
38.	Aug. 3, 1961	Bearden, Leon	CAL	B-707	Los Angeles/Houston	Prison—20 years.
39.	Aug. 9, 1961	Bearden, Cody (J)	PAA	DC-8	Mexico City/Guatemala	Reform school.
40.	do	Cadom, Albert	(F) Cubana	DC-3	Havana/Isle of Pines	Prison (Mexico) 8 years, 9 months.
41.	Sept. 10, 1961	Several men	(F) Charter	YAK-12	USSR/Armenia	3 killed, 6 wounded.
42.	Nov. 10, 1961	6 men	(F) Transportes Aereos (Portuguese)		Casablanca/Lisbon	1 killed, 1 wounded in crash. Landed in Brazil after refuel in Tangier.
43.	Nov. 27, 1961	5 men	(F) Avensa (Venezuelan)	DC-6B	Caracas/Maracaibo	Landed in Curacao; hijackers extradited.
44.	Mar. 17, 1962		(F)		France	
45.	Apr. 13, 1962	Healy, David	Private	Cessna 170	Miami (local)	20 years Nov. 12, 1964.
46.	Apr. 16, 1962	Oeth, Leonard	(F) KLM		Amsterdam/Lisbon	25 years Landed in Holland.
47.	Aug. 5, 1963	Siller, Roy	Private		Miami (local)	\$150 fine.
48.	Nov. 28, 1963	6 men	(F) Avensa (Venezuelan)	Convair	Ciudad Bolivar/Caracas	Landed in Trinidad; hijackers extradited.

Footnotes at end of table.

HIJACKINGS—Continued

Sequence No.	Date	Name	Airline	Type aircraft	Flight plan	Disposition
49. ^a	Feb. 18, 1964	Hernandez, Enrique; Rodriguez, Reinaldo.	Private	Piper PA-23	Miami (local)	
50. ^a	Oct. 19, 1964	2 men	(F)	AN-2	U.S.S.R.	Pilot wounded.
51. ^a	Spring 1965	1 man, 1 woman	(F)		U.S.S.R.	
52. ^a	Aug. 31, 1965	Fegerstrom, Harry (J)	Hawaiian	DC-3	Honolulu	Correctional school.
53. ^a	Oct. 11, 1965	Heister, Lawrence (S)	Aloha	F-27	Molokai/Honolulu	Hard labor; discharge.
54. ^a	Oct. 26, 1965	Boyd, Richard (S)				Hard labor; discharge.
55. ^a	Nov. 17, 1965	Perez, Luis	NAL	L-188	Miami/Key West	Acquitted, June 14, 1966.
56. ^a	Mar. 27, 1966	Robinson, Thomas (J)	NAL	DC-8	New Orleans/Florida	Correctional school.
57. ^a	Spring 1966	Cueto, Angelo	(F) Cubana	IL-18	Santiago/Havana	2 killed after pilot trick-lands in Cuba.
58. ^a	July 7, 1966	9 men	(F) Cubana	IL-18	U.S.S.R./Turkey	
59. ^a			(F)		Santiago/Havana	Landed in Jamaica; 1 wounded.
60. ^a	Sept. 28, 1966	Varrier, Maria, 18 men	(F) Argentine	DC-4	U.S.S.R./Turkey	
61. ^a	Feb. 7, 1967	Hajaj, Riyad	(F) Egyptian	AN-24	Buenos Aires/Rio Gallegos	Landed in Falkland; extradited; jailed.
62. ^a	Apr. 24, 1967	5 men	(F) Nigerian	F-27	Egypt	Landed in Jordan.
63. ^a	June 30, 1967	1 man	(F) Private (United Kingdom)	HS-125	Benin City/Lagos	Landed in Nigeria.
64. ^a	Aug. 6, 1967	4 Colombians, 1 Ecuadorian	(F) AVIANCA (Colombian)	DC-4	Spain/Mallorca	Landed in Algeria; Moise Tshombe aboard.
65. ^a	Sept. 9, 1967	Garcia, Ramiro; Garcia, Fernando; Garcia, Joaquin	do	DC-3	Barranquilla/San Andres Island	
66. ^a	Nov. 20, 1967	Gabier, Gabor Luis (Gabor Luis); (Marisy, Felix)	Private	Piper 150	Barranquilla/Magangue (Colombia)	
67. ^a	Feb. 9, 1968	Clark, William (S), (Marine pfc)	PAA (military charter)	DC-6	Hollywood/Bimini	
68. ^a	Feb. 17, 1968	Boynton, Thomas	Private	Piper	Vietnam/Hong Kong	Hard labor; discharged. Conviction set aside, December 1969.
69. ^a	Feb. 21, 1968	Rhodes, Lawrence	Delta	DC-8	Marathon/Miami	20 years—Mar. 11, 1970.
70. ^a	Mar. 5, 1968	Analayo, Sani; Villalobos, Aristides; Acosta, Jaico	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	DC-4	Tampa/West Palm Beach	Pending.
71. ^a	Mar. 12, 1968	Armenteros, Jesus; Gonzales, Gilberto; Martin, Ramon	NAL	DC-8	Rio Hacha/Baranquilla	
72. ^a	Mar. 16, 1968	"Hemingway"	(F) Private (Mexican)		Tampa/Miami	
73. ^a	Mar. 22, 1968	3 men	(F) Avenza (Venezuelan)	CV-440	Merida/Cozumel	
74. ^a	Jun. 19, 1968	Vargas, Radhames	(F) Viasa (Venezuelan)	DC-9	Caracas/Maracaibo	
75. ^a	Jun. 29, 1968	Carter, E.H.	Southeast	DC-3	Dominican Republic/Curacao	20 years—by Dominican court, Aug. 13 1970.
76. ^a	Jul. 1, 1968	Fonseca, Mario	NW	B-727	Marathon/Key West	
77. ^a	Jul. 4, 1968	Morris, John	TWA	B-727	Chicago/Miami	
					New York/West Coast	5 years—convicted June 16, 1969, sentenced.
78. ^a	July 12, 1968	Bendicks, Leonard	Private	Private	Key West/Miami	Pending.
79. ^a	do	Richards, Oran	Delta	CV-880	Baltimore/Houston	U.S. Hospital, Springfield, Mo., Sept. 3, 1969.
80. ^a	July 17, 1968	Leyva, Rogelio	NAL	DC-8	Los Angeles/Miami	
81. ^a	July 23, 1968	3 Arabs	(F) El Al	B-707	Rome/Tel Aviv	Landed in Algiers.
82. ^a	Aug. 4, 1968	Jessie, Willis (S)	Private	Cessna 182	Naples, Fla. (local)	10 years, Federal prison, June —, 1969.
83. ^a	Aug. 22, 1968	1 man	do	Cessna	Nassau/Exuma (Bahamas)	
84. ^a	Sept. 11, 1968	Beasley, Charles	(F) Air Canada		St. John/Toronto	
85. ^a	Sept. 20, 1968	Garcia, Jose	EAL	B-720	San Juan/Miami	
86. ^a	Sept. 22, 1968	Garcia, Ramon	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	B-727	Barranquilla/Cartagena	
87. ^a	do	Londono, Carlos	do	DC-4	Barranquilla/Santa Marta	
88. ^a	Oct. 6, 1968	Vazquez, Mrs. Judy	(F) Aeromaya (Mexican)	HS-748	Cozumel/Merida	
89. ^a	Oct. 23, 1968	Truitt, Alben (S)	Private	Cessna 177	Key West (local)	20 years Federal prison.
90. ^a	Oct. 30, 1968		(F) SEASA (Mexican)			Landed in Brownsville, Texas.
91. ^a	Nov. 2, 1968	Pastorich, Roger (J)	EAL	DC-9	Mobile/Chicago	Probation July 18, 1969.
92. ^a	Nov. 4, 1968	Johnson, Raymond	NAL	B-727	New Orleans/Miami	
93. ^a	Nov. 6, 1968		(F) Philippine		Philippines (local)	Escaped.
94. ^a	Nov. 8, 1968		(F) Olympic		Greece (local)	
95. ^a	Nov. 18, 1968	Torres, Hugo	(F) CMA (Mexican)	DC-4	Merida/Mexico City	
96. ^a	Nov. 23, 1968	5 men	EAL	B-727	Chicago/Miami	
97. ^a	Nov. 24, 1968	3 men	PAA	B-707	New York/San Juan	David Gonzalez and Alejandro Figuera acquitted of aiding and abetting air piracy.
98. ^a	Nov. 30, 1968	Sanchez, J. (Lopez)	EAL	B-720	Miami/Dallas	
99. ^a	Dec. 3, 1968	Canteras, Eddie	NAL	B-727	Tampa/Miami	
100. ^a	Dec. 11, 1968	1 man	TWA	B-727	Nashville/Miami	
101. ^a	Dec. 19, 1968	Washington, Thomas	EAL	DC-8	Philadelphia/Miami	Other charges pending in Philadelphia, 2 years; July 4, 1970.
102. ^a	Jan. 2, 1969	Austin, Tyrone	EAL	DC-8	New York/Miami	
103. ^a	do	Flamouides, George	(F) Olympic	DC-6B	Crete/Athens	Landed in Cairo
104. ^a	Jan. 7, 1969	1 man	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	DC-4	Rio Hacha/Malicao	Landed in Santiago.
105. ^a	Jan. 9, 1969	Bohle, Ronald	EAL	B-727	Miami/Nassau	25 years (June 3, 1970).
106. ^a	Jan. 11, 1969	Helme, Robert	UAL	B-727	Jacksonville/Miami	Acquitted (November 20, 1969).
107. ^a	do	Anaia, Jesus	(F) APSA (Peruvian)	CV-990	Panama City/Miami	
108. ^a	Jan. 13, 1969	McPeck, Kenneth	Delta	CV-880	Detroit/Miami	15 years, Federal prison (July 19, 1969).
109. ^a	Jan. 19, 1969	Navarro, Payano, Aristo	EAL	DC-8	New York/Miami	
110. ^a	do	3 men	(F) Ecuatoriana (Ecuador)	L-188	Quito/Miami	
111. ^a	Jan. 24, 1969	Coulter, Johnny (S)	NAL	B-727	Key West/New York	
112. ^a	Jan. 28, 1969	Booth, Byron	NAL	DC-8	New Orleans/Miami	Indicted (January 28, 1970).
113. ^a	do	3 men	EAL	DC-8	Atlanta/Miami	
114. ^a	Jan. 31, 1969	1 man	NAL	DC-8	San Francisco/Tampa	
115. ^a	Feb. 3, 1969	Hernandez, W., Babin, J	EAL	B-727	Newark/Miami	
116. ^a	do	Peparo, Michael	(J) NAL	B-727	New York/Miami	Correctional School.
117. ^a	Feb. 5, 1969	Fitzgerald, Tasmin	(J)			Do.
118. ^a	Feb. 8, 1969	Fuentes, Leonardo	(F) SAM (Colombian)	DC-4	Barranquilla/Medellin	
119. ^a	Feb. 10, 1969	Romo, Victor	(F) Mexican		Mexico City	Subdued.
120. ^a	Feb. 10, 1969	Alvarez, Pedro	EAL	DC-8	San Juan/Miami	
121. ^a	Feb. 11, 1969	3 men	(F) Aeropostal (Venezuelan)	DC-9	Maracaibo/Caracas	
122. ^a	Feb. 25, 1969	Ervin, Lorenzo	EAL	DC-8	Atlanta/Miami	Convicted, June 5, 1970; Life, July 6, 1970.
123. ^a	Mar. 5, 1969	Bryant, Anthony	NAL	B-727	New York/Miami	
124. ^a	Mar. 11, 1969	Caro Montoya, Juan	(F) Sociedad (Colombian)	DC-4	Bogota	
125. ^a	Mar. 15, 1969		(F) Aerocondor (Colombian)	DC-6	Barranquilla/San Andres	
126. ^a	Mar. 17, 1969	4 men	(F) Faucett (Peruvian)	B-727	Lima/Ecuador	
127. ^a	Mar. 19, 1969	Sandlin, Robert	Delta	DC-9	Dallas/Charleston, S.C.	Pending.
128. ^a	Mar. 25, 1969	Dickey, Douglas	do	CV-880	Dallas/New York	Mental institution, Aug. 14, 1969.
129. ^a	Apr. 11, 1969	Frese, Luis	do	DC-8	Dallas/San Diego	
130. ^a	Apr. 13, 1969	6 men	(F) Ecuatorian	DC-6	Guyana/Quito	
131. ^a	Apr. 14, 1969	4 men	PAA	B-727	San Juan/Miami	
132. ^a	Apr. 14, 1969	3 men	(F) SAM (Colombian)	DC-4	Medellin/Baranquilla	
133. ^a	May 3, 1969	Kivlen, John	NAL		Los Angeles/Miami	Prosecution declined.
134. ^a	May 5, 1969	Marion, N., Gagnon, J	NAL	B-727	New York/Miami	
135. ^a	May 20, 1969	3 men	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	B-737	Bogota/Pereira	
136. ^a	May 26, 1969	Samora, Crescencio; Garcia, Roberto; Bolivar, S.	NB	B-727	Miami/New York	Indicted February 18, 1970.
137. ^a	May 30, 1969	Routh, William	Texas International		New Orleans/Alexandria, La	Mental Institution.
138. ^a	June 4, 1969	Neimyer, Terrance				
139. ^a	June 17, 1969	1 man	(F) DIA (Portuguese)		Angola/Cabinda	Landed in Congo.
140. ^a	June 20, 1969	Brent, William	TWA	B-707	Oakland/New York	
141. ^a	June 22, 1969	3 men	(F) Urraga (Colombian)	DC-3	Colombia (local)	
142. ^a	June 22, 1969	1 man	EAL	DC-8	Newark/Miami	

Footnotes at end of table.

Sequence No.	Date	Name	Airline	Type aircraft	Flight plan	Disposition
141.1	June 25, 1969	Marques, John	UAL	DC-8	Los Angeles/New York	
142.1	June 28, 1969	Anthony, Raymond	EAL	B-727	Baltimore/Tampa	Pending.
143.1	July 3, 1969	1 man	(F) Saeta (Ecuadorian)	DC-3	Ecuador (local)	
144.1	July 10, 1969		(F) Avianca (Colombian)			
145.1	July 26, 1969	Canbera, David	(F) Mexicana	DC-6	Beracruz/Tabasco	
146.1	do	Crawford, J. C.	CAL	DC-9	Los Angeles/Lubbock, Tex.	Pleaded guilty September 14. Sentence—50 years, September 14, 1970.
147.1	July 29, 1969		(F) Nicaraguan			
148.1	July 31, 1969	Perry, Lester	TWA	B-727	Philadelphia/Los Angeles	
149.1	Aug. 4, 1969	3 men	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	DC-4	Santa Marta/Riohacha	
150.1	Aug. 5, 1969	McCreery, John	EAL	DC-9	Syracuse/Tampa	Mental institution. Landed in Khartoum.
151.1	Aug. 12, 1969		(F) Ethiopian			
152.1	Aug. 14, 1969	2 men	NE	B-727	Boston/Miami	
153.1	Aug. 16, 1969	Tsironis, Dr. V	(F) Olympic (Greek)	DC-3	Athens/Agrinion	Landed in Albania.
154.1	Aug. 18, 1969	2 men	(F) Misrair (Egyptian)	AN	Cairo/Luxor	Landed in Egypt.
155.1	Aug. 23, 1969	do	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	AV-748	Bucaramanga/Bogota	
156.1	Aug. 29, 1969	Klein, J. (Carballo)	NAL	B-727	Miami/Houston	
157.1	do	Khaled, Leila; Isawi, Salim	TWA	B-707	Los Angeles/Tel Aviv	Landed in Damascus.
158.1	Sept. 6, 1969	6 men, 1 girl	(F) Ecuadorian Air Force	C-47	Ecuador (local)	Landed in Santiago.
159.1	do	6 men	do	C-47	do	Copilot killed when refueled in Tumaco; plane abandoned.
160.1	Sept. 7, 1969	1 man	EAL	DC-8	New York/San Juan	
161.1	Sept. 10, 1969	Medina, Jose	EAL	DC-8	do	Mental institution, Jan. 3, 1969.
162.1	Sept. 13, 1969	3 commandos	(F) Ethiopian	DC-6	Addis Ababa/Djibouti	1 commando shot, other 2 arrested when landed in Aden.
163.1	do	Huete, Carlos	(F) Sahsa (Honduran)	DC-3	Honduras (local)	Arrested when landed in El Salvador.
164.1	Sept. 16, 1969	Toker, Sadi	(F) Turkish	Viscount	Istanbul/Ankara	Landed in Sofia; put in mental institution.
165.1	Sept. 24, 1969	Hernandez, Alfred (S)	NAL	B-727	Newark/Miami	
166.1	Oct. 8, 1969	1 man	(F) Cruzeiro do Sul (Brazilian)	Caravelle	Belem/Manaus (local)	
167.1	Oct. 8, 1969	Ugartteche, E	(F) Aerolineas (Argentine)	B-707	Buenos Aires/Miami	
168.1	Oct. 9, 1969	1 man	NAL	DC-8	Los Angeles/Miami	
169.1	Oct. 19, 1969	2 men	(F) LOT (Polish)	IL	Warsaw/East Berlin	Landed in West Berlin.
170.1	Oct. 21, 1969	Shorr, Henry (J)	PAA	B-720	Mexico City/Miami	
171.1	Oct. 28, 1969	2 men	(F) Air Taxi		Buenaventura/Bogota	
172.1	Oct. 31, 1969	Minchiello, R. (S)	TWA	B-707	Baltimore/San Francisco	Landed in Rome; under arrest.
173.1	Nov. 4, 1969	2 men	(F) Lanica (Nicaraguan)	BAC-111	Miami/Mexico City	Deplaned all but crew in Grand Cayman.
174.1	do	5 men, 1 woman	(F) Varig (Brazilian)	B-707	Buenos Aires/Santiago	
175.1	Nov. 8, 1969	Melgarejo, Luis	(F) Austral (Argentine)	BAC-111	Cordoba/Buenos Aires	Talked into surrendering at refueling stop in Montevideo.
176.1	Nov. 10, 1969	Booth, David (J)	Delta	DC-9	Lexington, Ky./Chicago	Used girl as hostage in terminal; declared mentally incompetent 10/15/69.
177.1	Nov. 12, 1969	2 men	(F) LAM (Chilean)	Caravelle	Chile (local)	Overpowered by crew.
178.1	do	1 man	(F) Cruzeiro do Sul (Brazilian)	YS-11	Brazil (local)	
179.1	Nov. 13, 1969	6 men	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	DC-4	Colombia (local)	
180.1	Nov. 18, 1969		(F) Mexican			
181.1	Nov. 20, 1969	Szymankiewicz, W., Zolotuch, R.	(F) Lot (Polish)	AN-24	Wroclaw/Warsaw	Landed in Austria. Sentenced to 2 years.
182.1	Nov. 30, 1969	1 man	(F) VANG (Brazilian)	B-707	Lisbon/Rio	
183.1	Dec. 2, 1969	Hamilton, B.	TWA	B-707	San Francisco/Philadelphia	
184.1	Dec. 11, 1969	3 men	(F) South Korean	YS-11	Kangnung/Seoul	Landed in North Korea.
185.1	Dec. 13, 1969	2 men	(F) Ethiopian	B-707	Madrid/Addis Ababa	Hijackers slain by security guard.
186.1	Dec. 19, 1969	1 man	(F) LAN (Chilean)	B-727		
187.1	Dec. 13, 1969	1 man	(F) LACSA (Costa Rican)	C-46	Puerto Limon/San Jose	Released 30 passengers at San Andreas.
188.1	Dec. 26, 1969	Martinez, M.	UAL	B-727	New York/Chicago	
189.1	Dec. 1969	1 man	(F) Ethiopian			Hijacker slain.
190.1	Jan. 2, 1970	4 men, 1 woman	(F) Cruzeiro do Sul (Brazilian)	Caravelle	Montevideo/Rio	Stopped in Peru and Panama.
191.1	Jan. 6, 1970	Funjek, Anton	Delta	DC-9	Orlando/Atlanta	Overpowered on ground, wanted Switzerland, plead guilty July 7, 1970; sentenced 25 years, July 30, 1970.
192.1	Jan. 7, 1970	Rodriguez, Mariano	(F) Iberia (Spanish)	CV	Madrid/Zaragoza	Wanted Albania; surrendered in Zaragoza.
193.1	Jan. 9, 1970	Belon, Christian	TWA	B-707	New York/Rome	Took over between Paris and Rome; landed Beirut, surrendered. Had 3 guns; fined \$7 then rearrested.
194.1	Jan. 9, 1970	Medrano, Jorge	(F) Rapsa (Panamanian)	C-47	David City/Bocas del Toro	Shot and killed by militiaman when plane returned to refuel.
195.1	Jan. 23, 1970	2 men, 2 women	(F) ALM (Netherlands Antilles Airlines)	Fokker F-27	Santo Domingo/Curacao	Landed in Santiago, Cuba.
196.1	Feb. 6, 1970	Bravo, Pedro; Vasquez Oscar	(F) LAN (Chilean)	Caravelle	Puerto Montt/Santiago	1 hijacker killed, 1 wounded; stewardess wounded by detectives disguised as crew.
197.1	Feb. 10, 1970	3 men	(F) El Al (Israeli)	B-707	Tel Aviv/London	Hurled grenades at passengers while plane parked at Municipal Airport; 1 passenger killed, 11 wounded.
198.1	Feb. 16, 1970	1 man (wife, 2 children)	EAL	B-727	Newark/Miami	Latin-type man armed with gun, homemade bomb; could not speak English.
199.1	Mar. 10, 1970	1 man (wife)	(F) Interflug (East German)		East Berlin/Leipzig	Couple reportedly committed suicide when attempt failed.
200.1	Mar. 11, 1970	Stubbs, Clemente (Evans, R.), (wife, 4 daughters)	UAL	B-727	Cleveland/West Palm Beach	Refueled in Atlanta.
201.1	do	4 men	(F) Avianca (Colombian)	B-727	Bogota/Barranquilla	Landed in Santiago, Cuba.
202.1	Mar. 12, 1970	1 man	(F) Varig (Brazilian)	B-707	Santiago/London	Same flight as was diverted Nov. 4, 1969.
203.1	Mar. 17, 1970	Divivo, John J.	EAL	DC-9	Newark/Boston (shuttle)	Co-pilot killed; captain, hijacker wounded; landed safely in Boston; murder.
204.1	Mar. 24, 1970		(F) Aerolineas Argentinas (Argentine)	Comet IV (British)	Domestic Cordoba/Tucuman	After 9-hour repair stop in Lima, Peru, landed in Cuba Mar. 25.
205.1	Mar. 25, 1970	1 man, 1 woman	(F) Charter	Cessna 180	Domestic, British Honduras	Refueled in Mexico.
206.1	Mar. 30, 1970	9 students	(F) Japan Air Lines	B-727	Domestic, Tokyo/Fukuoka	Armed with swords, youths wanted to go to North Korea; tricked into landing in South Korea. After 4½-day wait on ground, passengers exchanged for hostages and flight continued to North Korea April 3.
207.1	Apr. 30, 1970	1 man	North Central	DC-9		Crew and hostage returned April 4.
208.1	Apr. 22, 1970	Meeks, Ira D.; McKinney, Diane	Charter	Cessna 172	Domestic, Gastonia, N.C.	Hijacked bus to take him to airport; got on plane where he was subdued after threatening crew.
209.1	Apr. 25, 1970	1 man	(F) Viacao Aerea de Sao Paula (Brazilian)	B-737	Domestic	Hijacked taxi to airport; hired plane; refueled at Rock Hill, S.C., Jacksonville, Fla., and Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.
210.1	May 1, 1970	2 men (identified as American blacks)	(F) British West Indian	B-727	Jamaica/Senegal	Refueled in Guyana, deplaned 36 passengers, 1 "hippie" remained voluntarily.
211.1	May 5, 1970	Verner, Pavel	(F) Executive plane (Czechoslovakian)		Domestic	Originally wanted to go to Algeria but diverted to Cuba. Junior executive for Czech uranium plant. zoned out his boss and stabbed pilot; wanted to go to West Germany for job but diverted to Linz, Austria. 1 year jail, September 2.

Footnotes at end of table.

HIJACKINGS—Continued

Sequence No.	Date	Name	Airline	Type aircraft	Flight plan	Disposition
212. ^a	May 12, 1970	8 men	(F) ALM (Netherlands Antilles Airlines).	Fokker F-27	Santo Domingo	Dutch revolutionaries.
213. ^a	May 14, 1970	1 man	(F) Australian		Brisbane	Girl, 6, accidentally opened emergency exit door on plane as hijacker was threatening pilot with toy gun in plastic bag while plane on ground at Sydney Airport.
214. ^a	do	1 man	(F) Viaçao Aerea Sao Paulo (Brazilian).	B-737	Brasilia/Manaus	Refuel at Guyana and Curacao; hijacker armed with pistol and explosives.
215. ^a	May 21, 1970	4 men	(F) Avianca (Colombian).	DC-3	Domestic, Yopal/Sogamozo	Stopped unexpectedly in Barrancabermeja and later refueled in Barranquilla.
216. ^a	May 24, 1970	3 men, 1 woman	(F) Mexicana de Aviacion (Mexican).	B-727	Domestic, Cozumel/Merida	
217. ^a	May 25, 1970	1 woman (w/son)	Delta	CV-880	Chicago/Miami	Woman was armed with 38-caliber revolver, took over plane after Atlanta takeoff.
218. ^a	do	1 man	AA	B-727	Chicago/New York	Refueled at JFK in New York and deplaned passengers.
219. ^a	May 30, 1970	Stellipi, Gianlocca	(F) Alitalia (Italian).	DC-9	Genoa/Rome	Used toy pistol; landed in Cairo.
220. ^a	May 31, 1970	2 men	(F) Avianca (Colombian).		Domestic, Bogota/Bucaramanga	Refueled Barranca-bermeja.
221. ^a	June 4, 1970	Barkley, Auther G.	TWA	B-727	Phoenix/Washington, D.C.	Landed Dulles for \$100,000 ransom; departed for upstate New York, returned for more ransom and was captured; armed with pistol, knife and can of fluid; pilot and hijacker wounded.
222. ^a	June 5, 1970	Mosczymsky, Josef	(F) LOT (Polish).	AN-24 (Soviet)	Domestic Szczecin/Dganst	Hijacker armed with 2 hand grenades; landed Copenhagen.
223. ^a	June 8, 1970	Civanicki, Zbigniew.	(F) CSA (Czech)	IL-14	Domestic, Karlsbad/Prague	Landed Nuremberg, Germany; asked for political asylum.
224. ^a	June 9, 1970	2 men	(F) LOT (Polish)		Domestic, Katowice/Warsaw	Foiled by crew.
225. ^a	June 21, 1970	2 men, 1 juvenile	(F) Iranian National Airline	B-727	Iran/Iraq	Landed Baghdad.
226. ^a	June 22, 1970	Xyaert, Haxh	PAA	B-707	Beirut/New York	Landed Cairo.
227. ^a	June 26, 1970		(F) Avianca (Colombian).	B-727	Cucuta/Bogota	Refueled Barranquill.
228. ^a	July 1, 1970	1 man	NAL	DC-8	San Francisco/Miami	Hijacked by armed man after stop in New Orleans; 4 servicemen passengers roughed up at Jose Marti Airport. Hijacker boarded plane in Las Vegas.
229. ^a	July 1, 1970	3 men, 1 woman	(F) Cruzeiro do Sul (Brazilian)	Caravelle	Rio de Janeiro/Buenos Aires	Captured by Brazilian authorities; hijackers hoped to exchange passengers for jailed terrorists.
230. ^a	July 4, 1970	2 men	(F) Cruzeiro do Sul (Brazilian)			Refueled French Guiana; allowed 37 of 54 passengers to leave plane.
231. ^a	July 11, 1970	1 man	(F) Arabian	B-707	Saudi Arabia/Syria	
232. ^a	July 22, 1970	Hardin, Pvt. George (S) ^a	(F) Air Vietnam	DC-4	Pleiku/Saigon	Held pilot at knife point for 2 hours before surrendering; air let out of tires; all happened at Tan San Nhut Airport.
233. ^a	do	6 Arab commandos (5 men, 1 woman).	(F) Olympic (Greek)	B-727	Beirut/Athens	Released passengers after promise of Greek Government to release 7 Arab terrorists; flew plane to Cairo.
234. ^a	July 25, 1970	4 men	(F) Aeronaves de Mexico (Mexican).	DC-9	Alcapulco/Mexico City	Made 30 minute refueling stop in Mexico City; no one deplaned.
235. ^a	July 28, 1970	Albornoz, Fermin Jurado	(F) Aerolineas Argentinas (Argentine).	B-737	Salta/Buenos Aires	Hijacker pulled 2 pistols; plane refueled Cordoba where 23 of 48 passengers deplaned, and Mendoza Andes snowstorm forced plane back to Cordoba where hijacker surrendered to police.
236. ^a	Aug. 2, 1970	Rios, Rudolpho	PAA	B-747	New York/San Juan	Displayed "gun" and bottle of fluid; took hostage as he and stewardess remained outside cockpit door.
237. ^a	Aug. 3, 1970	Huber, Johann	PAA		Munich/West Berlin	Threatened crew with gun; wanted to go to Budapest; was told plane did not have enough fuel and he was convinced.
238. ^a	Aug. 7, 1970	Frej, Waldemar	(F) Polish		Szczecin/Katowice	Hijacker with grenade denied entry into cockpit; landed in East Berlin; wanted to go to Hamburg.
239. ^a	Aug. 8, 1970	Father, 2 sons	(F) Czechoslovak		Domestic	Landed in Vienna.
240. ^a	Aug. 19, 1970	3 men	Trans Carib	DC-8	Newark/San Juan	
241. ^a	do	Inagaki, Sachi	(F) All Nippon (Japanese).	B-727	Domestic; Nagoya/Sapporo	Ordered plane to land at Hamamatsu Air Defense Base, demanded rifle/ammunition in possible suicide plot; woman passenger feigned pregnancy pains and in confusion police came aboard and overpowered hijacker who had only toy pistol.
242. ^a	do	3 men, 2 women	(F) LOT (Polish)	IL-14	Domestic; Gdansk/Warsaw	1 hijacker had hand grenade; landed at Danish island of Bornholm; asked for asylum.
243. ^a	Aug. 20, 1970	Graves, Gregory (S) (AWOL Marine).	Delta	DC-9	Atlanta/Savannah	Said he had bomb in his lap but no one saw it.
244. ^a	Aug. 24, 1970	Labadie, Robert (S)	TWA	B-727	Las Vegas/Philadelphia	Said he had a bomb; landed in Pittsburgh for refuel but no one allowed off plane.
245. ^a	Aug. 27, 1970	Olma, Rudolf	(F) LOT (Polish)		Domestic, Katowice/Warsaw	Threatened crew with bomb, which accidentally exploded injuring hijacker and 10 passengers; wanted to go to Vienna; plane landed safely at Katowice.
246. ^a	Aug. 31, 1970	3 men	(F) Air Algerie (Algerian)	CV-640	Domestic, Annaba/Algiers	Refueled in Sardinia and Italy; wanted to go to Albania, which refused landing; went on to Yugoslavia where they asked for asylum.
247. ^a	Sept. 6, 1970	Guerrillas	TWA	B-707	Tel Aviv/New York	Palestinian guerrillas hijacked plane after stop at Frankfurt; taken to Dawson Field Jordan; plane blown up Sept. 12, 1970.
248. ^a	do	do	(F) Swissair (Swiss)	DC-8	Zurich/New York	Palestinian guerrillas hijacked plane near Paris; taken to Dawson Field, Jordan; blown up Sept. 12, 1970.
249. ^a	do	do	PAA	B-747	Amsterdam/London	2 original hijackers joined by 7 others in Beirut during refueling; blown up in Cairo Sept. 12, 1970.
250. ^a	Sept. 6, 1970	Khaled, Leila (see 157) Arguello, Patrick	(F) EL AL (Israeli)	B-707	Tel Aviv/New York	Armed El Al steward shot and killed male hijacker; female was overpowered by passengers; plane landed in London; Miss Khaled helped hijack TWA plane to Syria August 29, 1969.
251. ^a	Sept. 9, 1970	Guerrillas	(F) BOAC (British)	VC-10	Bombay/London	Palestinian guerrilla forced plane to refuel in Beirut before going to Dawson Field; plane blown up September 12, 1970.

Footnotes at end of table.

Sequence No.	Date	Name	Airline	Type aircraft	Flight plan	Disposition
252.1	Sept. 14, 1970	3 men	(F) TAROM (Romanian)		Bucharest/Prague	Landed in Munich.
253.2	Sept. 15, 1970	Irwin, Donald B.	TWA	B-707	Los Angeles/San Francisco	Wanted to go to North Korea; wounded by Brinks guard, who was a passenger, when plane landed in San Francisco to refuel and deplane passengers.

¹ Successful to Cuba.
² Unsuccessful to Cuba.
³ Successful other than to Cuba.
⁴ Unsuccessful other than to Cuba.
⁵ Originally thought to be hijacking.

⁶ Destination unknown.
⁷ No apparent destination.
⁸ Escaped from custody Aug. 10, 1970; tried to hijack C-141 from Bien Hoa Air Base; recaptured.
 Note.—Abbreviations: F—Foreign; J—Juvenile; S—Serviceman.

CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor to represent Gov. Robert E. McNair and the State of South Carolina in ceremonies commemorating Constitution Day at the Washington Monument on September 17. These splendid ceremonies, sponsored by the Citizenship Committee for the District of Columbia, under the capable general chairman, A. Leo Anderson, marked the 183d anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution. Master of ceremonies was the Honorable Philip J. Rutledge and the Constitution Day Proclamation was read by Mr. William H. Brown. The Governors of the Thirteen Original States were appropriately represented.

The principle address was delivered by Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president and co-founder of Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa. I commend this outstanding address to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to all the American people.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. KENNETH D. WELLS

As we Americans look over our shoulder to the span of the centuries since the calendar began, we find that the history of the human race has been a constant search by men and women on every continent for the fundamental high purposes and principles of human action that would provide an elevated, happy way of life with human fulfillment, as Justice Grady Head has written.

The greatest principles in this search have been known for a long time. They are hoary with age, but they are indivisibly together at this hour, as rock-like, as basic and as fundamental as when they came into being at the beginning of our calendar.

The ideals and high purposes found in the Ten Commandments received by Moses on Mt. Sinai have not been obscured, repealed, modified or improved upon in twenty centuries, except as the depth and magnificence of the expression in the Sermon on the Mount has expanded man's highest principles contained in the beloved rules given to Moses by God.

Neither hippies, nor Hitlers, nor any of their kind; nor Lenins, nor compromisers, nor fakers using hallucinatory drugs, nor smug atheist theoreticians nor surface scholars have found an ideal for a way of life that brings to your soul and mine the peace and understanding received when we follow the faith and teachings in the Sermon on the Mount.

When Justinian codified what the Roman civilization had learned through cen-

turies, the most profound advance in the field of human law the world had to that time known became a foundation stone for the road to the future. This road to liberty under law has become rocky.

Your search, my search, everyone's search for an improved way of living together harmoniously in perfect liberty and freedom in its total sense has been an ideal that has not yet had continual constructive progress. The entire world fell back in the centuries between the days of the Caesars and the foundations of English liberty in the Magna Charta.

Every judge, every legally trained man in the world knows and, I believe, every person of high school training knows, that the elementary principles of freedom, justice and liberty indivisible under the English law originated on June 15, 1215, when the English Barons took from King John at Runnymede the concepts of the Magna Charta. But again the ideals of personal liberty in those few short centuries suffered a setback. A lack of integrity on the part of rulers and individuals, a lack of strength in great voluntary organizations existed. Because of persecution and refusal to give religious liberty, and liberty to engage in enterprise as one saw fit, the first English settlers were forced from their homeland to the shores of this Continent.

Anguish and joy grew apace. The assault on death and disease began. Free enterprise motivated everyone. Medical progress was accelerated. Single family homes were proudly built. The colonists engaged in more and great trade. Invention and opportunity were hallmark. Better farming was sought. The English government became deeply, deeply jealous of our prosperity and of our ability as individuals. They applied many forms of tyranny. The young colonists' determination grew. The winds of death and danger blew each day. They chose freedom.

Mind by mind they decided to cast off the yoke of tyranny. We became free and independent people in free and independent states. The wholeness of the ideas of rights of men, as first stated in our Declaration of Independence, had as its natural parallel a fiery desire that the rights of the individual as a child of God would be at their zenith, and every citizen knew he and she should accept responsibility as a parallel for every right, by exemplary personal conduct. Our desire for a free government that was our servant and not our master was our quest. Freedom was table talk. Our Federal Constitution was built. It has since been proclaimed a thousand times a thousand times as the greatest written document by any group of men of any nation, of any race, who desired the real blessings of personal freedom—religious, economic, and political, at least one great and respected religious denomination treats it as scripture.

From the Ten Commandments through centuries of the Sermon on the Mount to the struggle to build the Roman Code, to the forcing of King John to his knees to grant the Magna Charta at Runnymede, and to the

time of our Federal Declaration of Independence and our Federal Constitution and our state constitutions and municipal ordinances man has struggled to govern himself. *These deep principles and positive truths—great in every sense—have been powerful and effective, and worthwhile, only as they have lived in the hearts and minds and daily lives of men and women.*

The Hebrews were not a great people because of Ten Commandments made them so, or because the Commandments were engraved upon stone and given to Moses by God for the governing of Hebrews.

The Hebrews became a great people and a great nation because they strove to place the great truth and principles of the Ten Commandments in every moment of their lives as individuals and as families, and in the development of their society.

The Roman Code of Law did not make the Romans great, but it became a vast nation—a world power—because the principles of Roman Law were the most advanced in the field of all human property and civil rights, responsibilities and human liberty, and they were widely applied in the lives of the people throughout the Roman Empire.

This Roman Empire fell and was smashed because the Romans did not live up to the concepts of liberty and justice in their laws. Moral decay destroyed them. Judges were dishonest. Law was not enforced. Private and public property was desecrated. Disregard for law crept throughout the land. The Roman Empire fell on history's scrapheap. Many others have been the same from the Incas to modern time.

Great Britain was a great leadership nation, had the greatest trade, the greatest sea power, and far-flung frontiers because the Magna Charta enumerated the great ideals and liberties under law. The common law was valid and powerful. Great Britain became a great nation because its people became on fire with the great ideas, incomplete as they were, of liberty and freedom applied in the daily work of English men and women. They worked, they prospered. Now it is different.

The United States is not the greatest nation on earth because Madison, Franklin, Jefferson, Washington, and all the others, framed the Declaration, Constitution, and Bill of Rights directed at just and personal freedom.

But, we have become the greatest nation on earth because we applied these principles of our Constitution in government without watering down their interpretation to satisfy individual group and party political needs. We are doing this now. To continue means our demise. We have been a great nation because we have been a good nation, respecting property rights, working hard, giving loyalty to God, country, and family—and seeking equity for all.

Our relations with other countries have been workable and usually stable. They have known what we believed in. They have known we would be firm yet compassionate, and have usually known what we have been committed to. Foreign nations have been able to cooperate with us because we have been

strong. They knew where we stood. They cannot cooperate with us when we are weak. No one can co-operate with weakness—moral, political, economic or military.

There are serious people in our land who believe that the United States is in its last days of its near perfect quest for liberty and individual freedom. They honestly fear that our beloved country is in historic and unnecessary danger induced by profligacy, parental neglect, and growing secular clergy and the subsidy of indolence; indeed, placing itself on the auction block because we are not standing fast with the faith that made us free.

These numerous citizens say we are living in the last days of the American Way of Life, its liberty, and its freedoms. I share their concerns, but I do not share their view of the outcome. Let the prophets of doom be quiet. If the U.S.A. goes into chaos, it will be solely because our people and our public and private leaders have wandered away from the moral, religious, and free political and economic concepts of our land; from the basic purpose of the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount and our fundamental documents, for these are not the greatest human relation principles.

Our productive risk capital American Way of Life is endangered in every generation. We must be determined that intelligent, able and conscientious men and women of the arts, business, science, education and religion will get off their perches and think, invest, speak and act in the perpetuation to the great ideals.

There is much too little teaching of responsible citizenship. Historian Arnold Toynbee has told us that every civilization that has been overcome and smashed has been overcome by barbarians within before it was smashed by barbarians from without. There are barbarians within our country. There are many men and women and youths all over this land, who hold no high standards for themselves, who take pride in being mediocre, who are unproductive, unwilling, frequently lazy and sometimes deliberately mentally and physically unclean. These affectations are many, but if he or she has any affection for anyone, it is affection for the slick dealers, the fast buck businessman, syndicate dope-pushers, "the wise guy" who sneers at accomplishment, the fixer who has committed himself, as John G. Fleck said recently, to the "cult of the slob." His first impulse is to turn to mob action.

We see "running off at the mouth" complaint, rather than responsible protest. Honest protest in a peaceable assembly we stoutly defend, but mobs must be put down. No decent American will put up with fires deliberately set and rifles poked out windows to snipe the innocent. Why not be tough-minded like our forefathers? Where is our moral indignation? Why can't we again refuse to call wrong, right? I see enough young people to know that most of them are sound of mind and body, wonderful, wonderful young people. But there are always those who revel in distressing and disrupting others. These few should not dominate, disrupt, and destroy our social fabric.

It is time we said "no" to ourselves when in any manner we harm our families and country and turn from the better things to the baser things.

Man is a child of God. Everyone alive has a divine spark. Let us call on that spark to ignite our faith—strong, thoughtful and bold. No bank accounts, stock portfolios or fancy clothes can ever make up for a fatty degeneration of our moral issues. If we want successful businesses, banks, schools, cities, we must have responsible families and homes. We cannot have them if we pursue indiscriminate sex and illegitimacy in hovels and pads in preference to family life in our homes, laziness in place of ambition, security

in place of opportunity. The quality of life outweighs the quantity of life on the only scales that count.

The base-rock fact is that we are an inseparable part of a sick world. The question is: will it pull us down or will we stand fast with the faith that made us free?

A simple question is before the world. It is, Is there a God? For me, there is no denial except by the vicious Communist-Socialist world structure, or by the confused. *But if there is no God, it is better, even so, to be generous rather than selfish; better to be honest than crooked and sneaky; better to be clean of mind than lewd; better to be thrifty than wasteful; better to die a brave man or woman rather than as a self-convicted moral coward.*

There are certain guidelines, simple things such as personal integrity, a good day's work, regular thrift, kindness and fairness to every man regardless of race, creed or color must prevail, or a free country cannot live.

Whether the civil disorder in over fifty cities in recent months which have shaken the basic structure of our political and social relations in the United States, destroys or does not destroy our country, our lives and our investments, it is clear that the lack of effective teaching of the great values is the root cause of our trouble, coupled with a lack of equity and opportunity in many things for all too many Negro and white citizens. We have known what to do. We have not done it adequately, we have over relied on government, under relied on ourselves.

Open, moral support of law enforcement agencies, is especially important. If civil order is to be preserved, it is essential that those who break the law be punished and that the innocent be protected. It is critical and urgent that the law-abiding citizens receive protection of the law from the lawless.

There is no way to have liberty under law in our business relations or in our family relations unless self-reliance and self-discipline of our citizens are shown each day by belief in respect for, and adherence to the rule of law.

We need correction of inequities in the law in an orderly plus voluntary fashion for all, regardless of race, creed or politics. Job discrimination et al. are ridiculous when people are law abiding, have good personal conduct and work sincerely. However, individuals, whether in business, the clergy, education, farming, factory, or on welfare—whoever they may be, who ignore the orderly legal processes of the United States of America, and who seek illegal redress of grievances no matter how much they are deserved, through rioting mob violence, force accompanied by sniping, burning, arson, looting, and other criminal acts of the gravest order, deserve the appropriate stern punishment of a free society. A new legal approach is long overdue to clear the country of commercialized pornography. It is a tremendously corrupting influence. Moral indignation must rise to shackle this \$5,000,000-plus-a-week industry.

There are constructive things to be given assistance. Trials are delayed. This can, these must be cured. Unreasonable and unnecessary delays in the administration of justice must be cured. Orphanages are full of good kids. They should be adopted. Cities are dirty or filthy. They can be cleaned.

We pray that our lives, regardless of age, health, wealth or lack thereof, may be a tribute to our country's heritage, equal to our competence as children of God. When our beloved President Eisenhower dedicated the American Credo monument at Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, his wise words included, "Let no man do less than his best". Let us teach our Credo.

The Right to Worship God in One's Own Way.

The Right to Free Speech and Press.

The Right to Peaceably Assemble.

The Right to Petition for Redress of Grievances.

The Right to Privacy in Our Homes.

The Right to Habeas Corpus—No Excessive Bail.

The Right to Move About Freely at Home and Abroad.

The Right to Own Private Property.

The Right to Free Elections and Personal Secret Ballot.

The Right to Work in Callings and Localities of Our Choice.

The Right to Bargain with Our Employers and Employees.

The Right to Go into Business, Compete, Make a Profit.

The Right to Bargain for Goods and Services in a Free Market.

The Right to Contract About Our Affairs.

The Right to Service of Government as a Protector and Referee.

The Right to Freedom from Arbitrary Government Regulations and Control.

Let's put forth our real enthusiasm to improve this nation so that it is near perfect by 1976, our 200th anniversary.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore legislation an amendment was offered to change the cutoff date exempting improved private property from condemnation from December 31, 1964 to December 31, 1968. In the ensuing teller vote I voted "no" on this amendment.

At one point in time I had seriously considered offering an amendment to this legislation calling for a cutoff date as of the date of passage of the legislation. It seems no more reasonable to provide a December 31, 1968, cutoff date than a September 22, 1970, date if the idea were only to protect those people who have gone ahead since earlier legislative proposals, which failed to be passed, to construct their summer homes.

After careful consideration I chose not to introduce this amendment. And let me state my reason.

Our basic concern in Sleeping Bear legislation is protection of the environment. Park Service plans for the area developed in 1964 have this well in mind. Their plans were prepared when it was possible to lay out the optimum locations for public use areas to minimize damage to the environment.

To allow improved property constructed after December 31, 1964, protection from condemnation is to significantly disrupt those optimum plans for protecting the environment. It would force the Park Service to use second, third, and even fourth choices for locations of its public use facilities, thus encouraging damage to the environment, damage which we can otherwise effectively avoid.

Mr. Speaker, it is out of this deep concern for the protection of the environment in the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Area that I voted "no" on the amendment to change the cutoff date.

LET US NOT SURRENDER THE
PANAMA CANAL

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted House Resolution 1171, which, with reference to the Panama Canal, expresses "the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the United States maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said canal and that the U.S. Government in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights or jurisdiction to any other sovereign nation or to any international organization." I urge the Committee on Foreign Affairs to hold hearings on this important measure as soon as possible, in order that it may reach the floor of this body for action during the present session.

While it is true that, under the Constitution of the United States "the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties," I do not interpret this to mean that Members of the House of Representatives, a coequal branch of the Congress, should remain silent on such an important matter as the treaty which the Johnson administration negotiated between the United States and the Republic of Panama.

The treaty, which is pending before the other body, provides for: Surrender of our sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama; a partnership between the United States and Panama in the management and defense of the canal; giving the United States an option on a site for a canal of sea-level design; and eventually giving both the existing canal and any new canal that may be constructed to replace it to Panama, all without any compensation whatsoever.

Even if such a colossal giveaway made sense, it could not be effected constitutionally without the consent of both Houses of Congress, the House of Representatives having as much to say in the matter as the Senate. The second clause of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution reads as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

It therefore becomes all the more necessary for Members of the House to speak out. We who must face the voters every 2 years are much closer to the people than are the Members of the other body, less than one-third of whom are seeking reelection this year. While a Senator may have been chosen by a majority of the voters of his State, his views on such a topic as the pending treaty may be diametrically opposite to those of the people who voted against him in the election or in his party's primary. It is possible that large numbers of those who supported him in the primary and in the election disagree with him in regard

to the treaty. Members of the House have a duty not only to listen to the voices of their constituents, they also have a solemn duty to alert them to what is going on in the Nation's Capital, especially in this day of managed news.

I want to discuss briefly why I believe the status quo in the Canal Zone should be maintained and why I hope the pending treaty will be overwhelmingly rejected by the other body. Actually, but 34 votes are required to block ratification, but I hope rejection will be effected by a substantial majority.

Before the construction of the Panama Canal, a ship had to travel more than 13,000 miles, a distance exceeding half the circumference of the earth, in order to go from New York to San Francisco. Utilization of the canal cuts the distance to about 5,200 miles. Bear in mind that the ships that supply our fighting men in Southeast Asia utilize the Panama Canal.

Republicans are frequently accused of "wanting to go back to the days of McKinley" and are often told that we can no longer follow the counsel of Theodore Roosevelt, who advised us to "speak softly and carry a big stick!" Certainly I would not want to go back to those days, even if it were possible, but by way of rebuttal I will say that William McKinley knew what to do about Cuba and Theodore Roosevelt knew what to do about Panama. Both of these nations owe their independence, their very existence, to the United States of America.

An uprising occurred in Panama on November 3, 1903, when it was part of Colombia. The presence of the warship U.S.S. *Nashville* at Colon, where it had arrived the day before, prevented Colombian troops from crossing the Isthmus of Panama to put down the rebellion. When the independence of Panama was proclaimed, the United States was the first nation to recognize the new country.

Under the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, the United States was granted exclusive use, occupation, and control of the Canal Zone in perpetuity. The United States could exercise all sovereign powers to the entire exclusion of the exercise of sovereign powers by the Republic of Panama.

Panama was to receive \$10,000,000 in cash and a \$250,000 annuity to begin 9 years after the treaty was ratified. The annuity was increased to \$430,000 in 1936 and to \$1,930,000 in 1955. The treaty was proclaimed on February 26, 1904, and the United States formally acquired the Canal Zone on May 4, 1904.

To implement the treaty, the United States proceeded to acquire outright ownership of all land and other property in the Canal Zone by purchases from the individual owners. The rights exercised by our Nation in the Canal Zone are thus derived from both the grant from the Government of the Republic of Panama and purchases from the individual property owners.

As Panama had been a place of endemic revolution, the framers of the treaty of 1903 insisted that it contain perpetuity, sovereignty, and protective clauses, thus guaranteeing the political stability that was so essential for the future efficient operation of the canal. The

United States would never have undertaken to build and subsequently maintain and operate the waterway if it had not been granted complete and perpetual control by the treaty. At this point I would remind my colleagues that Panama has experienced several unconstitutional changes of heads of government since 1930.

What has the Panama Canal cost our Nation? The net investment for acquisition of government of the Canal Zone, construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and police protection of the Panama Canal, offset by recoveries by the U.S. Treasury, totals approximately \$1 billion.

Defense of the canal by the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the United States has cost over \$4 billion, making our total investment in excess of \$5 billion. Because of the presence of our Armed Forces in the Canal Zone, the Republic of Panama is spared the necessity of maintaining an elaborate and costly defense establishment. It is thus relieved of a tremendous financial burden.

Obviously the Republic has derived considerable in the way of financial and other benefits because of the huge expenditures we have made. Our Armed Forces furnish gainful employment to over 3,000 Panamanian citizens, while their dependents provide an additional stimulus to the Republic's economy because of their purchases of goods and services there.

More than \$100 million is now injected into Panama's economy annually through employment and purchases. The isthmian nation has also been a passenger on the foreign aid gravy train, having received \$226 million from the various foreign aid programs of the United States during the period 1946 to 1970.

Many of the benefits that Panama receives from us cannot be measured in terms of dollars. The U.S. Southern Command, which is stationed in the Canal Zone, frequently transports seriously ill or injured persons from the interior of the Republic to the capital or other sites where they can receive proper medical treatment.

Major assistance was provided in 1965 when Panama City suffered from devastating fires. Aircraft of the United States flew many missions in support of Panama's relief efforts during the floods in the Chepo region in 1967.

Due to the efforts of the U.S. Government, the Canal Zone area underwent a metamorphosis from one of the worst pestholes on earth to the healthiest spot in all the tropics. In accordance with the treaty of 1903, the United States continued to enforce sanitary and health ordinances in Panama City and Colon. The treaty of 1955 between the two nations, at the request of Panama, relieved the United States of this responsibility.

What was the result of this transfer of responsibility? Garbage accumulations in the streets of Panama City became the food sources for an unprecedented increase in rats, which are the carriers of the bubonic plague and other diseases. During one 8-hour day in 1967, the rodent control section of the Municipal

Health Board of Panama City trapped 934 rats that averaged over 2 pounds in weight.

The greatest benefit that Panama receives from our presence in the Canal Zone is its continued independence, which can be guaranteed only by our remaining on the isthmus in perpetuity. While it is true that Panama's most important natural resource is its strategic location, it must be recognized that this also constitutes its greatest danger. That danger has been greatly magnified by the Communist takeover in Cuba.

The fundamental question in the proposed surrender of our sovereignty over the Canal Zone is not whether the United States rather than Panama shall control this strategic area, but whether the United States rather than the forces of international communism shall control it. If Western civilization is to be able to defend itself against Communist aggression, it is absolutely imperative that the United States continue to control, maintain, operate, and protect the Panama Canal. If we relinquish full sovereignty over this strategic waterway, all of the nations of Latin America will inevitably and swiftly go the way of Cuba.

Surrender of the Panama Canal will encourage the overthrow of constitutional governments by Communist revolutionaries throughout Latin America. It will also have a calamitous impact on such other crucially important strategic places as Southeast Asia, Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and Southern Africa.

In the event that expanded Communist power leads to control of the Middle East, Europe would be confronted with a situation similar to that it faced in 1453 when the capture of Constantinople by the Turks forced the Portuguese to seek a new route to India via the Cape of Good Hope. A fortunate result of the fall of Constantinople was the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus—do those who advocate the surrender of the Panama Canal anticipate equally happy results?

Continued economic sanctions against Rhodesia could open the back door to war with all of Southern Africa, the countries of which are anti-Communist. Seaports and airports in Southern Africa, occupied by Red naval forces, could well dominate the sea routes around the Cape of Good Hope and close the alternate passage between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.

Several years ago the misnamed Carnegie Endowment for International Peace issued a general staff type of war plan for a land, sea, and air assault on South Africa, to be conducted by the United Nations organization. Such a plan, if successfully carried out, would inevitably place Communist power in position to control the ocean routes adjacent to Southern Africa by submarines and aircraft, thereby strategically isolating the sea transport of Western Europe and the United States from countries bordering the Indian Ocean.

Ratification of the pending treaty by the Senate would constitute a complete surrender to Panama of our sovereignty with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone in favor of a dual managerial and governmental setup, in an area of end-

less bloody revolution and political instability. Such control could only lead to the unending conflicts and recriminations that inevitably accompany extra-territorial jurisdiction. It would mean the scrapping of all laws enacted by this Congress since 1904 for canal purposes and for governing the Canal Zone territory.

Such abdication of sovereignty would also mean the loss of our \$5 billion investment, as Panama does not expect to pay 1 cent for what it is trying to obtain.

If Panama were to become co-manager, its policy would be adamant against any use of the canal that might offend Communist powers and our Government would become involved in a constant state of friction with Panama concerning such matters.

In 1923, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes told the minister from Panama that—

It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President, or any secretary of state, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903.

In 1903 the Republic of Panama entered into a solemn treaty with the United States—it should honor the terms of that treaty just as we have faithfully carried out our obligations thereunder.

The United States has invested over \$5 billion to construct, maintain, and operate the Panama Canal—we must maintain possession of this vitally important strategic waterway.

The international Communist aggressors possess altogether too many vital locations already—they must be told emphatically to keep their hands off the Panama Canal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Foreign Affairs to hold early hearings and report out the strongest possible resolution. We must let the United States Senate know that the House of Representatives, the branch whose Members report to the people every 2 years and which is therefore more aware of true public opinion, is emphatically and unequivocally opposed to any effort to surrender the sovereignty of the United States in the Canal Zone.

UNITED STATES LINE INAUGURATES NEW SERVICE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new freight service inaugurated September 11 by United States Line. The new service will encourage coast-to-coast freight and cargo shipments between east coast ports and those on the west coast. The new route will also extend to Hawaii and the Orient.

I have long been an advocate of increased economic contact between our

country, particularly the west coast, and those countries in the Far East. This new route and service of United States Line is most certainly a step in the right direction.

There will be regular once a week sailings, and the round trip from New York to the west coast to the Orient and back will take only 56 days.

We are at a crossroads in the economic life of our country. We must find markets for our export goods as our traditional markets become saturated. The newly developing nations of the Far East are now available and must be given primary consideration in this context. The first step in developing new export markets must be an adequate freight and cargo linkage. This new route by United States Line, with its regular and rapid service, will serve as a much needed bridge between our Nation and the Orient. The linkage is a new and interesting contribution by the business community to the healthy growth of the economy of the United States, and I congratulate them on their foresight in taking this important step.

BEHIND THE CAMPUS REVOLT

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the July 18 Saturday Review carried an article containing many insights into the campus unrest question. The author lays to rest many of the theories on the unrest which do not stand up under logical analysis. He further places responsibility on the faculties of universities for developing adequate methods to cope with the destructive activities of student anarchists whose goal is to destroy the university and the establishment. Those goals will be fulfilled without such constructive efforts on the part of faculties.

I commend the article to my colleagues:

BEHIND THE CAMPUS REVOLT

(By Paul Woodring)

The tragic events at Kent State University this May, followed by demonstrations involving various degrees of violence on hundreds of other campuses, occurred only a few months after a number of college presidents had expressed the opinion that the worst was over—that campus dissent, protest, activism, and violence were on the wane. Now, with the college year ended, only a few will hazard a prediction. Whether the disorder will increase or subside when they reopen seems likely to depend on future events yet unforeseen and to some extent on the effectiveness of leadership on the national level. So far this administration has been even less successful than the preceding one in gaining the confidence of the younger generation, or in convincing it that our national policy is sound.

No administrator on either the national or local level can hope to be loved, admired, or followed by that segment of the younger generation which is convinced that all administrators are evil and that the Establishment must be overthrown. But this segment is a small minority of the nation's seven million college students. The great majority still is searching for leadership that it can

respect, as was demonstrated by those who shaved their beards and cut their hair in order to campaign more effectively for Senator McCarthy. There is grave danger, however, that in the absence of acceptable leadership, more students will give their allegiance to leaders who offer nothing but anarchy.

Millions of words have been written in efforts to account for the widening gap between young people and those whom they identify as "the Establishment." Though many causal factors have been listed, none of the hypothesis so far advanced adequately explains why the students of recent years differ so greatly from those of the Fifties, most of whom accepted the System and seemed eager to become a part of it. Why has there been so great a change in so short a time?

If dissent were found only in the United States, it might appear that the major cause is the moral dilemma presented to young men by our involvement in Vietnam. But, since protest and violence have become equally common in the universities of Japan, Mexico, Canada, France, Italy, and other nations not involved in the Vietnam conflict, any acceptable hypothesis must explain the world-wide nature of today's youthful activism. It must also account for the fact that college students—most of whom receive draft deferments, and few of whom get into combat even if they are drafted after graduation—protest more angrily than do the non-college men who are called upon to do the fighting. To say that it is because they are more intelligent and better informed seems a limp explanation.

Those who blame rigid college rules and authoritarian administrators for campus revolt must explain the fact that some of the most violent protests have occurred on campuses where the administrators have been noted for their liberalism, and where students enjoy an exceptional amount of freedom. They must also explain why the revolt came in the Sixties rather than a generation or two earlier when administrators enforced far more rigid rules without meeting much protest.

The view that campus unrest results from the bureaucracy and impersonality that come with large institutional size has some validity but cannot be a sufficient cause. Several American universities were excessively large even a generation ago (New York University enrolled 31,000 students in 1936), while some of the recent disorders have occurred on much smaller campuses.

The threats to the quality of life imposed by overpopulation and pollution increase the level of anxiety but do not adequately explain the attacks on the Establishment. It is young men and women, rather than older members of the Establishment, who have most of the babies, and it is they who can reduce the birth rate if they choose to do so. Industry can legitimately be blamed for much of the pollution, but students who drive overpowered cars also contribute to it.

Those who attribute campus protest to permissive child rearing must produce evidence, first that permissiveness really is productive of protest-prone personalities, and second that the students of the Sixties were reared more permissively than those who came to college a decade earlier. In the absence of such evidence, it seems unlikely that there was much change in child-rearing practices in so short a time.

When students are asked for their own explanation of the unrest, a frequent answer is, "Because we are aware." And indeed they are: well aware of social injustice, of the helplessness of individuals in a mass society, and of the dangers of pollution and of nuclear war. Yet, it seems a bit presumptuous for them to assume that no previous generation has been aware of the evils of the world or of the problems facing the nation. Stu-

dents of the Thirties were aware of the horrors of war and of the probability that many of them would die in a second world war. They read daily of the threats to freedom posed by the rise of Hitlerism. And they knew at first hand what it means to come to maturity during a depression.

Many of the students who came to college in the late 1940s and early 1950s had been personally involved in warfare, and all of them were aware of the existence of nuclear bombs that could destroy civilization. Yet, the level of campus protest was much lower in those previous decades than it is today.

Two recently published collections of essays by academic men throw additional light on these problems even though they do not adequately explain the magnitude of dissent on campuses. *Students in Revolt*, edited by Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altbach (Houghton Mifflin, 561 pp., \$8.95), presents the international picture with chapters on activism in Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America. *Student Activism and Protest*, edited by Edward E. Samson and Harold A. Korn (Jossey-Bass, 265 pp., \$8.50), covers the American scene.

The historical portions of the first of these books make it clear that anyone who wishes to avoid a revolution should not take student activism lightly. In Germany and Austria, students played a key role in the revolutions of 1848. In czarist Russia, they spearheaded various revolutionary movements and helped pave the way for the Revolution of 1917. More recently, student demonstrations played a role in the overthrow of Peró in Argentina and Jimenez in Venezuela. In 1960 the massive riots of Japanese students against the Security Treaty between the United States and Japan forced the resignation of the Kishi government. In all these nations the number of students in universities was much smaller than in the United States today.

The contributors to *Student Activism and Protest*—seven psychologists, one sociologist, and a political scientist—identify different types of dissenters; they stress the fact that only a small minority engages in violent or illegal forms of protest. James Trent, a psychologist at UCLA, says that, while some engage in "rebellion for the hell of it" and a few are anarchists who "want devastating confrontation for its own sake," others are "rationally motivated intellectual dissenters who are not interested in bringing down the social order but in probing it, testing it, and changing it." Kenneth Keniston says that the popular stereotype of the protesting student as a long-haired and unkempt individual who is influenced by Maoist or Castroite doctrines and who also experiments with psychedelic drugs, confuses two distinct varieties of students—the alienated and the political activists. In his own studies at Harvard, he has found that alienated students are not likely to engage in demonstrations, which they see as mere role-playing. Activists are of a different psychological type, which Keniston describes as the "protest-prone personality," noting that a student who demonstrates for one cause is likely to demonstrate for a number of others. Such students are not alienated. Many of them come from families with liberal political views, and their parents support their protest activities. They are recruited from among those young Americans who have enjoyed what is commonly considered the best of American life and have had the greatest opportunity to advance within the System.

The role of the faculty in stimulating and encouraging protest movements has not yet received the attention it deserves, but Sampson, in his introductory chapter, mentions two groups of faculty members who are sympathetic to the dissenters. The first is "composed of the old, disillusioned rebels of the Thirties [who] see in the present student movement their own life replayed, now life-

sized on a screen outside their offices. Though their heart is with the movement, their minds tell them that failure is all that faces these new activists."

A second sympathetic faculty group "is composed of the younger, just Ph.D.'d instructors and assistant professors who rose from the ranks of the more recent protests and who now come naturally to continue their battles. These are the faculty who can be seen huddled head to head with the student activists at every planning session, joining together with them in preparing what they hope will be the groundwork for the wave of tomorrow." These younger faculty members, like the students, are prone to see university administrators as "the enemy in residence," and, because of the rapid growth of universities in recent years, they often outnumber the older ones. Dissenting students, because of their reluctance to trust "anyone over thirty," are prone to follow the lead of the younger faculty members.

Several of the authors repeat a statement that has appeared in a dozen previous volumes: Student protest is found mostly in highly selective institutions, and is rare in less prestigious institutions "such as teachers college." In addition to being outdated by events of late, such a statement reveals a remarkable lack of awareness of recent changes in higher education. In most parts of the nation, teachers colleges as separate institutions disappeared from the scene a full generation ago. Some of the state colleges and universities that grew out of them—San Francisco State and Kent State are conspicuous examples—have had their full share of protest and violence. Activism is no longer restricted to a few campuses, or to any one type of institution.

Richard Flacks, a sociologist at the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California, offers a hypothesis that organizes a number of the contributing causes of unrest into a pattern: "The expansion of higher education in our society has produced a social stratum that tends to rear its children with values and character structures that are at some variance with the dominant culture. Affluence and secure status further weaken the potency of conventional incentives and undermine motivations for upward mobility. The outcome of these new processes is a new social type or subculture among the young—humanistic youth. Such youth are especially sensitized to injustice and authoritarianism, are repelled by acquisitive, militaristic, and nationalistic values, and strive for a vocational situation in which autonomy and self-expression can be maximized. They have been politicized and radicalized by their experiences in relation to the racial and international crisis, and by the failure of established agencies of renewal and reform, including the universities, to alleviate these crises. They also sense the possibility that opportunities for autonomy and individuality may be drying up in advanced technological societies."

One additional factor deserves mention—the contagion that has been notable since the first Berkeley disorders were televised. In the words of Donald Brown, a psychologist at the University of Michigan: "The news-hungry media tend to fan the sparks of unrest by massive and immediate publicity. . . . There is bound to be a generalization and spread of effect from campus to campus." There is little doubt that the nationwide publicity given to student protest leaders encourages the rise of such leaders on other campuses.

Whether or not our military involvement in Southeast Asia is the major cause of unrest in the United States, it seems clear that the decision to move into Cambodia provided the trigger for the violence that led to the closing of hundreds of American colleges and universities in the spring of 1970. If the withdrawal of our troops proceeds on sched-

ule, and campus dissent remains at its present level, it will be apparent that the search for more deep-seated causes must continue.

Although some of these authors suggest possible ways of reducing campus tension—experimental programs, student participation in policymaking, special programs for the disadvantaged, and the cluster-college plan for reducing institutional size—those in search of immediate solutions will not find them in books such as these. Academic men, by virtue of their training and traditions, are more skilled in analyzing problems (and proposing further research) than in offering clear recommendations and answers to the question that many administrators have faced: What ought a college president to do when he is confronted by a group of students who present "nonnegotiable" demands and threaten violence if their demands are not met immediately? To say that the president must continue to search for underlying causes of the unrest is a feeble answer. To wait until he acts and then to criticize the action taken is irresponsible.

The faculty, as a policymaking body, has a clear responsibility to formulate procedures for dealing with such confrontations, and to support the administrative action taken when it is consistent with pre-established policy. The unwillingness of faculty members to support even the best college and university presidents has made it more difficult for administrators to deal wisely, effectively, and promptly with activities that, if continued, would bring down the institutions of higher learning.

CAMBODIA OPERATION ANALYZED BY COL. WILLIAM C. MOORE, USAF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. News & World Report of June 22, 1970, carried an article entitled "Hanoi Has Suffered a Crippling Blow," and the issue of September 7, 1970, an article entitled "Cambodia Plus 2 Months." Both of these articles were written by Col. William C. Moore, the vice commander of Headquarters Command, USAF, Bolling AFB, Wash. Colonel Moore has served as a member of the Strategic Plans Group of JCS and also with SHAPE as a strategic planner. I believe his military appraisal of the Cambodian operation to be excellent and commend its reading to Members of this body.

The article follows:

"HANOI HAS SUFFERED A CRIPPLING BLOW"

(By Col. William C. Moore, USAF)

The Cambodian operation to date has been analyzed, evaluated and reported mainly in terms of statistics. The statistics are impressive. They leave no doubt that the enemy has been hurt. Now two essential questions arise: How permanently and how deeply has the enemy been hurt—and how quickly can he get well?

First, how deeply have the Communists been hurt?

The sheer magnitude of the impact that operations into Cambodia has had on the enemy's capability to fight is hard for many to comprehend.

It might help to recall MacArthur's landing at Inchon in the Korean War. Inchon serves a classic example of what happens to an enemy—no matter how well trained, or-

ganized or resolute—when his rear areas, his rest areas, his supply areas, his lines of communications are overrun.

Plans are disrupted, units decimated, communications destroyed, concerted resistance made difficult. Well-disciplined soldiers become preoccupied with their own survival, with their fear of death, capture or isolation. Their capability and effectiveness as soldiers are seriously impaired.

The Cambodian operation has not been reported in this press as a classic military flanking movement, as was Inchon. Nevertheless, it has had the same destructive effect always associated with a successful flanking maneuver or penetration. Not even the jungle can hide the facts. Not even the cleverest propaganda from the leaders in Hanoi can minimize the military debacle they have suffered.

The results to date—the booty captured, the bunkers uncovered, the enemy killed—tell the story.

Suddenly the leaders in Hanoi have suffered, it has had the same destructive effect on the countryside, to disrupt urban and suburban centers of friendly forces. Suddenly there are no zones for soldiers to rest and recuperate, to regroup and replan new attacks. Suddenly the lines of communications to supply these troops are severed and the avenues to restore them are greatly diminished. Suddenly a large portion of the North Vietnamese force is no longer available to quickly and efficiently carry out Hanoi's attacks on South Vietnam. Suddenly, in the classical military sense, the leaders in Hanoi have been outmaneuvered, their lines penetrated, their communication zone supporting their frontline troops overrun.

Secondly, what lasting effect will the Cambodian operation have?

At this point the enemy has few alternatives except to continue his efforts to redress the tactical situation which is now highly unfavorable to him. The most pressing need is new supply routes and bases to replace those now controlled by U.S. and friendly forces.

In the meantime, there is an urgent need to save as many troops as possible—to regroup them, to re-equip them, to reinforce them, to re-establish them as a viable force.

How successful the leaders in Hanoi will be in doing this, only time will tell. The monsoon season will cause them trouble. It most certainly will delay their efforts.

Given time, the enemy will undoubtedly be able to improve the situation now confronting him. Some sense of order will be restored and there will be a step-up in attacks as supply lines begin to fill up. In time—much time—the enemy may be able to re-establish the capability it possessed before the operation into Cambodia. The U.S. will monitor closely his actions to do this. What the enemy does will serve as a clue to his determination and future intentions.

No matter what course of action the enemy decides upon, he can never regain the time that the Cambodian operation has provided President Nixon to proceed with the Vietnamization program and the attendant withdrawal of United States forces. Nor can Hanoi undo the shot in the arm that the Cambodian operation has given the South Vietnamese armed forces.

Without question, Hanoi desperately would like to disrupt the Vietnamization program. In the long run, Vietnamization confronts Hanoi with the dim prospect of a protracted war in which the principal adversary is not the prestigious United States but South Vietnam itself. In this light, Vietnamization confronts the leaders of Hanoi with a war in which there is little glory, less prestige and great opportunity to lose face.

This is the real military story of the Cambodian operation—the one receiving only

minor attention. The operation has saved countless American lives—the exact reason for which U.S. forces entered Cambodia. No one can contest this. Moreover, the operation has engendered a new optimism that Vietnamization and its attendant withdrawal of U.S. troops will succeed. The achievement in Cambodia will rank high in the classical military sense, as passage of time reveals its full military scope and significance.

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.

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.

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Mount Vernon News of Mount Vernon, Ohio, carried in its September 18 issue a letter from S. Sgt. George W. Curry now serving in the jungles of Vietnam near the Cambodian border. I know that Sergeant Curry speaks for the overwhelming majority of American boys in Vietnam when he states:

How we are fighting this war is questionable at times, but the question of it being right or wrong is so ridiculous, it amazes me.

Of course, Sergeant Curry is learning the realities of the Vietnam conflict the hard way—by actual participation in the defense of the Vietnamese people against an unbelievably cruel and brutal enemy.

But one need not be exposed to the horrors of the Vietnam conflict to arrive at the truth. The late Dr. Tom Dooley described his experiences in Haiphong in 1954 when he treated victims of Communist brutality from the Communist North. Since that time many sources have documented the utter disregard for human life which has typified the activities of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Communists. Yet there are those clergymen, public officials, educators, and others who can still claim that the United States plays an immoral role in the Vietnam war.

Following is the letter of Sergeant Curry whose feelings, I am sure, are those of the majority of thoughtful American citizens here at home as well as those of our servicemen in Vietnam:

PEOPLE'S FORUM

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

This is the first opportunity I have had to express my feelings toward the riots, student unrest, violence, and general dissent of the American people.

I myself, am in the middle of the jungle in Vietnam with Cambodia only a stone's throw away. Being in the position to know both sides, I wonder sometimes if people actually know what they are saying by "end the war." How we are fighting this war is questionable at times, but the question of it being right or wrong is so ridiculous, it amazes me. Communism is an enemy of any democratic society, be it here in Southeast Asia or right in the middle of the public square. I feel that what we are doing here safeguards our own country, families, and our way of life. This disease called

communism must be battled even at the risk of American lives, because if not stopped here, it would eventually infect the good old U.S.A.

I'm more than willing to sacrifice a year and even my life to protect the things that are held most dear to me and I'm sure that the majority, if faced with the decision, would feel the same.

Like many young men of Mount Vernon and Knox County, I was drafted into the Army. Although my tour is relatively short, I have witnessed the devastating effects that a minority can impose on the majority. The young people of our city, state, and country are not all dope addicts, hippies, or revolutionaries. There are still some who value freedom, have respect for authority, and are willing to face the problems of the world, as it is today. These young people are your leaders of tomorrow, so cultivate in them the ideals that we, as Americans, fought and died for!

I am proud to be an American doing what is necessary to preserve the idea of "Americanism." No truer words were ever spoken when it is said, "For those who have fought for it, freedom has a taste the protected will never know!"

S. Sgt. GEORGE W. CURRY.

APO SF 96490.

THE STORY OF FORCED REPATRIATION—OPERATION KEELHAUL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for many years now, Mr. Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University has been diligently researching one of the greatest infamies carried out in American diplomatic history, that of Operation Keelhaul.

Operation Keelhaul was an Army code name used during World War II for the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communists back to the Soviet Union, where they were either enslaved or murdered outright.

Equally responsible for this infamy was the British Government, who worked with American forces to forcibly repatriate millions of anti-Communists back to the Soviet butchers.

Since World War II the Army has kept Operation Keelhaul files classified "top secret." Mr. Epstein sued the Secretary of the Army under the Freedom of Information Act to declassify the files, and the case eventually went to the Supreme Court. Without even examining the files, the Court denied Mr. Epstein his petition of certiorari, which disregards the intent of Congress under the Freedom of Information Act.

It has been 30 years since the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty. In the light of the on-going Soviet conspiracy and the manner in which the Soviets are continuing their treachery the world over, the American public ought to know how this country and the British were deceived by the Soviets into carrying out Operation Keelhaul. We ought to know who was part of this operation, what arguments were used to carry it out, what forces were at play, what agencies were

involved, and how this monstrous conspiracy was carried out.

In front of the National Archives Building here in Washington, one sees two inscriptions; one reads: "What is Past is Prologue," and the other: "Study the Past."

In receiving the full report on Operation Keelhaul, we Americans can be appraised of how a nation can be betrayed and from that lesson gird ourselves against a similar betrayal by the Soviets and their friends and dupes as they plunder the Middle East and prepare for new aggression into Africa, India, and other parts of the world.

Mr. Epstein will soon have published a book entitled "Operation Keelhaul—The Story of Forced Repatriation." I should like to place in the Record today a synopsis of his book which he prepared before the Supreme Court decision was issued.

I should also like to include in the Record two articles by Mr. Epstein which appeared in the Palo Alto Times concerning his legal action against the Secretary of the Army and the Supreme Court decision, and the notice from the Supreme Court denying a writ of certiorari.

Mr. Speaker, Julius Epstein is to be congratulated for his untiring efforts to bring before the American public the sordid details of Operation Keelhaul. He is a brilliant scholar whose sense of justice propels him onward to seek out the truth against those who commit crimes against humanity, serving to remind us that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

I also today call upon Secretary Laird to declassify the reports on his own initiative. I know this report will show a dreadful story of American duplicity but I am certain the American people are big enough, wise enough and strong enough to accept this information as an effort not ever to let it happen again.

Mr. Epstein's report follows:

OPERATION KEELHAUL AND MY LEGAL ACTION AGAINST THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(By Julius Epstein)

What does "Keelhaul" mean?

According to Webster, Second Edition, "Keelhaul" means and I quote: "To haul under the keel of a ship, either athwartships or from bow to stern by ropes attached to the yardarms on each side. It was formerly a punishment in the Dutch and British navies and a method of torture used by pirates." Unquote. As naval historians tell us 95-99% of those "keelhauls" died in the process of their punishment, which is no wonder when you think of the thousands of goose barnacles on the hull of the boat which ripped the bodies of those subjected to this torture.

Fully aware of the meaning of the word "Keelhaul," the American army chose this word as the code designation of a three-volume documentary dossier, comprising the evidence of what I consider to be an American-British crime against humanity, the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communists to Stalin's executioners and Siberian slave labor camps after World War II.

The fact that the army itself chose "Keelhaul" as code name for its own forcible repatriation of anti-Communists and especially anti-Stalinists, speaks for itself. It does not need any further comment.

The "Operation Keelhaul" dossier was assembled in 1948 by the army's historical divi-

sion. It contains American as well as British documents. From its origin on, "Operation Keelhaul" was classified as Top Secret.

Before I go into the details of this classification, unjustified under American law and executive practice, and before I tell you about my lawsuit against Mr. Stanley Resor, the American Secretary of the Army, which is to the best of my knowledge, the first trial in American history to obtain the de-classification and release of improperly classified documents, I'll give you, in a nutshell, so to speak, the essence of this American-British crime against humanity, now known as "Operation Keelhaul."

Since Stalin had decreed early in the war that the Soviet Government considered every Soviet soldier who became a prisoner of war of the Germans as a "traitor to the fatherland" to be punished after his return, and since Molotov had declared and I quote: "We do not have prisoners of war in Nazi hands, we have only traitors" unquote, it is not hard to understand that the vast majority of the millions of Soviet nationals in German POW camps did not want to return to the USSR. Certainly, nobody could ever blame them for their intention not, under any circumstances, to return to the Soviet Union.

While this intention not to return prevailed among the large majority of all Soviet prisoners of war in German hands as well as among the forced laborers deported by the Germans to the Reich, there was a special group of Soviet prisoners in Germany who had additional reasons not to set foot again in the USSR. I am speaking of General Vlasov and his far more than one million followers.

Who was Vlasov?

General Andrei Andreevich Vlasov had a long and distinguished career in the Red Army. He was, of course, brought up as a Communist. In his youth, Vlasov had been deeply impressed by Lenin's promises of "peace, land and bread." He believed in the sincerity of the promises made not only by Lenin but also by Trotsky, Bukharin, Sinowjew, Kamenev, Piatakov, Rader and others, all men who turned out, if we believe Stalin, to be nothing but traitors, diversionists, agents of Western imperialism, etc. Most of them, as you know, were shot in the great Stalinist purges of the late thirties.

At the outbreak of World War II, when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, Vlasov was Commander in Kiev. Stalin appointed him Commander-in-Chief of the 20th Army. As such, he was in charge of the defense of Moscow, now threatened by the Germans. Vlasov succeeded in pushing the Germans back to Rzhev, a distance of more than 125 miles. He had saved Moscow. For this deed, Stalin awarded him the Order of the Red Banner after he had already awarded Vlasov in January 1941 the Lenin Order.

On June 12, 1942, General Vlasov became a prisoner of war of the Germans. He was brought to Vinnitza in the Ukraine, the seat of the German High Command. It was there that Vlasov met many high ranking Red Army officers and could freely discuss for the first time in his life Soviet affairs without the perennial control and threat by Soviet commissars and the secret police.

In Vinnitza, Vlasov met the Soviet colonel Vladimir Bolarskii, Commander of the 41st Guard Division. Bolarskii told Vlasov that he hated the Soviet regime and that he thought it was possible to overthrow it with the help of the Germans. However, he was ready to cooperate with the Germans only under the condition that "liberation" and not "conquest" was planned.

Vlasov agreed. He and Bolarskii realized that a great many Russian soldiers would immediately desert if they only could be assured that they would not have to deal with the Nazis, but with a Russian national liberation movement, a liberation movement which would honestly represent the genuine national interests of the Soviet people.

The two former Red Army officers now wrote the first document of the Vlasov movement. It was a memorandum in which they declared that the vast majority of the Soviet population as well as the Soviet armed forces would welcome the overthrow of the cursed Stalin regime. Vlasov and Bolarskii stated that Stalin's forced collectivization had cost the lives of more than 10 million people, they recalled the history of the purges under the GPU chief Jeshov in the years 1936 to 1938, when every year 8 to 10 million Soviet citizens disappeared in Stalin's Siberian slave labor camps.

Sven Steenberg, whose Vlasov biography, "Vlasov, Traitor or Patriot?" appeared last year, states, and I quote:

"There is hardly any other example in history, that a regime was feared and hated by such a large segment of the population, as Stalin's regime. Only this fact explains that millions of Soviet citizens who felt no less nationalistic than the citizens of other states, were ready to enter into an alliance with the aggressor against their own regime. Only if we have this in mind can we understand that even those who had, in the beginning, no own conception, arrived at the same conclusion by the free dialogue with their compatriots." Unquote.

Thus, the Vlasov movement was born. A movement, unique in the history of war, a movement which the West has never been able to understand.

Ideologically speaking, the greatest ally of Stalin's in the fight against Vlasov and his movement with hundreds of thousands of deserters was Adolf Hitler and his East expert, Alfred Rosenberg, the Reichsminister for the Occupied Soviet Union. Both recognized only one goal: relentless subjugation and colonization of Poland and Russia. All Slavs were nothing but "Untermenschen" whose only purpose in life was to be the servants of the German "Herrenrasse."

Therefore, whatever support the Vlasov movement received from the Wehrmacht was, until very late in 1944, in contradiction to Hitler's and Rosenberg's intentions and orders. It was an expression of the Wehrmacht's opposition to Hitler's "Ostpolitik."

The message, contained in the Vlasov-Bolarskii Memorandum spread rapidly among the Soviet prisoners of war in the occupied zone as well as within the Reich itself. Millions of Soviet nationals saw themselves confronted with the problem whether or not to side with the Germans as the only practical way to destroy Stalin and Stalinism. Their other alternative was to defend the fatherland and, by doing so, to strengthen the hated regime.

To Vlasov's many friends and supporters among the German officers' corps belonged the most outstanding and courageous enemies of Hitler and everything he stood for: Colonel Count Stauffenberg who, on July 20, 1944, planted the bomb at the Fuehrer's Hauptquartier at Rastenburg and who was executed a few hours later in Berlin; the ambassador to Moscow, Count von der Schulenburg, who was also executed after July 20, 1944. Among the supporters of Vlasov and his movement we even find General Halder, Chief of the General Staff, an ardent opponent and conspirator against Hitler and Nazism. General Halder appointed Lieutenant Colonel Reinhard Gehlen to be "Director of the Department Foreign Armies East." Gehlen deeply believed in Vlasov's theory of an alliance with the Russian people in order to overthrow Stalin. He became later Chief of Chancellor Adenauer's Military Intelligence Bureau. Admiral Canaris, the chief of the German Counter Intelligence Corps, was another one among Vlasov's friends.

All these prominent people and thousands of others, less known officers, supported Vlasov and waged a courageous and immensely dangerous battle against the official Nazi Ostpolitik. They successfully sabotaged it

time and again. Under the silent toleration by the German OKH (Oberkommando des Heeres) but without the knowledge of the Fuehrer's headquarters, deserters and other prisoners of war were used in steadily increasing numbers by the German front units as drivers, mechanics, ammunition carriers etc. without being officially listed.

These Soviet nationals formed the very core of the later established "Russian Liberation Army."

The formation of a "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" was to be proclaimed in a special radio message from Smolensk. The proclamation was the so-called "Smolensk Manifesto" which consisted of 13 programmatic points.

The "Smolensk Manifesto" demanded the abolition of forced labor and all collective farms, the re-establishment of trade and private initiative, social justice and immediate termination of the reign of terror and violence. It also demanded complete freedom of religion, conscience, speech, assembly and press, as well as the inviolability of every person and his residence. It was modeled after the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The Manifesto was a revolutionary bombshell and was so received. Millions of Russians greeted Vlasov as a messiah, a new liberator from Bolshevik terror and tyranny. The Manifesto did not mention Hitler and the Nazis with a single word. The Nazis tolerated the broadcast from Smolensk only as a propaganda lure to induce more Soviet troops to surrender to the German Wehrmacht. In spite of this fact, the Manifesto had the effect of binding millions of anti-Stalinist Soviet soldiers on both sides of the front. From now on they considered themselves as ideologically belonging to the Vlasov movement.

On November 14, 1944, Vlasov proclaimed the so-called "Prague Manifesto" in the presence of many high ranking SS officers.

Again, the Nazi hierarchy, unable to stop the Vlasov movement, was forced to tolerate it under the pretext of propaganda. The Prague gathering confronts us with a unique phenomenon in modern history: High ranking SS officers, exemplifying the most brutal and atrocious part of the Nazi apparatus, listening to Vlasov's most liberal and democratic document. If anybody had dared to proclaim such a program for the Germans, oppressed by the Hitler regime, he would have been shot or put in a concentration camp within hours. But here in Prague, the SS officers had to listen and even to applaud General Vlasov.

The preamble of the "Prague Manifesto" states and I quote:

"There is no worse crime than the one Stalin commits of destroying the countries and suppressing the peoples who strive to preserve the land of their forefathers and to build their happiness by their own labor. There is no worse crime than to subjugate another people and force one's own will on them." Unquote.

Can you imagine how the SS officers, now listening to Vlasov, must have felt when they heard this accusation of Stalin which was, of course, at the same time the strongest accusation against the Hitler regime ever uttered in their presence? But they had to swallow their Nazi pride and even to applaud Vlasov. Their only weak defense was their reservatio mentalis that it was only for "propaganda reasons."

The Prague Manifesto continued:

"The Bolsheviks robbed the people of freedom of speech, freedom of political convictions, their personal liberties, free choice of domicile and travel, freedom of profession and the opportunity for everyone to take his place in society in accordance with his capabilities. They replaced this freedom with terror, party privileges, and arbitrariness toward the individual." Unquote.

The Manifesto laid down once and for all the aims of the "Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" which were to overthrow Stalin's tyranny, to end the war, an honorable peace, the creation of a new free people's political system without Bolsheviks and exploiters. This was followed by 14 main principles which included the liquidation of the kolkhozes, forced labor and the re-introduction of "inviolable private property, earned by work." The Manifesto ended with the sentence: "The Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia calls upon all of you to unite and to fight for peace and freedom." It was signed by Lieutenant General A. Vlasov and by 36 members of the Committee, as well as by 11 candidates.

At that time—November 1944—the final defeat of Hitler was already visible. With the approaching defeat of the Hitler regime in mind, Vlasov and his General staff as well as his followers decided to surrender to the Americans and the British as the case may be. They wanted to surrender to the West—not only to escape forced repatriation, which could only mean death or slave labor camps, but also because sooner or later, the West's alliance with Stalin would necessarily come to an end since it was a most unnatural and uneasy coalition. When the break would come, so Vlasov and his officers thought, their movement with far more than one million people might be a welcome ally to the West. Vlasov correctly foresaw the decay of the uneasy alliance, but he was greatly mistaken about the West's capacity to understand his own motivations.

While one million Soviet nationals had registered as volunteers in the Vlasov army, less than 50,000 men were actually armed and organized as a fighting unit. They fought their first and last battle on the Eastern front near Frankfurt on the Oder. Shortly after this engagement, the division decided—without German approval—to leave the front and to march in the direction of Czechoslovakia and the Americans.

In May 1945, the short history of the Vlasov forces reached its climax with the liberation of Prague. Most people—among them even historians—do not know that Prague was liberated from the Nazis by Vlasov troops under the Command of his Staff officer, Bunlachenko. It happened on May 5, 1945. More than 300 Vlasov soldiers and officers were killed or wounded.

An American correspondent's eye-witness report appeared in the Saturday Evening Post. It stated: "Prague really was liberated by foreign troops, after all. Not by the Allies who did not arrive until the shooting was all over, but by 22,000 Russian outlaws wearing German uniforms. The leader of these renegades was General Vlasov, a former hero of the Red Army." Unquote.

While the battle between the Vlasov troops and the Czech resistance on the one side and the Nazi troops on the other was still raging, a so-called "Provisional Government" was formed. It was dominated by Communists who did not like the idea that Prague should be liberated by non-Communists. They were waiting for Marshal Koniev and Stalin's Red Army. But they could not prevent the Vlasov troops in alliance with the anti-Communist resistance movement from liberating Prague. Not before this was achieved, the resistance was overthrown. The Communists ruled the hour.

Germany capitulated on May 7, officially on May 8, 1945. The Vlasov troops resumed their march to the South. They realized that there was only one way open to them: To the Americans.

They were eager to surrender to the Americans or British, not only for the reasons already mentioned. There was another reason. They wanted to make good use of the American-British specific invitation to surrender to the West. We had dropped millions of leaflets and so-called safe-conducts, signed by

Eisenhower, inviting the Germans and all those who had fought with them—including the Vlasov troops—to surrender to us. We promised in these leaflets fair treatment according to the Geneva Convention. After the War Department made first the incredible blunder to promise the Vlasov troops "speedy return to your beloved fatherland," the last thing on earth they wished for, we dropped other leaflets, entreating them to surrender to the Americans, now solemnly promising them: "We shall never return you to the Soviet Union."

We did not honor this promise.

We and the British forcibly repatriated between 2 and 5 million people to Stalin. Atrocious scenes took place in every single POW camp in Germany and Great Britain, even in Canada and the United States. Thousands committed suicide, preferring death to forced repatriation to Stalin's hell.

Let me give you just one or two examples of what really happened. Then, you'll better understand why the army chose the code name "Operation Keelhaul" for the record of American-British sponsored forced repatriation.

What happened at the American camp for Soviet war prisoners at Plattling, Germany, on the 24th of February 1946? This is what happened:

During the night before they were packed into army trucks and carted off to Stalin's slaughterhouses, the 4,000 prisoners of war slept peacefully. They had again and again been reassured officially that there was no intention to deliver them against their will to a red vengeance.

The reassurance was a cruel trick. Before dawn that Sunday morning their camp was surrounded by American armed troops under the command of grim-faced officers. Though the war had ended more than nine months before, all was in readiness for one of its bloodier—and morally most shocking—operations.

At about six, the prisoners, awakened by searchlights suddenly flooding the entire camp, were hustled out of their barracks. They were frisked for weapons—not weapons of assault but of suicide. Those who resisted were beaten up; skulls were cracked and ribs smashed. Despite careful planning of the macabre business, many of the victims succeeded in slashing their wrists and throats with concealed razor blades and jagged glass. Quickly the air was filled with cursing, wailing and the agonizing moans of the wounded.

In batches the men were driven onto the waiting trucks, each guarded by American soldiers flaunting rubber clubs and machine pistols. Hour after hour, the trucks hauled away their freight of betrayed prisoners, some of them bleeding and dying, to the communist fate they dreaded far more than death.

Identical scenes occurred to the German camps for Soviet prisoners of war at Passau, Kempten, Bad Aibling, St. Veit, Marburg and Dachau.

Let me read to you a few paragraphs from an article in the New York Times of January 20, 1946 about the events at Dachau, Bavaria. The article was written by the Times' correspondent in Germany, Kathleen MacLaughlin. I quote:

"Ten renegade Russian soldiers, in a frenzy of terror over their impending repatriation to their homeland, committed suicide today during a riot in the Dachau prison camp . . .

"Twenty-one others were hospitalized, suffering from deep gashes that they had inflicted on themselves, apparently with razor blades, but no further deaths had been reported up to a late hour tonight. Many suffered cracked heads from the nightsticks wielded by 500 American guards who were attempting to bring the situation under control . . .

"The practical certainty of the fate they

would face on arrival in the Soviet area precipitated the disorder, which had its prelude Thursday in the resistance offered by the inmates in one of the barracks when ordered to line up to enter the trains waiting on the track inside the former concentration camp. Even though threatened with rifles and carbines, they refused to leave the shelter, begging GI guards to shoot them rather than carry out the extradition order . . .

"Authorities in headquarters of the United States Third Army at Bad Toelz stated in reporting the riot that every possible precaution had been taken to deliver the prisoners in accordance with the Yalta terms." Unquote.

Now, what were the "Yalta terms?"

It is important to deal with this subject because of the fact that in "justifying" forced repatriation always a reference to the "Yalta terms" is popping up as if some contractual agreements or terms prescribing force in carrying out repatriation could ever justify the crime. At Nuremberg we have taught the world that there can be no excuse for war crimes and crimes against humanity by referring to "higher orders." The top Nazis, tried at Nuremberg, were hanged for obeying "higher orders." This, certainly was just. But if it was international justice to disregard so-called "high orders" as extenuating circumstances in the case of the Nazi war criminals, it is equally just to apply the same norm to Americans who committed unspeakable crimes when they tried to justify them by referring to "higher orders" or to the abused "Yalta terms."

The truth is that the Yalta Agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and displaced persons, signed at Yalta on February 11, 1945, does not refer with a single word to the use of force. Therefore, forced repatriation cannot be justified by any reference to the Yalta Agreement. To do this, would be a gross falsification of diplomatic history.

The truth is that forced repatriation of Soviet nationals by the Americans and British started in June 1944, eight months before the Yalta Agreement was signed. At that time Soviet prisoners were already forcibly repatriated from England to Odessa where it took the Soviet military police four days to disembark their prisoners who did not want to be returned.

As the record further shows, the principle of forced repatriation was officially accepted and acted upon by the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces (SHAEF) as early as April 1945, weeks before the war's end.

This and other disturbing information on the sordid subject is spelled out in an official classified and unpublished document entitled: "The recovery and repatriation of liberated Prisoners of War, Occupation Forces in Europe 1945-1946." This highly interesting document which I unearthed, was compiled under the authority of the Army Chief Historian, Colonel Harold E. Potter by the Chief Archivist, Gilett Griswold.

This document proves to the hilt that not only SHAEF but the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington deliberately chose to use force to drive Soviet nationals to their doom—not because they had to but because they wanted to. On page 64 of this highly revealing document we read and I quote:

"The principle of forcible repatriation of Soviet citizens was recognized in Supreme Headquarters in April 1945. Although the Yalta Agreement did not contain any categorical statement that Soviet citizens should be repatriated regardless of their personal wishes, it was so interpreted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On instructions from the latter, Theater headquarters ordered repatriation regardless of the individual desire . . ." Unquote.

This decision, taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff whose Chairman at that time was General Marshall, was distributed to all our European Army posts in May of that year as an equally restricted document. Its title reads, "Guide to the Care of Displaced Person in Germany—G5 Division Displaced Persons Branch." Let me read only two sentences from these instructions: Quote:

"After identification by Soviet Repatriation Representatives, Soviet displaced persons will be repatriated regardless of their individual wishes." Unquote.

And again, a few paragraphs later: Quote: "Enemy and ex-enemy displaced persons, except those assimilated to United Nations status, will be returned to their countries of nationality or former residence without regard to their personal wishes." Unquote.

The question arises: Why did SHAEF and the Joint Chiefs of Staff decide to invoke force against Soviet soldiers and civilians despite the fact that the Yalta Agreement did not make this obligatory?

Who was so anxious to rid the world of millions of anti-Communist Russians and other Soviet nationals, and why?

What we have learned in recent years about the infiltration of our government agencies, including the White House itself, by Soviet agents makes a clear solution of the mystery urgent and inescapable.

For that reason, I wrote a resolution to be introduced in the American Congress for the creation of a Select House Committee to investigate Forced Repatriation during and after World War II. The resolution was dropped into the hopper for the first time by Congressman Bosch of New York on February 8, 1955 as House Resolution 187.

I'll now read to you the preamble of the Bosch Resolution:

"Whereas the forced repatriation to Soviet-controlled countries of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians by American military and civilian authorities in the years 1945-1947 in Germany and in other countries brought death and misery to untold thousands of these anti-Communists before Soviet firing squads, on Soviet gallows, and in the Siberian slave labor camps; and

"Whereas this forced repatriation of prisoners of war and civilians cannot be justified by the agreement on prisoners of war signed at Yalta on February 11, 1945; and

"Whereas this forced repatriation was in violation of the rulings in implementation of the Yalta agreement on prisoners of war, made public by the Department of State on March 8, 1945; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation of prisoners of war who had enlisted in the enemy's army was in contradiction to the opinions of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, as expressed during the last forty years; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians represents an indelible blot on the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation and annihilation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians of Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, Hungarian, Baltic, and other origin is still poisoning our spiritual relations with the vigorously anti-Communist peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and is therefore impeding our foreign policy: Therefore be it

Resolved, . . . etc.

Since the Committee on Rules of the 84th Congress did not report the resolution, Congressman Bosch re-introduced it in the 85th Congress as House Resolution 111 on January 17, 1957 and introduced it for the third time in the 86th Congress as House Resolution 24 on January 7, 1959.

Three times, the Bosch Resolution was introduced. And three times it was killed by the Committee on Rules.

Now, let me go back to "Operation Keel-

haul". The British did not behave any better than the Americans. Rather worse, if this was possible. They repatriated under duress and unbelievable force more than 30,000 Cossacks including their wives and children. These 30,000 were assembled in Peggett, a suburb of Lienz in the Austrian Eastern Tyrol. There were many old emigrés, among these Cossacks, who had left Russia between 1917 and 1920. By no stretch of the imagination could these old Russian emigrés fall under the Yalta or any other agreement. Nevertheless, they too were forcibly repatriated on June 1, 1945, the day of the great Lienz tragedy. The extradition of these old Czarist Cossacks surprised even the Soviet Repatriation Commission. The Soviet officers said that the British should never have repatriated them. Nevertheless, the Soviets did not return them to the British but shipped them to the Soviet Union where their leaders were tried and executed and the rest sent to Siberian forced labor camps.

The leader of the British in Lienz was Major Davis, who assured the Cossacks repeatedly on his word of honor as a British officer that they would never be turned over to the Russians. The British word of honor was as worthless as the American one which was given the prisoners in German camps. As one Cossack officer remarked: "The NKVD or the Gestapo would have slain us with truncheons, the British did it with their word of honor."

Under the fraudulent pretext to appear at a conference with higher British officials, all the Cossack leaders were carted off and surrendered to the Soviets already on May 28, 1945. Thus, the British got rid of 2,749 leading Cossack officers.

On June 1, 1945, the tragedy reached its climax.

At dawn of June 1, 1945, a tremendous procession went to an altar set up on the main square of the camp at Peggett. Priests, garbed in their most ceremonial vestments, preceded it. There were thousands of crosses, flags, burning candles and holy books.

During the service, British tanks approached and heavily armed troops surrounded the camp. They belonged to the Argyll and Sutherland 8th Battalion, supported by the West-Kent 5th Battalion. Both battalions belonged to the 36th British Brigade. The tanks used in this British "Operation Keelhaul" belonged to the 11th British Tank Division.

Suddenly, during the continuing religious service, the British soldiers plunged into the Cossacks and their families and began beating with rifle butts on heads, shoulders, arms and faces. It was an unbelievable massacre.

The Austrian peasants of the villages, who witnessed the spectacle, first made the sign of the Cross, but soon started looting the tents and stealing the remaining horses and cattle. Church bells pealed. In near Doelsach, a black flag was hoisted on the Church spire. The British ordered it to be taken down.

As Mackiewicz reports in his book which only appeared in German, "Tragedy on the Drau," there were many honest soldiers among the British. The story was later told that one of them said to a Russian in broken Russian: "Don't surrender. They have no right."

A British soldier reported that a little girl came to him with a note, saying: "Kill us, but don't surrender us to the Bolsheviks." With some difficulty, the soldier deciphered the note, put it in his pocket and began to cry.

There were many Cossacks who threw themselves under British tanks. Those who tried to escape were shot. Hundreds of Cossacks succeeded in committing suicide. Untold soldiers, women and children drowned in the river.

The so-called suicide cemetery at Lienz still bears witness today to the Lienz tragedy

which is just another name for what in reality was a British crime against humanity. Neither the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 nor the Geneva Conventions of 1929 and 1949 mention force as a means of carrying out repatriation.

Our own Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said in his speech before Committee One of the United Nations General Assembly on October 24, 1952, when the Communists wanted the United States to return by force the Chinese and North Korean prisoners of war and I quote:

"It was quite unthinkable to the United Nations Command that it should use force to drive into the hands of the Communists people who would be resisting that effort by force. That was the attitude taken by the United Nations command. It was the attitude taken by all other governments whose troops were in Korea and who would be required to carry out this forcible return if it were instituted. So far as I know, there has been no member of the United Nations outside the Communist group that has ever suggested that it was right, proper, or necessary to return these prisoners by force." Unquote.

The question arises: If it was wrong, improper, illegal or unnecessary to return prisoners of war to the Communists by force in 1952, why was it right, proper, legal, or necessary to return them to the Communists in the years 1944-1947?

The most prominent American statesmen, politicians and Generals expressed in numerous statements their strong opposition to the idea of forced repatriation.

To give you just a few examples:

General Eisenhower said on May 7, 1953 and I quote:

"People that have become our prisoners cannot by any manner of means be denied the right on which this country was founded . . . the right of political asylum against the kind of political persecution they fear . . . consequently, to force those people to go back to a life of terror and persecution is something that would violate every moral standard by which America lives. Therefore, it would be unacceptable in the American code, and it cannot be done." Unquote.

And General George C. Marshall made the following statement in a press conference in 1947:

"It is the fixed policy of the United States Government to oppose any forced repatriation of displaced persons." Unquote.

I could go on and on but time limits do not allow me to do so.

Everybody who reads today these statements necessarily asks himself: Why then, was it done?

The answer to this question is obviously buried in the three-volume dossier "Operation Keelhaul." This documentary evidence has been kept Top Secret for more than 23 years.

It is my opinion that this classification is a gross violation, not only of common sense, but of American law. A still unredeemed violation of American administrative policy as laid down by President Eisenhower.

The law governing administrative procedures concerning classification of military reports and documents was enunciated by President Eisenhower in his Executive Order 10501 on November 5, 1953.

What does the Eisenhower Executive Order 10501 prescribe?

Let me quote one paragraph:

"Top Secret. Except as may be expressly provided by the statute, the use of the classification Top Secret shall be authorized, by appropriate authority, only for defense information or material which requires the highest degree of protection. The Top Secret classification shall be applied only to that information or material the defense aspect of which is paramount, and the unauthorized disclosure of which could result in exceptionally grave damage to the Nation such

as leading to a definite break in diplomatic relations affecting the defense of the United States, an armed attack against the United States or its allies, a war, or the compromise of military or defense plans, or intelligence operations, or scientific or technological developments vital to the national defense." Unquote.

Now, I'll read you the text of an army document which is part of the "Operation Keelhaul" dossier and which was just a few weeks ago de-classified by the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stanley Resor and released to me.

It reads, Quote:

"Reference operation KEELHAUL conversation between Captain Prall this Headquarters and Lt. Colonel Pateugill, ALCOME in Rome, indicates the following.

"ALCOME is unable to furnish interpreters at Separation Points or any person who will be able to identify individuals wanted imperative that individuals qualified to perform the above mentioned duties be furnished the Headquarters in order that mission may be accomplished." Unquote.

Now this little request—in a rather awkward language—for more interpreters in the Russian language was Top Secret for more than 23 years! During all these years "Operation Keelhaul" was reviewed time and again. But I was always informed that not a single document including the one I just read to you, could be released since it could endanger American foreign policy and defense.

How the disclosure of this document, part of the "Operation Keelhaul" dossier, could ever fall under Eisenhower's Executive Order 10501 is a major puzzle. How any serious person could ever maintain that release of this document would in the years from 1946 to 1969 have resulted in "exceptionally grave damage to the Nation such as leading to a definite break in diplomatic relations . . ." or an armed attack against the United States and in the other dangers, specified in the Eisenhower Executive Order, is unimaginable. This released document is the definite proof of the overclassification of documents going on in the Pentagon if there ever was such proof.

There is now a chance to get the documents de-classified and released to the American people. This chance came into being when the so-called "Freedom of Information Act" went into force on July 4, 1967. It was sponsored by Congressman John E. Moss of California who had waged a more than ten year battle for his bill.

The "Freedom of Information Act," better known as "Moss Act," provides that every citizen has the right to complain in the District Courts should the Government deny access to documents under the pretext that they are classified in order to protect American Foreign Policy and National Defense.

Then, according to the Moss Act, the Government has to prove in Court—in camera, of course—that maintenance of classification is justified. Should the federal judge find that disclosure of the documents in question would never endanger American foreign policy or defense, he has the duty to enjoin the Government to release the documents.

This is the sense of the "Freedom of Information Act."

I decided to test this Public Law 89-487 in the American courts. I filed my legal action against the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stanley Resor in the District Court of San Francisco.

I lost in the District Court. Judge Carter found that classification was "appropriate." Period. How an American judge could find classification of documents "appropriate" without having seen them will always remain a mystery in American legal history.

I had no choice but to appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court in San Francisco. My case is still pending there.

In October 1969, the American Civil Liberties Union for Northern California joined my fight for "Operation Keelhaul." The Civil Liberties Union filed a Brief of Amicus Curiae on my behalf which is the most penetrating presentation of my case I have ever seen.

The concluding paragraph of the Civil Liberties Union's Amicus Curiae Brief states:

"The judgment below must be reversed because the trial court did not discharge its statutory responsibility to determine the propriety of the Army's withholding of the requested information and because the Army did not sustain its statutory burden of establishing its claim to an exemption. The express language and the fundamental purposes of the Freedom of Information Act require a reversal." Unquote.

I am now waiting for the outcome of my appeal. With me, the American people are waiting, the people who have a right to know the truth.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK, SUPREME

COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., June 15, 1970.

Re Epstein V. Resor, etc., et al., No. 1533, Oct. Term, 1969.

PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, Sr., Esq.,
Menlo Park, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Mr. Justice Douglas is of the opinion that certiorari should be granted. Mr. Justice Marshall took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

Very truly yours,

JOHN F. DAVIS,

Clerk.

(By _____, Assistant Clerk).

[From the Palo Alto Times, June 19, 1970]

"TOP SECRET" OFTEN ABUSED

EDITOR OF THE TIMES:

The Supreme Court's refusal to review my legal action, Epstein v. Resor (Times, June 15) makes the miscarriage of justice in the lower courts final. By this denial, the Supreme Court declared the Freedom of Information Act a dead letter.

This raises the question, What is Congress going to do?

Human Events of May 30 carried an article "Is the Freedom of Information Act Really Working?" by Carol D. Bauman, who lists Epstein vs. Resor among the key lawsuits based on the act. Miss Bauman wrote:

"The appellate court upheld the decision of a lower court denying release of the document. However, freedom of information specialists say that the case was significant since it was the first time the appellate court clarified its authority to determine whether information is being stamped 'secret' legitimately. Some congressmen are calling for a congressional investigation into the continued classification of the Operation Keelhaul files."

Two lower courts found that nondisclosure was warranted in the interests of foreign policy and national security. They miraculously found so without having examined a single document in the three volumes of Operation Keelhaul.

Material classified on the ground of protecting foreign policy and national security is indeed exempted from disclosure but, according to the act, only if disclosure would really harm American foreign policy or national security—in other words, only if the document was properly so classified.

The Army itself proved it was improperly classifying Operation Keelhaul files "top secret" when Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor suddenly released four documents to me. Not one ever warranted "top secret" classification. In one, ALCOME, Rome asked for more Russian interpreters. This purely technical document bore for 23 years the stamp

"top secret!" The three others are of the same character.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California stated in its amicus curiae brief: "Finally, the judgment (in the lower courts) makes no sense. How can judges decide important questions without having the crucial facts before them? There was no compelling national interest to be served by precluding not only disclosure but also review in camera of the file. A citizen's right to know, a historian's scholarly research, the open disclosure policy of Congress, and the interest, vital to our judicial process, of having an adequate record to review were all sacrificed for a false sense of security."

JULIUS EPSTEIN, Palo Alto.

[From the Palo Alto Times, July 30, 1970]

INTENT OF CONGRESS—FREEDOM OF
INFORMATION ACT AMENDMENT

(By Julius Epstein)

By the Supreme Court's denial of my petition of certiorari in my legal action, Epstein vs. Resor, the Freedom of Information Act was declared a dead letter.

I sued Mr. Resor, the secretary of the Army, in order to get the documentary dossier "Operation Keelhaul" finally declassified and released to the American people. The documents contained in the Operation Keelhaul file concern the forced repatriation of anti-Communist displaced persons found in Germany to Stalin's henchmen and slave labor camps.

The jurists agree that this forcible repatriation was a crime against humanity according to the norms laid down by the International Military Tribunal which tried the Nazi war criminals at Nuremberg.

We committed this crime against humanity in the years 1944 to 1947, when we forcibly repatriated against their will between 2 and 5 million anti-Stalinist prisoners of war and civilian displaced persons to the Soviet Union where their leaders were hanged and the others were sent to Siberian slave labor camps.

In 1955 Khrushchev declared an amnesty and released the prisoners from the slave labor camps. At that occasion, Pravda remarked in an editorial: "Now, everything is forgotten and forgiven. But you will never forget how the Americans and the British forced you on the points of their bayonets unto the trucks and trains which brought you back to the U.S.S.R."

The official American army records of this crime against humanity are contained in the dossier Operation Keelhaul. The dossier was classified top secret when it was compiled in 1948.

Since a top-secret classification can only legally be applied if disclosure would result in "exceptionally grave damage to the nation," such as "a break in diplomatic relations, an armed attack against the United States, a war," etc., it must be assumed that the continued classification of the Operation Keelhaul dossier is completely unjustified.

The Freedom of Information Act provides the possibility to lodge a complaint in the U.S. District Court. Then, the classifying agency has to prove—in camera—that maintenance of classification is justified. If the judge finds that disclosure would not result in "exceptionally grave damage to the nation" he has the duty to enjoin the government agency from further withholding the document. This is, according to a sworn affidavit by Rep. John E. Moss, D-Sacramento, sponsor and author of the Freedom Act, the meaning of the new law.

The courts in which I lost my case (the District Court in San Francisco and the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco) disregarded the intent of Congress as explained by Moss in his affidavit. They stuck to the text of the Freedom of Information Act. This text states that

documents classified in the interest of foreign policy and national defense are exempted from disclosure.

What Congress meant was, of course, that the exemption can only be claimed if it was properly applied—in other words, if disclosure would indeed result in grave danger to the nation. The arbitrary use of the power to classify is strictly forbidden.

Unfortunately, this was not spelled out in the final text of the law itself. It was this absence of clarity which allowed the courts to decide against my complaint.

The only remedy to revive the Freedom of Information Act is an amendment to the law which would remove this gap and would spell out in the law's final text what the real intent of Congress was when it created the act.

At the suggestion of Congressman Moss, I have written this draft amendment.

DRAFT AMENDMENT

To Public Law 90-23, 90th Congress, HR 5337, June 5, 1967, 81 Stat. 55.

Exceptions. "(3) . . . On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. This includes agency records classified under Executive Orders 10501 and 10964 to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy. The burden is on the agency to show that classification meets the requirements of the executive order, specifically the requirement of Executive Order 10501, Section 1(a) which provides the standard for top secret classification as follows:

"Except as may be expressly provided by statute, the use of the classification Top Secret shall be authorized, by appropriate authority, only for defense information or material which requires the highest degree of protection. The Top Secret classification shall be applied only to that information or material the defense aspect of which is paramount, and the unauthorized disclosure of which could result in exceptionally grave damage to the Nation such as leading to a definite break in diplomatic relations affecting the defense of the United States, an armed attack against the United States or its allies, a war, or the compromise of military or defense plants, or intelligence operations, or scientific or technological developments vital to the national defense."

Nonapplicability. "(b) This section does not apply to matters that are "(1) specifically and rightfully required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy."

THE RIGHT TO BE HEARD

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, free speech means the right of a man to be heard and the right of his listeners to disagree with what he says. But disagreement should not be expressed in such a way as to disrupt public meetings by trying to shout down the speaker.

In recent days the President and the Vice President of the United States have been subjected to treatment that brings shame on these responsible for it. The

right to dissent does not include any right to scream obscenities at any individual. Even if we leave aside the matters of bad manners and worse taste such disruptive efforts cannot be condoned by any American concerned with the maintenance of freedom in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the mindless hurling of insults is no substitute for reason. Enlightenment does not come from the language of the gutter. Free speech is guaranteed by our Constitution for all. Not just for those with whom we agree. It should be upheld for all.

WILLIAM A. GARRETT

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

MR. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the observance of a birthday and advance in his profession by William A. Garrett of the Gannett News Bureau. Mr. Garrett is an accomplished newsman, a veteran of work with the Hartford Times and, one of the distinguished corps on which we Members of the House depend to carry our words and actions to the people.

Mr. Garrett came to the Washington Bureau of the Gannett service in 1951, following years of service in Bristol and Hartford. Born in Troy, N.Y., he is a graduate of Trinity College in Hartford, and worked for a time with the New Britain Herald before he came to the Times. There he specialized in politics and crime and is notably remembered at the Times for his special assignment work on a mercy killing in Vermont to which the Times sent him for coverage of the trial. He was the Times correspondent in Bristol when I was first becoming active in Connecticut; he shared desks with Bob MacGregor and Hank Murphy at the Times and worked with their present managing editor, Nat Sestero. Both Dick Hartford, former managing editor of the Times and Nat, who holds that job now, remember him as the "fastest one finger typist in the business." He was extremely popular as a correspondent in Bristol, and as a reporter in Hartford, and I can certainly testify to the respect which those of us in Washington hold for his fairness and his abilities.

He was the host to White House correspondents on the occasion of Connecticut visits to Washington, and despite attacks in recent years, has continued to put in a hard-working time at the bureau. He has been a friend for the years I have been in Connecticut and certainly in our time in Washington, and I have found him resourceful and accurate as a reporter. I have noted his pride in the development of his family, his continued interest in the Times, where he frequently spent time on his vacation to drop by and pay respects. Cheerful, he always carried his share of responsibilities, whether in Bristol, Hartford, or Washington.

On one or two occasions, he stepped aside from his news duties to take responsibilities in private industry or with the Government, but his basic loyalty is to the newspaper business. His friendship and mine go back many years, primarily with the Times. I understand that his retirement will come about at the end of this month with the bureau asking him to continue to make his experience and wisdom available in free-lance and consulting work. I am pleased to be a friend of a fine correspondent, and to pay tribute to his lengthy and distinguished career. The Gannett Bureau can be proud to have such a distinguished man on its staff.

DENOUNCES POW TREATMENT BY NORTH VIETNAMESE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in denouncing the North Vietnamese treatment of American servicemen. The plight of our men who have been captured by the North Vietnamese has been well documented. The evidence indicates that many of these men have been, and are being, held in solitary confinement, improperly fed, harshly beaten, mistreated, prevented from receiving adequate medical care, subjected to humiliation by public display, and cut off from all communication. I am appalled that such atrocious cruelties have existed. I fear that in all probability they will continue to exist unless action is taken to undermine the objectives Hanoi has in perpetuating these cruelties.

The callousness and intransigence of the North Vietnamese toward our legitimate demands have also been demonstrated. Repeatedly they have elected to play politics with the lives and spirits of our men rather than extend to them the decency expected when man deals with man.

Our response to these flagrant and inhumane violations of the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949 must be to continue to mobilize world indignation against the unconscionable treatment of our men. We have seen Hanoi's response to adverse public opinion in the past. Their ill-advised decision to bring our prisoners to trial as war criminals was averted by the world outcry against that action. Such outcry must exist today. Pressure from the administration, from our negotiators in Paris, from the State Department, and from this Congress must be strenuously applied in a conscientious efforts to insure that the fundamental rights of our prisoners abroad and their families at home are upheld.

In addition, I feel that we should work diligently towards our goals through the International Red Cross. The fact that in the past North Vietnam has refused to allow the Red Cross to render their services to our men increases the gravity of their cruelty. I would hope the government of North Vietnam would co-

operate with the Red Cross as most every nation in the world has. The Red Cross is not the tool of U.S. policy but an organization dedicated to the betterment of man.

Our goal must be to make it emphatically clear that the use of helpless prisoners of war as pawns in an attempt to influence our Asian policy is intolerable. Intolerable not only as a political lever but intolerable from a moral standpoint as well. While there may be disagreement as to the conduct of the war in Southeast Asia, I believe it is imperative that we unequivocally condemn the treatment of our prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. The issue before us is not political but humanitarian. We must urge Hanoi not to be misled by our differences on policy into the belief that we are divided on this issue of human decency. We are united against this action so devoid of moral qualities.

MR. AGNEW, WHAT ABOUT THE STATE DEPARTMENT?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our illustrious Vice President, the Honorable Spiro Agnew is presently on tour and promises in his stump talks to expose the radicals in Congress.

The American people certainly hope that he will continue his crusade, and many wonder why he does not extend his exposé to include the troglodytic leftists who infest the State Department and who it is that tolerates their remaining, against the thorough housecleaning promised the American people by President Nixon before he was elected.

The American people realize that their major menace is not the big Red Army from without but the big pink army within. With Marxism taking the world, the people are wondering why there is no mention of an obvious Communist menace within the higher echelon of our Government.

I include an article on William P. Rogers, by Frank A. Capell, which appears in the September 23 issue of the Review of the News, as follows:

WILLIAM P. ROGERS: PRESIDENT NIXON'S SECRETARY OF STATE CONTINUES TO PROTECT THE COMMUNISTS

(By Frank A. Capell)

Subversion in the U.S. State Department has for many years been a prime concern of those conservative Americans who helped elect Richard Nixon and hoped for the "housecleaning" he promised. Candidate Nixon assured America on October 13, 1968: "I want a Secretary of State that will join me in cleaning house in the State Department. We are going to clean house up there." Many actually believed him.

The New York Times of April 24, 1969, reported the response of Nixon's Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, when reminded of the above Nixon promise. The Times said Mr. Rogers laughed and declared: "You know, I come from a small town, and to us a housecleaning was something that was done once a year. The wives freshened everything up, moved things around, got rid of the things

that weren't useful anymore—but they never threw out all the furniture."

It was thus that Mr. Nixon's new Secretary of State laughingly informed deluded Americans that there just was not going to be any housecleaning at State. In fact, Mr. Rogers even refused to allow Otto Otepka to return to the State Department so that Nixon could make good on another campaign promise—to see that justice was done in the case of Otepka, who had been ousted as State's top security evaluator for attempting to maintain some semblance of security in a Department seriously threatened by treason. Secretary Rogers means to have the State Department run by the same radical crowd.

William Pierce Rogers was born in Norfolk, New York, on June 23, 1913, the only child of Harrison Alexander Rogers and the former Myra Beswick. His father was a papermill executive, bank director, and local Republican leader who was left by the Depression with only a small insurance business. When William Rogers was thirteen his mother died and he went to live with his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Pierce Beswick of Canton, New York. He graduated from Canton High School in 1930, attended Colgate University on scholarship, and was graduated from Colgate with a B.A. degree in 1934. With the help of scholarships, he continued his education at Cornell Law School, earning his degree in 1937. Bill Rogers married a fellow law student, Adele Langston of Wenonah, New Jersey, on June 27, 1936. They have a daughter and three sons.

While in college, Rogers displayed an inclination "to be with the guys who were doing big things," and had no problem penetrating the inner circle of any group he joined. Then as now he was handsome, charming, and urbane. Upon graduation he joined the prestigious New York law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft, but stayed only a few months. The place to be was obviously around Tom Dewey, who was being prepared by New York's *Insiders* for big things.

Thomas E. Dewey's rise up the political ladder had begun with publicity gained as a racket-busting New York District Attorney. Rogers went to Dewey's office and offered to work for him for nothing if permitted to join the Dewey staff of "top-notch young crime investigators." Tom Dewey was impressed, and Rogers became one of fifty young men selected from 6,000 applicants to be assistant district attorneys in New York. From 1938 to 1942 he argued over 1,000 cases in court.

Attorney Rogers joined the U.S. Navy in August of 1946. He returned to the New York District Attorney's office under Frank Hogan, who had by now replaced Dewey. In April 1947, however, Rogers resigned from the District Attorney's office to go to Washington. He became counsel to the Senate's Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. In July of the same year he became Chief Counsel.

By March of 1948 the Special Committee was succeeded by the Senate Investigations subcommittee of the Senate Executive Expenditures Committee. The Chairman was Senator Clyde R. Hoey, a Democrat of North Carolina, who asked Rogers to remain as Chief Counsel even though he was a Republican. Bill Rogers' only public act of anti-Communism occurred during this period. He publicized information which led to the perjury conviction of the Commerce Department's William Remington "for lying about passing secret information to Soviet spy Elizabeth Bentley." Miss Bentley forced his hand.

Rogers' other accomplishments during his stint with the Senate Committee were the jailing of Major General Bennett E. Meyers for inducing a witness to lie to the Committee during a war contracts investigation; and a perjury indictment against John Maragon,

a White House intimate, in the investigation of the "five percenters." Rogers left the Committee March 1, 1950, to join the Washington offices of the New York legal house of Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey—the "world's largest law firm."¹

William Rogers has been in, out, and on the fringe of government service for many years. But he would probably have attained his political aims much sooner had the results of the 1948 presidential election been different. As *Parade* magazine noted in its issue of February 23, 1969: "Had Dewey been elected President in 1948, Rogers, as his protégé, would have assumed a position of importance." Thomas E. Dewey had used his reputation as a "racket-buster" to propel himself into the New York governorship, from which he took the jump into the presidential race. The "Eastern Establishment" thought its boy had it made. But, Dewey's overconfidence and his refusal to use against the Democrats the issue of Communist subversion gave Harry Truman a surprise victory.

The next opportunity for a Republican try at the presidency, and Rogers' next chance at an appointment to a top government post, would not come until 1952. William Rogers devoted himself to the practice of law for the *Insiders*. When the *Insiders* of the "Eastern Establishment" persuaded General Eisenhower to be their candidate in 1952, Rogers offered his services in the campaign to secure the Republican nomination for Eisenhower. He was active at the Republican Convention and worked with Herbert Brownell Jr. in designing the strategy which sabotaged Taft. And, Rogers was chosen to accompany vice-presidential nominee Richard Nixon on his campaign tours.

Bill Rogers was by now not only a Dewey-style *Insider* but an old friend of Richard Nixon's, having counseled him in the Hiss-Chambers affair. Rogers had advised Nixon, who was then an unknown Congressman, to go ahead with the case. Pragmatically, it was a good move. It brought Richard Nixon an undeserved reputation as an anti-Communist—and, it assured him a key seat in the U.S. Senate. Rogers' advice was not so much based upon any desire to expose Hiss, as to warn Nixon that since Chambers' story was backed up by microfilmed evidence it was irrefutable.

Another crisis developed while Rogers was accompanying Nixon on his campaign. Again he gave his friend excellent advice and assistance. The famous Checkers speech was Rogers' brainchild, and it saved the day for the future Vice President. Demands had been made for Nixon to withdraw as Eisenhower's running mate after enterprising reporters established that a group of California businessmen had provided a "slush fund" to pay Nixon's expenses as a Senator. Rogers advised him to stand pat, and sold the idea of a grandstand play to Tom Dewey, who was masterminding the Eisenhower campaign. Nixon went on national television and, in a speech reportedly put together by Rogers, declared he had never taken any gift except a cocker spaniel named Checkers, and that he intended to keep the dog. That speech kept Richard Nixon on the ticket.

Following the Eisenhower victory, Rogers was at the request of Dewey and Nixon appointed Deputy Attorney General. He became the Department of Justice's chief liaison with Congress and other federal departments and agencies. When Attorney General Herbert Brownell resigned in 1957, William Rogers was immediately appointed to succeed him. Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times* stated prophetically: "Rogers is important not only

because he is a member of the [Eisenhower] Cabinet; among the close advisers of the President, he is closet to the Vice President—officially and personally. In a Nixon Administration, Rogers would be even closer than he is at present to the center of American political power."

William Rogers played a principal role during the Eisenhower Administration in the drafting of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and in establishing the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. It was Rogers who wrote the brief justifying the use of the troops in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1957. He is known as a strong advocate of "Civil Rights"; both Rogers and his wife have been contributors to, and sponsors of, the Washington Negro Student Fund. One of the founders of this fund was Lydia Katzenbach, wife of radical Nicholas Katzenbach—who is being retained as a special consultant by the State Department under William Rogers. Another contributor and sponsor of this outfit was Adam Yarmolinsky, who once raised funds for the Young Communist League, and who has admitted: The Young Communist League believed and I was inclined to believe that a so-called Communist government was a desired end."

One of Rogers' most important roles in the Eisenhower Administration was as a key operative in the effort to put an end to the anti-Communist crusade of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin. Also involved was another Nixon appointee, Henry Cabot Lodge, who was at the time U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. According to a press release in November 1953, Lodge was working on leave with the White House, after the recess of the United Nations, "in connection with matters on Capitol Hill or matters relating to the Senate." This was brought out in the testimony before the Special Senate Subcommittee on investigations to explain his presence at an anti-McCarthy strategy meeting held on January 21, 1954, in the office of the Attorney General.

Also present at that meeting were Attorney General Brownell; Deputy Attorney General Rogers; White House aides Sherman Adams and Gerald Morgan; and, John G. Adams, counselor, Department of the Army. As a result of this conference the decision was made for John Adams to start compiling notes to be used as the basis for filing charges against Senator McCarthy and members of his staff. Adams admitted before the Senate Subcommittee:

"The meeting finally concluded with the decision that I should call on the Republican members of the investigating subcommittee . . . and point out to them the two problems which I had discussed with the Attorney General's office."

One of these "problems" was the fact that Senator McCarthy planned Hearings on the loyalty board—which Senator McCarthy believed to have been clearing Communists for sensitive government positions.

As is well known, the anti-McCarthy plotters were successful. The charges against Senator McCarthy were given to the press even before they were presented to the Senators. McCarthy was "censured" by his colleagues and rendered ineffective in his efforts to clean out the Communists being harbored in our government. All this was the result of a well-planned operation hatched in the highest echelons of the Executive Department, and with much of the "responsibility" resting upon the shoulders of our present Secretary of State, William P. Rogers.

Upon his shoulders also must rest the responsibility for having Helmut Sonnenfeldt moved into a highly sensitive position on Henry A. Kissinger's staff in the National Security Council. It was during Rogers' tenure of office in the U.S. Department of Justice that Sonnenfeldt was in "very serious

trouble" because of alleged "leaks of top secret and secret" classified information to foreign agents with whom he had frequent and close associations. An intense F.B.I. investigation resulted in discussions about prosecution. No such prosecution ever took place because the State Department held that it was "not in the interest of the U.S. government" to have the secrets involved become public knowledge. Rogers agreed not to prosecute and Sonnenfeldt was saved from conviction under the espionage statute.

Many other highly dubious characters have been retained, reassigned, and promoted under the new Secretary of State. Among these are such security risks as Jacob Beam (now Ambassador to the Soviet Union), Edwin M. Martin, and David H. Popper—all of whom received promotions despite long histories of association with Communist, radical, and subversive causes. More serious, Nicholas Katzenbach and George Ball were selected as special consultants, and Idar Rimestad was asked by Rogers to remain in the State Department to be in charge of all personnel.

Rimestad has been instrumental in keeping Otto Otepka, the ousted State Department security chief, from obtaining justice. The State Department just wasn't big enough for both. Rimestad is reported secretly to have learned Russian, to have conferred repeatedly in private with Soviet nationals, and to have maintained pro-Soviet and anti-American views going all the way back to 1946. Mr. Rimestad is now operating for Rogers out of Geneva.

Nicholas Katzenbach, appointed special consultant to Secretary of State Rogers, studied law with his wife Lydia under Abe Fortas at Yale University.² Mrs. Katzenbach (the former Lydia Stokes) comes from a famous Leftist family. Her aunt, Rose Pastor Stokes, was a notorious Communist with an ugly police record. Her uncle, James Graham Phelps Stokes, was president of the Fabian Intercollegiate Socialist Society and Counselor for the Bolshevik Russian Information Bureau in the United States.

As Under Secretary of State, Nicholas Katzenbach issued a security clearance for John Paton Davies, a serious security risk who was heavily involved in delivering China to the Communists. Davies was cleared by Katzenbach to work as a consultant at the C.I.A.-financed Center for International Studies at M.I.T., which has a contract with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The clearance was given with the consent of Secretary of State Rogers, who then ensured his continued access to Katzenbach by appointing him a special consultant. The M.I.T. center also has on its staff identified Communist Harold Isaacs, who was involved with Agnes Smedley of the Sorge Spy Ring.

George W. Ball, another of Secretary Rogers' consultants, was recommended for appointment as Under Secretary of State by Adam Yarmolinsky (himself a serious security risk) who worked in George Ball's office in Washington, D.C., from 1951 to 1954. Like many others in the Nixon Administration, the radical Mr. Ball is a member of both the Council on Foreign Relations and the Bilderbergers.

On March 5, 1969, Congressman John Rarick (D-Louisiana) called the attention of the Congress to the fact that the citation of the National Lawyers Guild on the Attorney General's list had been rescinded by William Rogers. In light of the evidence, as Rarick noted, this was simply fantastic! Congressman Rarick quoted from public addresses of U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr. as follows:

² The *Washington Star* of January 19, 1969, states that "before the election . . . William P. Rogers wrote to Nixon a letter recommending that Nixon name Justice Abe Fortas as chief justice if Nixon won."

¹ In recent years known as Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells. William Rogers did so well he became a senior partner—earning \$300,000 a year, a seat on the board of directors of the ultra-Leftist *Washington Post*, and a fancy apartment in the U.N. Plaza Building.

"It is because the evidence shows that the National Lawyers Guild is at present a Communist dominated and controlled organization fully committed to the Communist Party line that I have today served notice to it to show cause why it should not be designated on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations."

Congressman Rarick continues: "On September 11, 1958, the Attorney General [Rogers] rescinded the proposal to designate the Guild. (1958 Annual Report of the Attorney General, Page 251.) On September 12, 1958 . . . the Attorney General [Rogers] had 'concluded that the evidence that would now be available at a hearing on the merits of the proposed designation fails to meet the strict standards of proof which guide the determination of proceedings of this character.'"

That was pure balderdash! Rogers' reversal of Brownell was out-and-out appeasement of the Communists. The National Lawyers Guild had already been cited as a Communist Front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on April 23, 1956. The House Committee on Un-American Activities' citation of September 21, 1950, stated that the National Lawyers Guild is the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions," and that "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

Yet, Attorney General William P. Rogers made the determination that sufficient proof was not available to keep the National Lawyers Guild on the Attorney General's list even though such proof had clearly been established by both Houses of Congress. As usual, he was supporting the Reds.

Another incident of Secretary Rogers' support for the Communists was brought to light by Willard Edwards in the *Chicago Tribune* of March 5, 1970. The matter concerned Communist terrorist Amilcar Cabral, whose seven-year guerrilla war in Portuguese Guinea has been waged with Communist backing and arms. Secretary Rogers had actually allowed Cabral to come to the United States for ten days so he could appear before the House Subcommittee on African Affairs. The State Department thus promoted yet another propaganda victory for the Communists. Ed Hunter pointed out in *Tactics* for March 20, 1970, that the use of the U.S. Congress as a forum for this Communist terrorist would be exploited abroad to enhance his prestige while being interpreted as a slap at Portugal, our N.A.T.O. ally.

Rogers' aid to the enemy was also brought out in the summer of 1969 when he authorized the State Department to pressure the courts in Chicago to release indicted anarchist prisoners so that they might represent the United States in Paris and in Asia. Rogers' sanction permitted self-confessed Communists Dave Dellinger, Rennie Davis, and other Leftists to negotiate with their Comrades among the Vietcong about the release for propaganda purposes of three American prisoners.

In March of 1969, Secretary Rogers laid it on the line to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "We are not," he said, "seeking a military victory" in Vietnam. Secretary of State William Rogers doesn't want victory over the Communists in Vietnam or anywhere else. As *Human Events* has noted: "Rogers, according to one high State Department source, is constantly thinking up ways in which the United States can make concessions to the Soviets."

During the Eisenhower Administration, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles carried forward the Leftward course of American foreign policy by "always saying the right thing and always doing the wrong thing."

Rogers, thoroughly trained in the quiet behind-the-scenes maneuvers of the Eisenhower Administration, does "the wrong thing" without even bothering to say the right one. The latter task has been assigned to Vice President Spiro Agnew. But you will note that even Mr. Agnew avoids talking about "housecleaning" at the State Department.

MIDEAST OUTLOOK GRIM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the continued crisis in the Middle East is the type which could turn optimism to pessimism. The mounting complications in the area are such that one could honestly wonder whether a solution will ever be reached. The Chicago Daily News in a very penetrating commentary in its September 17 edition very effectively analyzes the Middle East situation, as follows:

MIDEAST OUTLOOK GRIM

There's little encouragement to be had from examining events in the Middle East just now. From the grim cat-and-mouse game being played by the Arab guerrillas with their remaining hostages to the breakdown of the peace talks and the fragile state of the regime in Jordan, the news is bad.

About the only trace of a silver lining is Egypt's vow that it will hold to the cease-fire as long as Israel does, even though it considers the rest of the peace initiative dead. But if this promise is no firmer than the earlier one to abide by the status quo on missile emplacements, it won't amount to much. The United States now says it has confirmed new movements of missiles in the cease-fire zone more serious than the violations previously reported.

Besides, with the guerrillas more than willing to do their dirty work, the Arab governments may simply elect to wait things out for a bit. King Hussein in Jordan appears to be an exception in opposing the guerrillas, but only because they pose a threat to his own skin. While fighting them and referring to their deeds as the "shame of the Arabs," he still calls for a united front against Israel.

The ominous clouds in the Middle East overshadow all other foreign policy considerations for the time being, as nothing could demonstrate more clearly than the just-announced itinerary of President Nixon. His end-of-the-month trip will put a world spotlight on the U.S. presence in the Mediterranean and on NATO.

As noted by Peter Lisagor, our Washington bureau chief, every stop Mr. Nixon plans bears in some way on the Mideast crisis, even though it involves such political opposites as the crusty old dictator of Spain, Francisco Franco, and that eminent Communist, Marshal Tito, in Yugoslavia. Franco's Spain still plays host to U.S. bases at the entry to the Mediterranean. Tito may still have the ear of Egypt's Nasser, though the "Third World" concept they tried to launch has fallen into disarray.

Mr. Nixon's review of the 6th Fleet is of course a direct reminder to the Russians that the United States still has power, as well as vital interests, in the Mediterranean regardless of Russia's naval buildup in that crowded sea.

The uses of power have undergone a considerable transformation since the old gunboat days, to be sure. Superbombs and missiles have proved to be no answer at all to

such new phenomena as global skyjacking—a fact the Russians, too, must be pondering these days. Yet just such newfound tactics by fanatics or madmen could start a train of events unstoppable short of a clash of superpowers.

The prime objective of the United States must be to cool the hotbed in the Middle East and somehow try to get the Arab-Israeli peace talks going again. That should be the Russian objective, too, but if the Kremlin has come to that conclusion it is mighty slow in showing it.

HON. TIM LEE CARTER'S 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for your perusal, my sixth annual questionnaire.

SEPTEMBER 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: Every two years you have an opportunity to elect your representative in Congress, and this is such a year. The only election other than for United States Congressman is that for Judge of the Third Appellate District, Kentucky Court of Appeals, which covers Adair, Clinton, Cumberland, Green, McCreary, Metcalfe, Pulaski, Russell, Taylor, and Wayne Counties. I remind you of the November 3 Election Day and encourage you to exercise your right to vote for whomever you desire, for this is the only way to insure a government that represents you.

I spend as much time in the District as possible and hope to see you personally, but it is impossible to obtain everyone's recommendations on major issues confronting us in Congress during these visits. For that reason, I am sending you the sixth annual questionnaire. Your answers will be computerized, and the consensus of your views greatly influences my voting. The results will be released to the news media when they are finalized so that you might see the opinions of your neighbors.

If I may have an expression of your thoughts it will be greatly appreciated, and if I can be of service to you in any way, please let me know.

Your Friend,

TIM LEE CARTER.

SIXTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Do you favor—

1. Federal gun registration laws?
2. Having Daylight Saving Time only from Memorial Day to Labor Day?
3. Passage of a Constitutional Amendment allowing prayer in schools?
4. The soil-banking of tobacco?
5. Stricter enforcement of laws to insure less pollution of our water, air and land?
6. Use of veto by the President if he believes an appropriation bill is inflationary?
7. Replacing the present military draft system with an all-volunteer Army?
8. Allowing Federal police officers, with a warrant, to enter a house without knocking, if they believe evidence being sought would be destroyed?
9. Exempting an only son, who is in the Armed Forces, from serving in a combat zone?
10. Continuation of United States Foreign Aid?

Please check answer which best expresses your feelings as to the policy the United States should follow in Vietnam:

- a. Withdraw all troops immediately;
- b. Withdraw all troops by end of 1971;
- c. Withdraw all troops as fast as South Vietnam can assume combat duties;

- d. Use all necessary military force to win a victory.
Please check best approach for assisting poor people:
a. Guarantee of remunerative employment (work);
b. Guarantee minimum income;
c. Guarantee minimum income by supplementing earnings if the person works;
d. Offer no assistance;
e. Continue present programs.

THE FIRE ANT FIASCO

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall. The article entitled "The Fire Ant Fiasco" eloquently speaks for itself:

THE FIRE ANT FIASCO
(By Stewart L. Udall)

In a triumph of bureaucratic log-rolling over common sense, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and farm agencies in nine southeastern states have proposed a \$200 million, 12-year pesticide campaign to wipe out the imported fire ant. The campaign could eventually blanket 120 million acres with 450 million pounds of deadly Mirex bait, threaten human health and devastate fisheries throughout the Southeast.

The Alabama legislature has balked at the idea of sending airplanes aloft to shower this poison down on cities, forests, fields and streams. But in Mississippi, Georgia and South Carolina the federal-state war on fire ants has been fully funded and is picking up steam.

Never in the history of USDA-inspired pesticide drives has a more destructive cannon been leveled at a less significant target. The fire ant is neither a health menace nor a threat to agriculture. It feeds mainly on other insects, including the economically destructive boll weevil, bark beetle, pinetip moth and sugarcane borer. The chief complaint against this quarter-inch stowaway from Argentina (here since 1918) is that its bite is painful and its foot-and-a-half-high nests interfere with haying operations. But such minor nuisances can readily be controlled by local, mound-to-mound doses of short-lived pesticides.

Instead, over the protests of scores of biologists, USDA's Agricultural Research Service (ARS) and the nine state agricultural departments have called for an indiscriminate serial bombardment campaign that would saturate every square foot of terrain in cities and fields alike with about 50 granules bait laced with long-lasting Mirex. Deeply concerned about the human and environmental hazards, 100 Mississippi scientists and citizens have joined with the non-profit Environmental Defense Fund of East Setauket, N.Y. in a court suit to stop the fire ant program.

The biologists' objections are twofold:

The National Academy of Sciences has reported that it is sensible to control, but not to eradicate, the highly adaptable fire ant. Between 1957 and 1963, USDA and the nine southeastern states poured \$25 million into an eradication campaign—only to have the fire ant extend its range by 11 million acres. This preview of the present all-out war made

use of heptachlor, a pesticide whose residues were banned from most foods in 1960. The heptachlor experience should have been a warning to USDA, but it wasn't. The Department proceeded to embrace Mirex with unbelievably little concern for its potential toxicity to people and wildlife.

Mirex, a chlorinated hydrocarbon closely related to DDT but longer-lasting, is a threat to many species besides the fire ant. Under present plans, which call for it to be dumped on ponds and streams as well as fields and forests, it could destroy the multi-million-dollar shellfish industry in the Gulf and South Atlantic estuaries. At Senate hearings in 1969, Francis J. Mulhern, associate administrator for regulatory and control programs in the ARS, testified that "this bait does not last too long in the presence of rain." Why not? Mulhern didn't say, but it is clear that the pesticide is washed into streams and bays.

The Interior Department's biological Field Station at Gulf Breeze, Florida, has recently found that minute doses of Mirex (one part per ten billion parts of sea water) kill over a third of the shrimp tested. Mortality among young blue crabs is also high. Like DDT, Mirex appears to reach higher and higher concentrations as it moves up through food chains. Livers of treated shrimp at Gulf Breeze accumulated 24,000 times as much of the pesticide as was present in the sea water.

Last year, moreover, a government commission on pesticides reported that Mirex causes cancer in laboratory mice and should not be used unless public health conditions absolutely warrant it.

It is true, as USDA officials point out, that laboratory findings do not necessarily show what will happen in natural settings. And it is a small comfort to know that USDA is now conducting field studies near Charleston, S.C. to determine the effects of Mirex on marine organisms.

But why in the name of sanity doesn't USDA call a halt to the fire ant campaign until the Charleston studies are completed? Why has it helped its sister agencies in Mississippi, Georgia and South Carolina take unnecessary risks with the seafood industries, wildlife and people of these states? In effect, USDA is saying that neither the Gulf Breeze nor the Charleston research amounts to a hill of... ants.

Environmentalists all over the country are candidly perplexed by this particular USDA performance. "Given the low level of need and the potential effects on non-target species," says Charles D. Kelley, chief of the Game and Fish Division of Alabama's Department of Conservation, "it's incredible that this program has started up again. Why mess around with a carcinogen?"

Indeed, there is no popular demand for broadcast bombings against the fire ant. A few farmers who would rather have the government subsidize a control program than foot the bill themselves have prevailed upon politicians like Rep. Jamie L. Whitten of Mississippi to make the fire ant campaign their favorite pork barrel issue.

It is no accident that fire ant war was drummed to a fever pitch after J. Phil Campbell was named Under Secretary of Agriculture in 1968. Previously, Campbell had served as Commissioner of Agriculture in Georgia, where he made fire ant eradication drives just about the biggest thing in his balliwick.

But the overriding reason for the fire ant fiasco may simply be bureaucratic inertia. "It's one of those horrible cases where an early commitment has grown so strong that the people involved can't back down," says Joe Broder, Washington, D.C. Director for Friends of the Earth. "A bureaucratic idea has turned into an obsession."

H.R. 19387

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am joining today in cosponsoring legislation, H.R. 19387, being introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), a bill to amend the act creating the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to terminate the accrual and payment of interest on the Corporation. This is a measure vital to the economy of the Great Lakes States and important to the continued growth of the Nation. While the legislation does not go as far as the measure I introduced last year, H.R. 12909, in that the bill introduced today does not relieve the Corporation of its obligation to repay its indebtedness to the Treasury, the bill is a timely step forward.

The administration last month changed its position on this issue and now fully supports this measure, and the other body last Thursday passed the legislation with little opposition. Now is the time for colleagues interested in advancing the St. Lawrence Seaway toward a status comparable in equity to that accorded other federally supported waterways to lend their full support to the bill being introduced today.

The proposed legislation would end the requirement for the Corporation to pay interest on the seaway debt. This includes unpaid interest which has accrued to date—about \$22 million—and interest that would otherwise accrue on revenue bonds issued to the Treasury under the original 1954 act.

Under the bill, the obligation to repay the Treasury the principal on the revenue bonds issued by the Corporation would continue. Projections of the Department of Transportation indicate that repayment of the bonded debt with relief from interest payments should enable the Corporation to hold the line on tolls. Thus the bill is designed to put the Development Corporation on a more sound long-term financial footing while it more effectively develops and promotes the movement of cargo through the seaway.

Over its first decade of shipping the seaway has been more responsible financially than any other waterway in the continental United States. The seaway paid for the entire cost of its operation and maintenance, totaling almost \$15 million. It paid the Treasury over \$29 million in interest, approximately 60 percent of its total interest obligation. Under the bill, the seaway would still be treated unfavorably in comparison with all other waterways in the United States which have been developed and operated entirely out of general tax revenues. In this light, the proposed conversion of the seaway debt to an interest-free loan is but a modest step.

For the sake of comparison, through fiscal year 1965 the Federal Government

paid more than \$54 million in construction costs and more than \$113 million in operating costs for the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to the sea. Combined Federal costs for the Houston ship channel were more than \$67 million; for the Sacramento deep water channel, more than \$50 million; and for the Mobile, Ala., channel, more than \$19 million. The seaway together with the Great Lakes is a fourth seacoast and is very much like an ocean ship channel in the service it renders a particular geographic area. Yet, unlike ocean ship channels, it has had to repay invested capital, interest, and operating and maintenance costs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the limited remedy set forth in the legislation I am cosponsoring today will, nevertheless, permit the seaway to grow and remain viable. Failure to enact it will require substantial toll increases under terms of existing law and our agreements with Canada and may well signal the decline of one of the greatest Federal enterprises in our national history. I urge speedy consideration and enactment of the bill.

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS IN RUSSIA

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) for sponsoring his concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 743, and am most happy to associate myself with this effort to focus public attention upon the plight of the Soviet Jews.

As one who has long been concerned over the persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union, I am also pleased that I am one of the 39 cosponsors of this bill, introduced in the House yesterday, which I hope will have the early attention of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to which an earlier resolution of mine has been referred.

Because of a meeting of the conferees on the military procurement authorization bill, it was not possible for me to attend the press conference called yesterday morning by the gentleman from New York, and I now want to take this opportunity to congratulate him upon his efforts and to let him know he has my wholehearted, unstinted support on this and other resolutions urging renewed efforts by this Government to bring about an end to the religious persecution of Jews in Russia.

In December of last year, I strongly protested Soviet mistreatment of Jews in Russia. I addressed the House in a fervent plea to our State Department and the Secretary General of the United Nations to circulate among its members the request of the Israeli Government on a specific case of mistreatment it cited and refer the matter for action to the Human Rights Commission.

In addition, I urged our Secretary of

State to recommend to the Secretary General that this matter be officially referred to the Commission and placed on the agenda for consideration at the earliest possible time and to use the good office of our Government with the Soviet Union to prevent these abuses.

While some consideration has been given to mistreatment and persecution of Jews in Russia, there are continued complaints that these pernicious practices are still taking place. I renew my protest and again calling on the Secretary of State to give these matters his insistent attention, so that representations can be made to the Soviet Government in behalf of our own Government that we strongly oppose any manifestation of anti-Semitism, and particularly mistreatment and persecution, and denial of human rights of the Jews in Russia.

I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague, the distinguished Congressman from New York, the Honorable RICHARD OTTINGER, in the concurrent resolution he is sponsoring in an effort to fix attention on this very regrettable situation in Russia and bring it to an end.

I think we should continue to press the Soviet Government in conferences and in the United Nations to make every effort to end persecution and discrimination, and other manifestations of anti-Semitism, so that all men and women would be entitled to equal treatment under the law, regardless of race, class, creed, or status, and would be treated and be protected in their individual and human rights.

As I have noted before, anti-Semitism is a curse and a scourge to humanity, and it must be banished by all mankind, and this great Nation of ours must set the example, as we have done in the past. I repeat, and I urge, that the Jews must be free from the cruel bondage of discrimination, mistreatment, and persecution.

I also urge our Government to take a determined stand in striking down these gross violations of ordinary, human rights, and I plead with all my heart with the Soviet Government to end these deplorable practices that shock world conscience.

This resolution also strongly urges our President to condemn persecution of any person because of his religion by the Soviet Union and to try to negotiate permission for Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel and other countries willing to receive them.

This resolution demands human rights for the Jewish people of Russia, and I hope this can be favorably acted upon and implemented by this Government at an early date.

RESOLUTION AIMED AT HALTING AERIAL HIJACKING

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the city council of the city of Philadelphia at a

meeting held September 10, 1970, unanimously adopted a resolution urging a boycott of the Arab States and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes and those airlines serving Arab countries in an effort to halt the crime of aerial hijacking. I plead with President Nixon and my colleagues to read this resolution carefully and to take all possible steps to implement it. Without action such as suggested here, many more lives of aerial passengers will be jeopardized. The resolution follows:

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, RESOLUTION No. 298

Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to declare a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes and those airlines serving Arab countries, in an effort to halt the crime of aerial hijacking

Whereas, the recent and most barbaric wave of aerial hijackings has focused world concern upon the Arab states who harbor terrorists who prey upon international air travelers; and

Whereas, at the present time more than two hundred innocent people are being held captive in the Jordanian desert by Palestinian air pirates; and

Whereas, these actions emphasize the immediate need for cessation of all American commercial flights to any Arab countries which allow plane hijackers to operate from their territory; and

Whereas, it is long past time for the airlines and governments of the world to declare a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes or those airlines serving Arab countries; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to take all possible steps to effect a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes and those airlines serving Arab countries, in an effort to halt the crime of aerial hijacking.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the members of Congress from Philadelphia.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the tenth day of September, 1970.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

CHARLES H. SAWYER JR.,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

Sponsored by Councilman George X. Schwartz (on behalf of the members).

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those many persons who have inquired about recent changes in VA educational assistance programs, I would like to enter the following table in the Record at this point:

Title	Eligibility	Assistance
1. VA orphans, wives, and widows education assistance.	Sons and daughters between 18 and 26, and wives and widows of service-connected deceased veterans or 100-percent disabled veterans.	\$175 per month for full-time study; \$128 for $\frac{3}{4}$ time study; \$81 for $\frac{1}{2}$ time study.
2. Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.	(1) Anyone serving more than 180 days active duty, part or all after Jan. 31, 1955, discharged on conditions other than dishonorable; or (2) released from active duty after Jan. 31, 1955, for service-connected disability; or (3) any person in service 2 years and continuing on active duty.	$1\frac{1}{2}$ months of assistance for each month of service on active duty after Jan. 31, 1955, but not more than 36 months' assistance, however, a period of 18 months of such active duty will qualify a veteran for the full 36 months. Allowance: \$1 to \$230 per month plus \$13 for each additional dependent over 2 depending on hours of attendance and number of dependents of student. These rates are applicable for institutional training— $\frac{1}{2}$ time or more. Varying rates apply to other types of training including less than $\frac{1}{2}$ time.

USAF'S DUAL FRONTIERS

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1970, the Honorable John L. McLucas, Under Secretary of the Air Force, spoke to the Middle Georgia Chapter of the Air Force Association at Robins Air Force Base, Ga., which is so ably headed by Dr. Dan Callahan, Mister Air Force Association of middle Georgia. I was not privileged to be present when Secretary McLucas addressed this outstanding chapter of the Air Force association but my constituent and good friend, Mr. J. H. Rosenberg of Warner Robins, Ga., has brought this excellent message to my attention and I share Mr. Rosenberg's enthusiasm over the goals and outstanding programs of the Air Force outlined in this stimulating speech.

I ask your permission to share the contents of Secretary McLucas' address with my distinguished colleagues, but before doing so, I would like to take this opportunity to commend every member of our Air Force, not only for the fine job they do every day in performing their assigned military duties with honor and distinction, but also for their obvious willingness to go the extra mile in being good neighbors on an individual basis, as well as collectively, in sponsoring and participating in the many civic activities in the civilian communities near our bases throughout the country. I am particularly proud that we, in the third district of Georgia, have the fine men and women at Robins Air Force Base as our neighbors and especially appreciate the splendid leadership of Robins' commanding general, Maj. Gen. A. J. Beck.

The speech follows:

USAF'S DUAL FRONTIERS: MILITARY SECURITY AND SOCIAL EQUITY

(By Hon. John L. McLucas)

In deciding what to talk to you about this evening, I was torn between two themes. Both, I think, are of major interest to this audience; and both are extremely important to the Air Force. First, is the Air Force's mission in the 70's and our capability to fulfill it. Second, is the relevance and response of the Air Force to the society we defend. Although either topic is worthy of a full volume of analysis and exposition, the two are so important to our nation and to the USAF that I have decided to offer a few key thoughts on each of these subjects.

First, let me assure you that Secretary Seamans and I and all our colleagues are fully alive to the difficult task of maintaining adequate military forces. But we must carry out this task with a shrinking military budget. Dr. Seamans terms this unenviable position of the Air Force, "a three-way crunch," caused by pressing domestic needs, continuation of our worldwide commitments and a need to modernize our military equipment.

We hope for the success of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviets, but at the same time we must be sure that we can continue to deter strategic war. Two developments add to our concern in this regard: first, the increased numbers and total payload of Soviet ICBMs, and second the Soviet deployment of an initial ABM system and continued extensive ABM research. The combined effect could be a considerable reduction in the effectiveness of both our land-based and sea-based missiles.

To maintain deterrence in the face of these Soviet developments, we are deploying ABM protection for our missile fields, while modernizing with Minuteman III and Poseidon. But in the future, the effectiveness of our missile forces will tend to vary depending on the length of time it takes us to respond to new Soviet capabilities. As a result, it is extremely important that we maintain the bomber portion of our deterrent capability. To do this we must modernize our aging force of B-52's, and the B-1 appears to be the answer.

The Air Force has awarded development contracts to North American Rockwell for the B-1 system and to General Electric for the B-1's engines. The five test aircraft will incorporate only such avionics as are necessary to achieve the airframe and engine test objectives using off-the-shelf equipment. No decisions have been made on production of the B-1 or development and integration of the B-1's avionics.

Regarding the tactical airpower missions, present day fighter and attack aircraft cannot cope with the requirements of the late 70's. For air-to-air combat the Air Force plans to use the F-15. McDonnell-Douglas has a development contract which calls for 20 test aircraft, one wing of fighters, and options for two follow-on wings. Actual procurement money for the F-15, as contrasted to R&D money, will be budgeted in the future.

In response to the close air support needs of the ground forces we are working on a survivable, all-theater, attack plane known as the AX. Six contractors have responded to our May 7 Request for Proposal on the AX, and the responses are now being evaluated. By early next year contracts should have been awarded to two contractors to each build two copies of a competitive prototype. We are able to build flying prototypes of this aircraft because of its relatively low cost.

The three systems I've noted are badly

needed if the Air Force is to continue to carry out its mission in the 1970's.

But the armed forces now have an additional role, one of front line engagement in the war against domestic distress. The F-15 program recently provided an example of the combined domestic and military concerns of the Air Force. Through oversight, the F-15 contract was awarded without an equal opportunity clause. The overriding importance that the Air Force assigned to correction of this error was quickly apparent. Secretary Seamans, attending a conference in Puerto Rico at the time, immediately flew to St. Louis to revise the agreement and to survey the hiring practices of McDonnell-Douglas.

As we have become more and more aware since World War II, there are real injustices in the societal framework of this great country. I think Ted Sturm, the Executive Editor of the *Airman* magazine, had a fine grasp of the interacting causes when he wrote the following:

"The 'enemy' has been well defined by many people. He is the evil rampant in our society—and his offspring are the multifarious outgrowths of poverty, ignorance and discrimination. It is difficult to separate these three villains and the evils they spawn—crime, hate, fear, destroyed lives. They are closely related. Poverty is often the result of ignorance and vice versa, and both can result from discrimination. Poverty and ignorance can set up a self-perpetuating and vicious cycle that must be broken by the destruction of one, or both, and the eventual removal of the basic causes."

As Mr. Sturm implied, conditions over which an individual has no control often tend to predestine the road of life he must follow. But in traveling that highway he carries within him the seeds of revolt against the institutions that denied him a fair chance in life. He feels little commitment to a society which does not respond to his basic needs. Too often this alienation of the underprivileged results in all types of anti-social reaction. Since 1948 the Air Force, keenly aware of these factors, has vigorously campaigned against their causes.

About 16 months ago Secretary Laird established the Department of Defense Domestic Action Council. I am especially proud to be the Air Force representative to this group, whose aim is to apply DOD resources to the alleviation of domestic difficulties. Our goals for 1970 are pretty impressive. They are:

First, to establish summer youth employment opportunities at a rate equal to 4.2 jobs for each 100 Civil Service employees. A goal which we believe we have exceeded.

Second, to provide in each military department the equivalent of 200,000 man weeks of educational, recreational and cultural opportunities for disadvantaged young people.

And third, to sponsor or support at each active and reserve installation at least one significant project to improve the health and well-being of the adjacent community.

Within the Air Force, we have a Domestic Action Policy Council which provides specific service direction to the guidance of the DOD Council. The policy council monitors and guides the USAF's field efforts. Our service has two categories of domestic action—centrally managed and locally managed.

Examples of centrally managed, service-wide endeavors are Project 100,000, Project Transition, Youth Opportunity Programs, ghetto area contracts and development of new construction methods. There are about 13 of these programs, and usually they involve such an expenditure of funds or effort that they require special legislation or appropriations.

Under Project 100,000, the services enlisted 100,000 men per year who would previously

have been considered mentally or physically disqualified for active duty. Rigorous inservice training and remedial courses of the most fundamental variety are making these people into productive servicemen. And the benefits will continue to grow as many of them return to a civilian society which can reward their enhanced skills.

Another important program is our research and development study of new construction methods for family housing. The pilot project at George Air Force Base, California looks like it may yield a three-bedroom house for \$12,000. Such value would represent a considerable breakthrough in development of materials and techniques for low-cost housing.

Throughout the planning and execution of these programs the Air Force, through the Department of Defense, has been actively cooperating with the Departments of Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education and Welfare. On a gratifying number of occasions, private businesses have also cooperated in sharing program costs.

Local domestic action programs are just what the name implies; they respond to the requirements of the time and the place. The field commander and his staff are in the most advantageous position to know and appreciate the area's needs and to help meet them with available resources.

Recognizing the local problem for what it is—often it's a derivative of ignorance, poverty or discrimination—and attacking the causes are the most important facets of local domestic action. Too often in the past, efforts of the well-meaning have addressed the effect rather than the cause. Thereby, they have perpetuated a status quo, altered only by a momentary anomaly within the established pattern.

The Air Force people at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, assisted a young lady to her feet through a domestic action program, but her gratitude was tempered by bitter memories. Recalling her past, she said:

"Don't offer me pity or handouts. Ones from the past burn in my heart."

The girl from Oklahoma had experienced charities which cost too much in dignity, charities directed at an effect, which did very little to eliminate the cause. We hope that our programs will go further toward long-term improvements.

At Wilford Hall USAF Medical Center, Texas, we trained a group of underprivileged girls as laboratory assistants. One of the outstanding graduates of this program, Miss Oralia Perez, a young lady who now plans to attend college in preparation for a career as a medical technologist, had this to say about the helping hand she received from the Air Force:

"It's the only way I could have received this training without first completing high school and earning enough money to pay for the course."

For a girl who had dropped out of school as a sophomore to help support her family, these goals might well have been unattainable. But those who worked with Miss Perez addressed the problem squarely and provided her a means to alter her future with dignity.

Fundamentally, the local domestic action program is dynamic neighborliness, but we couldn't call it that. In the first place the term seemed a little too exposed. We didn't want to be accused of being unneighborly when the requirements of the moment dictated full attention to our primary job. Community relations cannot become the dominant theme of Air Force activity. We must carry out our primary mission while at the same time doing whatever we can to be a good neighbor.

What is a neighbor? He's the fellow who loans you a ladder. Hancock Field made available vehicles and classrooms to the State of New York for a truck drivers school. Both jobs and untrained men were available, but facilities were in short supply.

Who else is a neighbor? He's a man who listens to your kids problems when they can't explain them to you. AIC James L. Habegger of Tyndall Air Force Base has spent the last year in just this type activity in Panama City. He's reaching out to communicate with a group of troubled teenagers. Fortunately, he digs them and they dig him. The school's curriculum coordinator labels the results, "Tremendous!"

Who is another neighbor? She's the lady who says she'll baby sit little Mike. When you come home, you find that your son's affections have been alienated by a group of very commonplace happenings, but to him they were very new and completely fascinating. Yet, what else is Project Youth at Robins AFB? Children are provided the facilities and opportunity to see, to do, to learn, to experience, and to enjoy a host of new things.

You'll also find that neighbors have taught your son to throw a curve, they've driven your wife to an appointment, and they've bandaged the scratched and bloodied knees of your offspring. There are service counterparts for them all. The "Big Brothers" of the Air Force Academy have associated themselves with disadvantaged youth in Colorado Springs. Numerous wives clubs throughout the country provide transportation and shopping services for the aged and infirm. The experimental Military Assistance for Safety and Traffic programs in San Antonio and at Luke and Mountain Home Air Force Bases provide helicopter evacuation of accident victims when requested by local traffic authorities.

There is, however, a difference between the neighborliness of your street and the more corporate variety between a base and its adjacent community. The latter takes a bit more effort and organization because it is bigger and lacks an initial, personal spark. Once underway, spontaneity can build. We have bases calling in to headquarters with imaginative campaigns which they feel deserve publicity so that other units can emulate them. Fortunately, our programs are to a degree self-sustaining which allows us greater leeway in DOD and Air Force Headquarters to examine new avenues of approaching the basic goals without fearing the collapse of our present endeavors.

Our current Domestic Action programs are reaching a large number of people. The Department of Defense has provided jobs for over 53% of the 66,000 disadvantaged youths hired by federal agencies this summer. Over 550,000 young people are engaged in service-sponsored endeavors similar to the WRAMA's Project Youth.

Domestic action is a highly important realm of endeavor for all federal agencies these days; and as has been true for many years, the armed forces are in the vanguard of the effort. That our efforts have met with as much success as they have has been attributable to two factors: First, the spare-time involvement of our airmen, officers and families. Second, the unselfish, unflagging assistance of community-minded organizations.

I'd like to salute one of the finest such agencies I know—the Middle Georgia Chapter of the Air Force Association. Your varied interests, valuable work and fantastic growth over the past year and a half border on the unbelievable. Most noteworthy I feel have been your contributions to the Project Youth Lunch program, your education scholarships, and finally the projects you have initiated on behalf of our Prisoners of War in North Vietnam. These men and their cruelly exploited loved ones at home deserve our ever-increasing efforts to secure both their rights under the Geneva Convention and their early repatriation.

The accomplishments of WRAMA, Robins AFB and the Middle Georgia Chapter of the AFA have provided the Air Force with one of its proudest examples of dynamic, productive Domestic Action. Others have noted this performance also. Next Monday at the

AFA Annual Convention the Middle Georgia Chapter will be recognized in a citation as the Air Force Association's most outstanding unit in the field of community relations. Your president, Dr. Dan Callahan, will receive the Medal of Merit for his distinguished service to airpower and to the Association. General Beck will also be presented a citation for his steadfast support of the energetic AFA community in Georgia.

I see here in Middle Georgia the kind of teamwork and civil-military interaction which will go a long way to smoothing the Air Force's path as it faces the challenges of the 70's. Thank you and keep up the good work.

VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM, AMERICAN STYLE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in senseless terrorism and violence across our Nation has horrified Americans in all stations and walks of life. Many of us are unable to comprehend the motivation behind such useless destruction. The following editorial from the September 11 Washington Star is an excellent analysis of the background and reasons for this violence as well as what it forebodes for the future of our free society if we do not take positive steps now to stem this lawlessness and reaffirm our own faith in America and the ideals for which it stands:

VIOLENCE AND TERRORISM, AMERICAN STYLE

With attention riveted on the guerrilla-held airstrip in Jordan, it was almost possible for people here in the United States to forget, briefly, the mounting turmoil in our own society. Almost—but not quite. For some, the grim chess game being played with human pawns did not serve as a horrifying diversion, but as a reminder that terrorism is not a foreign product. It is appearing in shocking quantity right here and right now. And it is quite possible that the terrorist tactic of kidnapping and the bartering of hostages could happen here, too.

It is time for us to recognize what is taking place in this country. It can be called by a variety of names. It is, if you will, a revolution, or a guerrilla war, or a terrorist uprising. But whatever the name of the game, the goal is the same: A small, dedicated group of warped romantics is determined to topple the structure of American society.

It has been possible for members of the besieged society to find consolation in the fact that the attack is being mounted by a revolutionary army of minute size. There was reassurance to be found as well in the knowledge that terrorist tactics are not new to America; we have been through outbreaks of violence and bombing before, and we have survived. It must follow, therefore, that we will survive the present microcosmic revolution.

Both of these rationalizations for apathy should be re-examined.

The example of the Palestinian terrorists should serve as sufficient instruction in what a numerically insignificant army can accomplish once an opponent's Achilles' heel can be found. The greatest powers on earth were helpless to prevent a handful of men from kidnapping hundreds of innocents. And here at home, the achievements of a small group

of terrorists—possibly numbering in the hundreds—is chillingly impressive. Over a recent period of 16 months, there were 4,330 bombings, many in public buildings; there were 1,475 additional attempted bombings and more than 35,000 disruptive bomb threats. More than 100 policemen have been wounded in unprovoked attacks during the first eight months of this year, more than a dozen of them fatally, and the incidence of bombing police cars, sniping at patrolmen and luring them into traps is increasing week by week.

The demonstrated vulnerability of an open society to the tactics of terror should dispel the illusion of weakness in numerical inferiority. And the comfort offered by history is equally insubstantial.

The United States has had its home-grown terrorists before the extremists who have turned to violence to change the status quo. But the radical reactionaries of the Ku Klux Klan and the Molly Maguires and the Wobblies of the early labor movement used violence and terror against a specific segment of society in pursuit of what they perceived as positive goals. We have had our anarchists, too, in the Great Red Scare of the early 1920s, practicing destruction for the sake of destruction. It was an importation of despair, brought by a handful of immigrants who had harbored a paranoid hatred of authority.

But now, there is a difference. For the first time, the country is confronted with a terrorism that is both native and anarchistic. It is a movement that has no single, identifiable center. The two most publicized revolutionary groups—the Black Panthers and the Weathermen—have little in common beyond the impulse to destroy. The terrorists are not totally isolated from the main body of society. They are tacitly supported by an unthinking minority of unknown size of young Americans who share the despair if not the psychoses of the activists, who slip easily into the rhetoric of hatred, and who, if forced now to choose sides, might well rally under the black flag of anarchy.

This is the situation confronting the vast majority of citizens who believe that the American system is the farthest step yet taken by imperfect men in their endless search for the ideal form of government. What can be done about it?

First, society must move with firmness and determination to protect itself. Destruction of lives and property cannot be excused or tolerated. Those who volunteer for service in the law-keeping forces deserve and must be given the full support of those they protect.

At the same time, the law-enforcers must be continually monitored to make certain that lawlessness and violence is not met in kind. Anger and panic can induce the police to take short cuts with the law. Terrorism in the protection of society is a suicidal course that must not be condoned.

Society must guard, too, against the possibility that it can be panicked into a reaction of blind repression that will succeed in achieving the goal of the terrorists: The destruction of the liberties and the constitutional protections that make this government worth fighting to preserve. We have taken such dangerous detours before, as in the Red hunt of 1920 undertaken by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer in response to a series of anarchist bombings when, on a single night, some 4,000 suspected radicals were arrested in 33 cities, most of them on the flimsiest of evidence. Any such action today, in this era of instant communication and excited passions, would give substance to the specter of repressiveness that now exists in the imaginations of the militants.

If the violence is suppressed without brutal repression, if the majority avoids the tempting illogic of assuming that because some destroyers are black and some have long hair, all black or long-haired youth is

the enemy, the problem still will not be solved. The rash of violence is the symptom, not the illness. An end to the violence will not mean a cure.

But what disease is this that can bind together the despairing youth of the black ghetto and the affluent white youth in a deadly partnership? What common romantic aberration can make a black militant write that "dynamite is my response to your justice" and induce a Harvard student to describe his desire to blow up "the White House, the Capitol, the Pentagon, the university"—to destroy all of society because "only then will we be able to plant trees and flowers all over our woes, and begin again"?

Those who would answer that the Vietnam war is responsible are deluding themselves with an easy—and incorrect—answer. The war has been at most a catalyst hastening the chemistry of violence.

The fact is that there is no single cause, no readily isolated social virus to be cured. The black militant is reacting to a history of deprivation and a present of agonizingly slow progress toward a promised goal. The middle-class white militant is, it would seem, acting with less rationality, protesting against affluence, rejecting material wealth, striking out at the system that guarantees the right to protest.

There is, however, one common thread that runs through the confused tapestry of violence: A loss of faith.

There is a disbelief in the willingness or the ability of this government to right the wrongs that it acknowledges. There is a disdain for the past and a distrust of the future. There is a rejection of set values. There is a loss of purpose, a surrender to uncertainty, created by the repeated shock of changes that have come too quickly, and nurtured by the realization that annihilation is a daily possibility.

Exhortations, slogans, name-calling and stern lectures cannot effect a cure. The erosion of faith can only be halted if each of us who believes in the worth of our society reinforces that belief with a redefinition of goals and a candid re-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses. When faith is gone, it cannot be ordered back into being. It must be searched out and discovered anew. It is a difficult and painful process—but it must be done. The structures of a free society cannot stand on any less substantial a base.

HOW TO SUCCEED IN BUSINESS WITHOUT REALLY TRYING

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House are naturally deeply troubled by the difficulties being experienced by businessmen in this time of national economic travail.

Many thousands of businessmen have been forced into bankruptcy as the result of the Nixon administration's economic policies, and many thousands of others have seen their profit margins dip to the vanishing point.

It is, therefore, very encouraging when one reads about how some individual businessmen manage to succeed against great odds. It shows, indeed, that this is still the land of opportunity.

I refer, particularly, to the Horatio Alger success story of a fellow Californian by the name of F. Donald Nixon—

as related in the following article in the Los Angeles Times:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 9, 1970]

ENVY OF RIVALS: DONALD NIXON'S EASY ENTREE AIDS IN SELLING

(By Robert L. Jackson)

WASHINGTON.—F. Donald Nixon is aware that some business competitors regard him as "unfair competition."

The name seems to open doors wherever he goes. And in the past eight months Don Nixon, the President's brother, has been to London, Lisbon, Athens, Rome, Mexico City and Caracas, as well as up and down the West Coast several times and back and forth between Washington and New York.

Not only does he have easy entree to business executives, but he seems to be able to see high foreign government officials almost without trying.

"I don't let my brother know when I'm going on trips," said Nixon, who was hired last January for a specially created vice president's post by the *Marriott Corp.*, a Washington-based hotel and restaurant firm that has international operations.

THE WORD GETS OUT

"Still the word seems to get out. Our ambassadors have frequently called my hotel to extend any courtesies to me. But I tell them it's a private trip."

Don Nixon's activities might not normally command much attention, except that he has been calling on many U.S. airline executives. He is asking them to shift their in-flight food catering business to Marriott, and there are indications he has been largely successful.

Since airlines are regulated by the federal government—and since President Nixon has sole authority to determine international air routes and who flies them—Donald Nixon's efforts are arousing jealousy and bitterness among many of Marriott's in-flight food service competitors, and a degree of wonder and uneasiness among some airline officials.

CRITICISM IS IGNORED

For his part, Donald Nixon is aware of the talk about him but is seemingly undisturbed by it. Interviewed in the Washington office of J. Willard Marriott Jr., the company's 38-year-old president, Nixon said he is accustomed to be criticized.

"It's nothing new," Nixon said. "Dick's been in politics many years. I've had to lead a careful life, to completely stay out of anything to do with politics, which is my brother's concern."

"He doesn't have to tell anybody who he is," said one airline executive. "He has entree into the top echelon everywhere."

Said another airline official Donald Nixon visited:

"It's a pretty fine line when you're dealing with companies that are federally regulated."

On foreign trips, when he is calling on potential customers or inspecting Marriott's overseas "flight kitchens," Donald Nixon is accorded privileges most businessmen would envy.

He dined with officials of the Greek military junta in Athens last March, and traveled recently to Caracas and met with two Venezuelan cabinet ministers. About two weeks later—although no one can show a connection—a new U.S. competitor of Marriott's in Caracas, Ara Services, Inc., experienced difficulties with the Venezuelan government and had to suspend its airline catering operations there.

Donald Nixon said he has pointedly avoided any involvement with government contracts. That was a principal reason, he said, he decided late last year to leave a similar job at Ogden Foods, an arm of the Conglomerate Ogden Corp. which has federal contracts.

Nixon had been a marketing consultant

for eight years at Ogden Foods before Marriott persuaded him to leave last January to become staff vice president.

BIG AIRLINE SWITCH

A month later, on Feb. 1, American Airlines switched a \$500,000 annual food catering contract from Ogden to Marriott, this contract, at Dulles International Airport here, had been held for five years by Ogden.

An American spokesman said the decision to change caterers was made earlier—before Nixon joined Marriott. Ogden officials said they gave American "superb service" and had received no complaints.

Nixon said that "so far as any advantage to being the brother of the President, it has been a handicap to some extent because of having to avoid government contracts."

Asked if he has been handicapped while at Marriott Corp., Nixon turned to Marriott and said:

"Bill, have I been handicapped? Actually, Bill has not asked me to do anything for the company that relates to the federal government, so I'm not in conflict with any responsibilities of my brother."

PRESIDENT'S FRIEND

The firm is headed by Board Chairman J. Willard Marriott Sr., 70, who has been a long-time friend of President Nixon and a fundraiser for Republican causes. He was chairman of Mr. Nixon's 1969 inaugural committee and organized the national "Honor America Day" program on the Washington monument grounds last July 4.

Donald Nixon and the younger Marriott both denied that contacting airlines posed any conflict problems. "I don't play the game of being a brother to the President," Nixon said. "People have to find that out themselves."

Nixon, 56, is a heavy-set six-footer. He bears a strong facial resemblance to President Nixon, and his voice and gestures are strikingly similar. He lives in Newport Beach and works mainly out of Marriott's West Coast office.

Last Jan. 28, shortly after Marriott hired him, Nixon and other Marriott officials visited Trans World Airlines' corporate offices in New York to try to persuade the airline to give them more business.

For one thing, Marriott—which already serves TWA at Washington, Newark and some European stations—wanted the airline's \$2 million annual contract at San Francisco, which has been held for 18 years by Club Catering, a small firm in Burlingame, Calif.

In a pattern he later followed at other airline offices, Nixon did not deal with the details of a new contract proposal. Rather, he spoke in general terms about the capabilities of the Marriott Corp. The specifics were gone into by Jerald O. Jarrard, Marriott's vice president for in-flight services.

Said Richard B. Patton, a TWA vice president who presided at the meeting: "I don't think Don Nixon believes he has much influence over his brother. And I think he's the first to tell you that."

Patton has known Nixon for four years as "a very modest, outgoing, sweet average person."

"There is bitterness around" in the airline food catering business, Patton said, because it is highly competitive. And Nixon, he said, is being unfairly attacked by some of his business opponents.

TWA officials said their eventual plans for the San Francisco contract are still in doubt. However, the airline has given Marriott additional business in Athens, where Marriott has opened a new flight kitchen.

Nixon said his responsibilities involve "customer and employee relations" in all aspects of Marriott's food and hotel business. The younger Marriott said Nixon was hired because of his long experience in the food business. His salary has not been disclosed.

KINSHIP "DOESN'T HURT"

"He's a sincere, friendly and very effective salesman," Marriott said. "And being the brother of the President doesn't hurt him."

Donald Nixon is a man of great charm, his acquaintances say, whose occasional references to his brother may only be misunderstood by critics.

He is well-tailored, belongs to the Marco Polo Club at the Waldorf Astoria in New York and, according to one source, "is a good man with a knife and fork."

"At dinner," said an airline official who has known him socially, "he often drops Dick's name or talks about the grocery store that the parents owned in Whittier. He talks about 'when Dick and I were kids.' He keeps reinforcing by implication that there's a close relationship—which, of course, there should be—but he doesn't strain to make the point."

At Western Airlines, here Nixon dined with officials in April, there was "no mention whatsoever of any White House influence," according to Richard Ensign, Western's vice president for inflight services.

THE "EXTRA GUEST"

Ensign said Nixon showed up "as an extra guest" for a dinner meeting Ensign had arranged in Los Angeles with two other Marriott officers—the younger Marriott and Jarrard. The purpose was to discuss Marriott's contract with Western at Mexico City.

"The whole group," Ensign said, "bent over backward a little bit to make clear his (Nixon's) attendance was just simply that he happened to be with them, and that was it, period."

Nixon has paid other office visits this year to three supplemental airlines headquartered in Oakland—World Airways, Trans International Airlines and Saturn Airways.

All are certificated to fly international routes and derive much of their revenue from charter flights, an area where the Civil Aeronautics Board is proposing strict new regulations.

In fact, the CAB this year filed civil complaints against World and Saturn, among others, charging violation of charter-flight rules. Those cases are still pending.

World and Saturn have granted new food catering business to Marriott, and Trans International officials said they will consider Marriott's bid later this year. Marriott's prices and services are the only considerations, officials of the airlines said.

Early in July Nixon traveled to Mexico City and Caracas on Marriott business. But he said firmly in an interview that he saw no foreign government officials. "I steer away from government officials," he said.

When asked specifically, however, if he had not conferred with the Venezuelan minister of development, Nixon said he may have. He said the Venezuelan government sought him out—not the other way around—to ask if Marriott would be interested in expanding its hotel facilities and initiating on-the-ground food service at the Caracas airport.

RIVAL FOLDS UP

Nixon said the main purpose of his trip was to meet some of Marriott's Latin-American airline customers.

Shortly after his trip, a new Marriott competitor, ARA Services, Inc., had to suspend catering operations at the Caracas airport after only four days in business.

ARA experienced trouble with the Venezuelan government over its permit to do business and was plagued by mechanical difficulties in some of its equipment. Nixon said ARA's plans to begin business were not discussed during his visit.

His Latin-American trip was similar to a European tour Nixon made last March for Marriott, highlighted by an Athens dinner attended by some leading officials of the Greek junta as well as Greek businessmen.

Nixon said he was surprised that government people were at the "social" function, which was hosted by Thomas Pappas, a Republican fund-raiser from Boston who has wide business interests in Greece.

Nixon said he inspected Marriott "flight kitchens" throughout Europe and visited with employees. In Athens his purpose was to meet officials of Olympic Airways, which has become a new client of Marriott's, he said.

Regarding air routes, Nixon said he avoids discussing the question when he contacts any U.S. airline, because he is sensitive about his brother's responsibilities in this field.

"When the matter comes up, I wish them all well," he said. "I say, 'I don't know which route you're going for.' I recognize that international routes go by the White House. I've never discussed this with my brother, and I wouldn't."

But Nixon said the matter has not come up since he joined Marriott.

Donald Nixon sees the President frequently in San Clemente or Washington, "but we only discuss family matters."

Another brother, Edward G. Nixon, 40, is a phone company official in Seattle. Edward turned down a \$30,000-a-year federal position last year after being advised this might violate a 1967 antinepotism law.

Donald Nixon, for his part, says he has a right to earn his own living. "Just because my brother's President, I don't want to go on relief yet," he said.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT ERRS IN MIDDLE EAST PLAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the contribution, or really lack of it, to the Middle East crisis by the junior Senator from Arkansas has been widely noted in many columns and press reports. One of the most effective commentaries on the newest misdirection of Senator Fulbright was carried by the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News on Friday, September 4, in a column by the international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol.

The column follows:

INTERNATIONAL SCENE—SENATOR FULBRIGHT ERRS IN MIDDLE EAST PLAN

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Fulbright's suggestions for a Middle East settlement reinforce the belief that he lives in a world of his own.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee calls for an "imposed settlement" under the charter of the United Nations.

Then in the next breath he recognizes Israeli and American lack of confidence in the U.N. and suggests he would be "willing to support a significant new commitment by the United States to assure Israel survival."

This implies a military pact with Israel which would automatically bring us into the war to protect that country.

Two points in the senator's proposal are simply unrealistic.

1. The United Nations is in no position to "impose" any settlement on anyone. With its veto structure the Security Council has never been able to take any major decision with Soviet approval.

The one exception came when it ordered help to South Korea, and that action was

only possible because the Russians were boycotting the council at the time.

Unless the USSR agrees on a Middle East settlement, the Security Council has nothing to say. And if the Russians are in accord on a settlement, who needs the Security Council.

A bilateral defense treaty with Israel is even more unrealistic. It would isolate us and the Israelis and expose both of us to all kinds of "credibility" tests.

Both Allies and would-be aggressors must be convinced that the United States is both willing and able to honor such a treaty with sufficient strength.

There are serious questions today about many American commitments, thanks to the performance Fulbright and his "doves" in the Senate who have done so much to undermine American re-credibility abroad.

Can one ask Israel, for instance, to take seriously Sen. Fulbright's offer to sponsor a new military commitment when one recalls what happened to his Tonkin Resolution.

It was, after all, Fulbright who sponsored and piloted that through the Senate in 1964, and then later, after he changed his mind, did everything in his power to nullify it and hamper our war effort.

Can one assure Israel that if attacked the United States would be able to muster enough support at home to come to its aid with the strength necessary to assure success?

The words of the Cooper-Church and McGovern-Hatfield amendments and the full-scale attack on our defense establishment were hardly encouraging.

Nor are the antiwar demonstrations, moratoriums, draft-dodging draft-card burning attacks against ROTC centers, slogans like "No more Vietnams," "We can't police the world," "bring our boys home," and other neo-isolationist trends in the U.S.

Sen. Fulbright has helped make the confused world in which we live. And now he wants to add more confusion.

THE SEARCH FOR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. ELFOR D. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending to the people of the 10th Congressional District a newsletter outlining what I feel to be two of the major problems which we face today. In our efforts to stabilize the economy I feel that several aspects of our fight have been overlooked and I treat this situation extensively in my report.

The drug problem among our youth is certainly one of the more frightening problems which our Nation faces. In an effort to provide some light on this subject, I am including in my newsletter a rather comprehensive but succinct fact sheet on the drugs which are being used today. I hope that this brochure will prove useful to the people of the 10th District of Michigan and I recommend it to my colleagues for their attention.

Finally, I think it is important for our people to share their thoughts and I have, therefore, included excerpts from a letter which I received which I believe to be representative of the feelings of a great number of Americans today. I highly recommend my constituent's thoughts to the attention of my fellow Members.

The text of my newsletter follows:

THE SEARCH FOR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

I welcome this opportunity to discuss with you some of the major issues and policies which are facing our nation and its citizens and ones that I do not believe have been getting through to the public in most recent newspaper commentary.

The search for national priorities—where we put our Federal monies and our national talent—is one of the most difficult challenges confronting Congress this year and one with which I am deeply concerned.

Despite the continuation of the war in Vietnam we are making progress. In the past two years there has been a significant shift in our priorities, a shift that is certain to continue and to intensify as the war in Indochina is brought to a conclusion.

To understand what is now going on in our economy, it is important that we realize our economic system is having to make not one but two major adjustments simultaneously. It is having to adjust to a major decline in defense spending while it is also cooling off from a long inflationary overheating that had become increasingly dangerous.

The adjustment in defense spending is a far greater force on the economy than many people realize. From 1969 to mid-1970 defense spending has been reduced over \$12 billion (in terms of this year's prices) and by mid-1971 the reductions will approach \$20 billion.

Now this is a massive re-ordering of priorities. While some have been busy orating about the need for this, the President has been busy doing something about it. As a matter of fact, for the first time in 20 years we are spending more this year for human resource programs than we are for defense. In 1962 the Federal government spent 48 percent of its budget for defense and only 29 percent for human resources. By 1968 that comparison was 45 percent to 32 percent. This year those priorities are reversed with 37 percent for defense and 41 percent for human resource programs.

While the Administration has been struggling to break the inflationary cycle, some Members of Congress still are intent upon increasing spending. I believe that this is one of the contributing factors to our present inflation and for this reason I have voted each year to cut government spending and to balance the budget.

True, we are still feeling the grip of inflation. Inflation created by a decade of massive fiscal irresponsibility cannot be stopped overnight. The President's anti-inflationary policies are having some effect on the economy. The per capita income was at an all time peak in the second quarter of this year. Money is becoming more available. Interest rates have been edging downward. Housing starts are already increasing. Commitments for mortgages are rising. All indications are for an improved economy during the last quarter of this year.

The time is long overdue for the "big spenders" of the Congress to assume their share of responsibility if the economy is to prosper once again. Continued reckless spending as we have witnessed so often in the past will only serve to fuel the fires of inflation.

HOW PARENTS CAN HELP TO COMBAT DRUG ADDICTION AND REDUCE CRIME

As a Member of Congress, I share with all citizens and particularly parents the increasing awareness and alarm over the twin problems of drug addiction and traffic in this heinous poison. Just how serious is the drug abuse menace? The number of narcotics addicts in the United States is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. Between 1960 and 1967 juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 800 percent, and one-half of those arrested for the illicit use of

drugs and narcotics were under 21 years of age. Some five to seven million persons in the United States reportedly have used marijuana at least once, an estimated one million persons have used non-barbiturate sedatives and over 400,000 have used barbiturates and amphetamines. The estimated social cost of drug abuse in this country is \$540 million a year. Studies show that the average heroin addict needs \$47 a day to buy drugs. Larceny, mugging, shoplifting, burglary, drug peddling—these are the crimes he commits most often. Merchandise stolen is usually discounted by one-half to one-third. Property valued at \$150 may bring only \$50 when resold. Between July of 1969 and March of 1970 drug crimes cost the nation an estimated three billion dollars. Between 30 and 70 percent of all crimes in our large cities are attributed to drug addicts in search of money to support their habit.

It is a tragic fact but everything from marijuana and pep pills to heroin is being sold in the schools of our nation, the schools of our 10th Congressional District—perhaps the very school your child is attending. An estimated 35 percent of all students in high school and college use marijuana. Each of us must be aware of this problem. No child, no school and college use marijuana. Each of us must be aware of the epidemic dangers of drug abuse. It is criminal to stubbornly refuse to believe that "it can't happen in my home," for indifference and apathy are the weapons of the pushers.

Parents must stop looking the other way until the problem hits home.

As parents, teachers, and concerned citizens, let us not succumb to and have a complex about cries of "generation gap" or "communications gap" as excuses for drug abuse.

Parents, please study the information in this brochure—and most importantly, sit down and discuss the problems of drug abuse with your children. Find out how they feel about drugs, how their friends feel about it. Be sure they are fully aware of the terrible consequences of being a slave to drugs. Above all, assure your children that you are available at any time to help with any problems they might have. Stop drug addiction before it grabs hold—and save your children.

GLOSSARY OF NARCOTICS TERMS

Following is a list of major illegal drugs, how they are used, their popular names and the effects:

Marijuana—Called "pot" or "grass." Derived from female hemp plant. Usually smoked. A mild hallucinogen that distorts perceptions of time and space and coordination. Strong doses can cause short-term psychotic reactions. Long-term effects are not known. To use marijuana is to "get high," "turn on," or "get stoned." Marijuana cigarettes are called "joints."

Hashish—Called "hash," same as marijuana, except more potent.

Amphetamines—Stimulants used to combat fatigue. Taken in pill form, although some stronger forms are dissolved in a liquid and injected with a needle. They speed action of the heart and metabolism. Called "bennies," "pep pills," "diet pills," and in strong doses, "speed." Not addictive physically, but psychological dependence is common. Larger doses are required for the same effect after a while.

Barbiturates—Sedatives, called "downs" or "goofballs." They relax the nervous system, slow the heart rate, lower blood pressure and slow down breathing. Effects can resemble drunkenness and users sometimes become irritable and angry. Physically addictive, like heroin, barbiturates are a leading cause of accidental deaths in the country.

LSD—A powerful hallucinogen called "acid." It causes sharp changes in perception. Non-addictive, but can cause panic, paranoia, and hallucinations. Can also

produce permanent derangement and physical defects. Mescaline, DMT, psilocybin are similar, but less potent substances.

Heroin—Called "junk," "stuff," "scag." Derivative of opium. Usually injected under the skin or "mainlined," injected directly into a vein, it depresses certain areas of the brain and nerves, causes physical and psy-

chological dependence, and gradually takes greater quantities to achieve the same effect. Cocaine is similar.

It is possible to save a user of narcotics from a life of horror if detected early. There are not enough doctors in this world to examine each and every possible user, but there are enough parents.

I have prepared this brochure in order to alert parents to the various symptoms that drugs produce. Observe your children and note unusual changes in normal behavior.

For informative booklets on drugs, write my Washington Office: 2303 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Drug used	Physical symptoms	Look for—	Dangers
Glue sniffing	Violence, drunk appearance, dreamy or blank expression	Tubes of glue, glue smears, large paper bags or handkerchiefs	Lung/brain damage, death through suffocation or choking, anemia
Heroin, morphine, codeine	Stupor/drowsiness, needle marks on body, watery eyes, loss of appetite, blood stain on shirt sleeve	Needle or hypodermic syringe, cotton, tourniquet—string, rope, belt, burnt bottle, caps or spoons, glassine envelopes	Death from overdose, mental deterioration, destruction of brain and liver
Cough medicine containing codeine and opium	Drunk appearance, lack of coordination, confusion, excessive itching	Empty bottles of cough medicine	Causes addiction
Marijuana, pot, grass	Sleepiness, wandering mind, enlarged eye pupils, lack of coordination, craving for sweets, increased appetite	Strong odor of burnt leaves, small seeds in pocket lining, cigarette paper, discolored fingers	Damage to liver, inducement to take stronger narcotics
LSD, DMT, STP	Severe hallucinations, feelings of detachment, incoherent speech, cold hands and feet, vomiting, laughing and crying	Cube sugar with discoloration in center, strong body odor, small tube of liquid	Suicidal tendencies, unpredictable behavior, chronic exposure causes brain damage
Pep pills, ups, amphetamines	Aggressive behavior, giggling, silliness, rapid speech, confused thinking, no appetite, extreme fatigue, dry mouth, shakiness	Jar of pills of varying colors, chain smoking	Death from overdose, hallucinations
Goof balls, downs, barbiturates	Drowsiness, stupor, dullness, slurred speech, drunk appearance, vomiting	Pills of varying colors	Death from overdose, unconscious

LETTERS I HAVE RECEIVED

The following is an excerpt which I believe expresses the concern of many of the Tenth Congressional District—a concern which I share.

"Many millions of good, solid American people like myself, which could be classified as silent Americans, are beginning to get anxious as to how long will the bombing of schools and burning of property by protesters and radicals, killings on street corners of our citizens throughout the land can go on. . . . What does get a person steaming mad when you read of these sad happenings throughout our land, is should the police, after spending many hours and days, apprehend our (criminals), they are put into a courtroom at public expense and immediately an attorney is hired to defend these so-called citizens to make sure their rights are not violated, again costing the taxpayers additional sums of money. What about the rights of the innocent victims and their families."

"How long will it be before serious thought will be given to protect the rights of our good Americans that work so hard that have never seen an inside of a jail, that don't draw any state or Federal aid although many would be entitled to it, especially our poor farmers that work so hard for such meager returns. In many cases if you figure by the hours that a man, wife and children spend in a cow barn, their straight time may not amount to anywhere than 35¢ or 40¢ an hour. Yet, where would you ever hear of this class of people going out and burning anything? All the millions of these solid Americans' rights are violated in every direction and no one seems to care less."

I also receive hundreds of letters from my constituents requesting assistance on a wide range of matters, from Social Security and Veteran pensions to military cases. An example follows:

Mr. D. A. of Bay City writes: "As the Congressman for my voting district I wish to ask for a little of your time in straightening out a matter of great importance to me. I have had a lot of trouble receiving my V.A. benefit for education assistance."

"I have asked many times at the V.A. office but they cannot get anyplace. Your help in this matter will be greatly appreciated."

We contacted the Veterans Administration officials in his behalf to investigate the entire matter from his first enrollment to the present time and requested that payments be made for the Fall and Winter terms. We were successful in this matter and the funds were granted.

If you have a problem with any government agency and feel I can be of help, please

contact me at my Washington Office, 2303 Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. We are not always successful, however, you may be certain that we will do everything we can to be of assistance. Also, I would very much like to hear your views on any issue you feel is important.

NEW BLOOD FOR TIRED HOSPITALS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as we all are aware, the current conditions of the health-care facilities in the country today are deplorable. There are those of us in the Congress who have realized this need and who have banded together to override the President's recent veto of the Hill-Burton appropriations.

However, the realities of existing policies force upon us the realization that we cannot accomplish all we desire in this vital area. We must, therefore, seek new alternatives, fresh approaches which will inject new life and concern in our health care programs.

The meteoric rise in health-care costs cause us further consternation as we are shown the clear inadequacies of current insurance programs. Economic incentive must be employed in this area to streamline and improve the efficiency of these programs and of the participating medical facilities.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article which deals with these problems in a commendable manner. I urge their careful consideration of Mr. Wasyluka's observations and recommendations.

[From the Harvard Business Review, September-October 1970]

NEW BLOOD FOR TIRED HOSPITALS

(By Ray G. Wasyluka)

Foreword.—Soaring costs have precipitated a nationwide health care crisis to the danger point; only the intervention of business leadership, augmented by federal government action, can remedy the situation. Hospitals need real management skills, not just titular

management that rubber stamps the recommendations of the medical staff. In arguing this point, the author also prescribes a cure which would offer a choice of two brands of health care to the consumer, so that he could select the one he felt he could afford.

(Mr. Wasyluka is Vice President of a division of W. R. Grace & Co. He initially became involved with hospitals during his work as a CPA, and later became a management consultant for hospitals.)

According to the American Hospital Association: "Rising costs of health care got a lot of press coverage in 1969. But the consumer press that reported \$100-a-day stays in hospitals despite the billions of dollars supplied by the Medicare and Medicaid programs also told the public of more basic shortcomings of the health care system in this country."

"As it emerged throughout the year, the basic problem became the fact that the United States has not a system but rather multisystems of health care . . . each beset with inefficiencies that would be intolerable in any other industry."

The business community has meekly avoided any involvement in this health care crisis. It has obsequiously respected the non-profit tradition of hospital operations—except in the case of about six small publicly held companies that have become known as "hospital chains."

If the business community continues its "head-in-the-sand" attitude toward hospitals, massive intervention by the federal government is sure to eventuate. And federal bureaucracy is not the kind of medicine needed to alleviate this crisis. Instead, the managerial skills of business organizations might be a more efficacious therapy.

After first exploring the causes of our present health care crisis, I shall concentrate on what steps can be taken by business and government to remedy the situation. Then I shall conclude by offering an "exemplary profile" of what the ideal type of health care system for our country would be like.

CAUSES OF CRISIS

There are no objections to the higher costs of health care from those whose lives have been saved by the many techniques and gadgets that have come into existence in the last two decades. Who is to say whether hospitals can "afford" to offer their cardiac patients the sophisticated equipment one finds today in the intensive care units that generally did not exist 20 years ago?

Today, an average of 16 laboratory tests are performed for each in-patient, whereas just 4 laboratory tests per patient were per-

Footnotes at end of article.

formed then. Some of the hospitals that used unsophisticated X-ray equipment in 1950 today use nuclear medicine and very specialized equipment for their diagnostic scanning.

Insurance and welfare programs

The number of people covered by medical insurance increased from 75 million in 1950 to nearly 180 million by 1970. Millions of elderly people who previously could not afford hospital care are now provided with a very respectable quality of care. Hospitals typically derive over half their revenue from Blue Cross and other private insurance plans.

The prevalence of health insurance coverage induces even the most reputable physician to prescribe diagnostic tests and medical treatment somewhat beyond what he would otherwise do if the patient had to bear the full cost of his hospital stay. The medical doctor has a human tendency to allow the insured patient to stay an extra day or two, to ensure a complete recovery. The fee charged by the physician is often inflated as the doctor plays Robin Hood and rationalizes that the higher fee charged to the impersonal insurance carrier simply compensates him for the charitable work he does for nominal fees.

As unpleasant as it seems, there is abundant evidence that the abuses of health insurance by medical doctors are sometimes of a deceitful and disgusting nature. It is not simply a matter of hospital facilities being used for services that could—and should—be performed in the doctor's office for no other purpose than to make the insurance company absorb the expense. Investigations by review boards repeatedly disclose instances of needless surgery. Other studies have shown that tonsillectomies, hysterectomies, and appendectomies have a significantly higher incidence among patients whose insurance is of the fee-for-service type, as compared with prepaid group practice plans in which the doctor's compensation is essentially a fixed salary.

Dysfunctional compensation: We cannot avoid a frank recognition of the fact that the doctor's compensation is corollary to the amount of diagnostic work he considers necessary, the amount of therapeutic services he regards as essential, and the complexity of the services he judges to be appropriate. Stated more simply, the bigger the illness, the bigger the fee he charges. Except for the group practice plans, there is no system of financial incentives and disincentives designed to discourage the doctor from loading the patient with unnecessary medical services.

Approximately 90% of the revenues of general hospitals come from Medicare, Blue Cross, and other commercial insurance plans. Except for a small portion of the Blue Cross and commercial insurance plans, reimbursement is made on the basis of the hospital's cost. This type of cost reimbursement is an open invitation to inefficiency. It provides the hospital with no incentive to control costs. An administrator knows that he will never be condemned for providing too much nursing care; of course, people may talk about his costs, but he knows that providing too much care has never got an administrator fired.

Ideally, it would be nice to have magnanimous men of great virtue ordained as medical doctors. It would be reassuring to have these men compensated by some scheme which enabled them to prescribe medical treatment without being influenced by the effect their diagnosis would have on their own compensation. In fairness to these men, it would also be desirable to have our medical schools produce a sufficient number of competent doctors so that they would have a workweek like that enjoyed by other professional men. Finally, it would be nice if those admitted to this priesthood were all selected on the basis of their intellectual

competence and moral dedication, rather than their social class and financial ability to support themselves through the several years of medical school and internship.

Pragmatic considerations: It is stimulating to contemplate what our national health care system might be like; however, the pragmatic considerations are much different. It is not realistic to think that the American Hospital Association or the federal government will be able to suddenly achieve a massive reorganization in the ownership and management of all the hospitals throughout the country. They will continue to function in their present disorganized, uncoordinated state. It is doubtful that our medical schools will suddenly increase the number of doctors produced each year, and it is unlikely that the selection criteria will be modified appreciably.

Nevertheless, there is hope for improvements in insurance and welfare programs so as to curtail the current practice of perfunctorily reimbursing hospitals for whatever they chose to spend. Moreover, there is hope that business organizations will recognize the need for the emergency of a subacute medical care industry whereby commercially operated clinics would perform much of the diagnostic work and minor medical functions with which hospitals are now burdened.

PROPRIETARY HOSPITALS

Hospitals are classified by ownership into three groups: (1) voluntary or charitable hospitals, (2) proprietary hospitals, and (3) state and local government hospitals. Hospitals are referred to as "general hospitals" or "special hospitals" for the purpose of classifying them according to the range of services they offer patients. General hospitals offer a relatively full range of services whereas special hospitals are exemplified by mental hospitals, children's hospitals, and chronic-illness hospitals. These specialized institutions account for 51.6% of the 10,000 hospitals in the United States.²

Proprietary hospitals are typically quite small and provide a very limited range of services. They are usually owned by members of the medical staff. For this reason, aspersions are often cast at the doctor-owners, contending that their profit motive improperly influences their decisions concerning patient care. These doctor-owners are accused of sometimes keeping the patient hospitalized an extra day or two when beds just happen to be available, and also of admitting patients that might not be admitted if the doctor were not sharing in the profits of the hospital.

The critics who make such allegations fail to explain that doctor-owners are affected by the profit motive in exactly the same manner as other doctors are affected by their inclination to increase their compensation. Both the doctor and the doctor-owner benefit financially in proportion to the complexity and the volume of medical services they choose to perform.

Another objection commonly made about proprietary hospitals is the limited range of services they offer. They typically avoid the "loss services" such as obstetrical and emergency rooms. The proprietary hospitals do not obtain unusually expensive equipment for which very limited usage is normally made. Such highly expensive equipment does not permit a fee structure sufficient to recapture costs, and the nonprofit hospitals have to absorb the financial burden.

A final objection made about proprietary hospitals is that they tend to be fastidious about the cases they accept, whereas the nonprofit hospitals tend to accept everyone. The proprietary hospitals tend to accept fewer charity cases. They also prefer to cater to patients who will be hospitalized a relatively short length of time. Hospital fees per

patient day tend to be highest during the first few days of hospitalization when the diagnostic tests and surgery are being performed. The hospital earns only the daily room charge plus small pharmacy charges on patients who have been hospitalized for a prolonged period. There is no doubt that the proprietary hospitals pursue the "high margin business."

Appalling shortage: In spite of these objections, proprietary hospitals are being constructed at a rate faster than ever. Thus the most obvious justification for their existence is the appalling shortage of hospital facilities that currently exists in this country.

This raises a very pertinent question: Is it reasonable for entrepreneurial investment to be diverted from the hospital community when emergency cases frequently have to wait several hours in out-patient departments before a doctor examines them, when very sick people are often denied admission to large metropolitan hospitals, and when residents of a ghetto have to be transported for miles before reaching a hospital?

The voluntary hospitals and government hospitals say that they are doing their best to alleviate the crisis, but this is no consolation to the afflicted who demand competent treatment today. Richard L. Johnson has protested that government regulatory agencies should compel proprietary hospitals to assume their fair share of the loss services which they have avoided thus far. His study of proprietary hospitals produced these findings:

Proprietary hospitals have 14% fewer employees per patient than do voluntary hospitals and 7% fewer employees than do government hospitals.

Payroll is 61.5% of total expense in the voluntary hospital and 65% in government hospitals, but only 50.9% in proprietary hospitals.

The quality of care as measured by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals is slightly better in proprietary hospitals of 200 beds or more than it is in voluntary nonprofit hospitals, and both these groups provide considerably better care than is given in state and local government hospitals.

Proprietary hospitals have no hesitation about investing in expensive patient services (i.e., operating rooms) when the volume of usage is high.

Proprietary hospitals tend to avoid offering patient services requiring large investments and high operating costs when the volume of usage is low (i.e., premature nursery).

As proprietary hospitals increase in size, they increase in efficiency, since they do not add to the scope of services provided. By comparison, the voluntary nonprofit hospital typically adds to the comprehensiveness of its service, which leads to an increased cost per "patient day."³

Profit motive stigma: The business organizations that own the "hospital chains" maintain a consistent policy of providing fees lower than those charged by other hospitals in the community. Centralized purchasing, accounting, bookkeeping, and staff functions accomplish the cost savings that permit these organizations to charge lower fees and still make a profit. A substantial portion of proprietary hospitals are fully accredited in every respect, and they are judged by review boards to have medical services just as competent as those offered by the nonprofit hospitals.

Of course, there is a substantial number of proprietary hospitals owned by unscrupulous members of the medical staff or "get-rich quick" entrepreneurs. Virtually every medical doctor has heard of the individual who establishes an unaccredited proprietary hospital, staffs it with unaccredited doctors, selects only "profitable business," and provides poor patient care because of his in-

²Footnotes at end of article.

satisfiable appetite for profit. Some individuals like this have committed the same rape behind the facade of a voluntary hospital, by hiring relatives and providing them with grossly inflated salaries.

It is outrageous to imply that maximization of revenues is something peculiar to proprietary hospitals. The voluntary hospitals might be just as culpable of maximizing revenues, even though they have no patent profit motive; instead, their motive is *loss avoidance*. They buy the equipment and perform the services that the doctors demand, and the doctors endeavor to adorn their hospitals with the most sophisticated gadgetry in order to enhance their own professional status. Since virtually everyone is insured these days, the doctor feels that the patient will not suffer any financial detriment from an inflated hospital bill.

Although the stigma of "profit motive" is ascribed to proprietary hospitals, the profit motive of physicians with nonprofit hospitals probably constitutes the greater evil. This is the microcosm that explains today's soaring costs of health care.

BUSINESS COOPERATION

The existing system has failed! The reasons for failure appear to be many. Regardless of how many factors are responsible for the breakdown in our nation's health care system, it is apparent that either one of two suggested remedies must be taken:

1. The federal government will have to adopt a national health insurance system which will enable everyone to afford the soaring costs of hospital care. In order to arrest these skyrocketing costs, this program might impose restraints on the amount of reimbursement paid to hospitals, or it might provide incentives to induce hospitals to control their costs.

2. The entrepreneurial dollar and the management skills of established business organizations will have to be contributed to the health care community.

The use of federal government bureaucracy might very well enable all people to afford the increasingly higher fees charged by hospitals. However, it certainly will not be able to—

Provide the existing caliber of health care at lower prices;

Supply the management skills hospitals so sorely need;

Offer the cost efficiencies of centralized services;

Disenthroned the doctor from the current powerful position that enables him to mold and refashion the services the hospital will provide and the resultant prices the hospital will have to charge for such services.

If our national health system is to escape the fat layers of administrative expense and the inevitable abuses that accompany greater federal control, business organizations must provide these three "wonder drugs": (1) real management, (2) a meaningful system of incentives and disincentives, and (3) the opportunity for each consumer to choose the basic medical services he feels he can afford.

Managerial skills

Except for the larger metropolitan hospitals, hospitals historically have been managed by a board of trustees composed of prominent civic leaders who generously contribute one hour or so of their time per month to oversee an operation they do not understand. They contribute kindness, rather than management. The important decisions they are compelled to make are necessarily compliant with the recommendations of the medical staff.

It is difficult to generalize about the quality of management found today in hospitals. Most hospitals now have an administrator who has been prepared for his responsibilities with several years of professional training in a university. Twenty years ago, it was common for the head nurse or head book-

keeper to function as the hospital administrator.

However, at most hospitals the practice of management has undergone little improvement over the years. This is particularly true of the small hospitals in rural areas where management is epitomized by the practice of finding out what the influential doctors want and satisfying their requests. If his request is not satisfied, the doctor may threaten to accept an opportunity to join a larger and more modern hospital in a metropolitan area.

Generally speaking, the doctor is trained to practice medicine. The administrator is trained to operate the hospital, supervise the personnel, and maintain proper relations with the community. Neither of them is trained to formulate organizational strategy, assess risks, develop multi-million dollar financial projects, and methodically transform plans into desired results. Business executives with hospital savvy constitute the only means of driving a wedge through the intimate relationship between the medical doctor and the hospital administrator. The management resources of ordinary business organizations should be injected into the power structure of some hospitals so that at least some hospitals will be able to provide the service that the businessman perceives as being desired by the consumer.

The stereotype of the U.S. businessman suggests a hard-driving executive striving to maximize profits and coldly eliminating all persons and product lines that do not meet his established corporate goals. This caricature has been drawn particularly by those who oppose corporate entry into proprietary hospitals.

Yet every time a patient swallows a pill or receives an injection, he is betting his life on a capitalistic organization having produced a product of acceptable quality. So let us dismiss any contention that business management is synonymous with a reduced caliber of patient care. Some proprietary hospitals have some incompetent and unscrupulous personnel, but there is overwhelming evidence that exactly the same conditions are found at some nonprofit hospitals.

If management in hospitals is to become something other than a titular activity, a power structure must be established whereby management personnel with hospital savvy will be given the responsibility of resolving: (a) the patient services to be provided by the hospital, (b) the price that the patients will be charged for those services, and (c) the administration of activities that will bring actual results into conformity with those desired objectives. If it wishes to stop socialized medicine from becoming an accomplished fact in this country, the medical profession must abdicate from the monopoly which it currently exercises in the areas of hospital utilization and hospital medical care.

Incentives and disincentives

No government-regulated monopoly is fortified with the privileges of (a) receiving guaranteed reimbursement of soaring costs and (b) denying services to consumers when no facilities are available. Yet this unrealistic scheme has been allowed to develop in the health care community, and it will be nourished to obesity if it is fed with even more government bureaucracy.

The last thing our country needs is a federally controlled system which would induce (or virtually coerce) a semblance of standard fees for all hospitals. For one thing, those hospitals that lacked the skills necessary to achieve low-cost efficiency would be dangerously tempted to sacrifice their quality of patient care. For another, such a system would impose a "one brand" range of health services on all the people.

One of the weaknesses of the existing health care system is that the doctors directly or indirectly choose the brand of

health care they consider appropriate, and the people are expected to dutifully absorb the rising costs. If it is improper for doctors to have the exclusive discretion of resolving the brand of health care that will be provided to our people, nothing would be gained by endowing the federal government with such exclusive discretion.

What we need at this time is a health care system that offers the consumer a choice between two or more brands of health care. Instead of allowing the American Medical Association to resolve this matter through debate with Congress, a more equitable solution would be one that permits the consumer to choose between the Cadillac brand of patient care (and Cadillac prices) and the Rambler brand of patient care (and Rambler prices). There currently is no inducement for any hospital to offer this choice of brands. After all, a hospital that would espouse lower fees would risk losing some of its medical staff.

Consumer choice

The most immediate benefit of hospital investment by business organizations would be that more health care facilities would swiftly become available to deal with the critical shortage that exists today. Bills are passed in Congress, state programs are enacted, and fund raising programs are carried on by voluntary hospitals. These are well and good, but all have simply failed to provide sufficient financing for the hospital facilities that are desperately needed right now.

A massive investment in hospitals by business organizations would put the cost of basic hospital services within the reach of the average man. For example, 30 years ago an entrepreneur introduced the drive-in movie. A lower cost was offered to those patrons who were willing to sacrifice a scintillating marquee, an ornate interior, thick rugs, and cushioned seats. Yet those drive-in patrons were provided with the very same caliber of motion picture as that available at the expensive downtown theater.

Business organizations can offer a similar trade-off today to the consumers of health care. It can provide them with the opportunity to buy, say, a thoroughly competent appendectomy or tonsillectomy without having to subsidize the obstetrics (OB) department or to absorb part of the cost of some other person's open heart surgery.

Hospitals throughout this country respect a peculiar tradition of operating some facilities, such as the OB department and the emergency room, at a staggering loss year after year. Other departments, such as radiology and pharmacy, always produce an immense profit. Certain types of highly specialized surgery that are usually limited to prominent medical centers involve such extraordinary costs that there is absolutely no chance of charging fees that would recover them. Generally accepted financial policies of these nonprofit hospitals prescribe that enough revenues must be collected from the "routine business" to cover the costs of the routine services, *plus* the operating deficits of the OB department, the emergency room, and the extraordinary surgery work.

The proliferation of proprietary hospitals managed by reputable business organizations would make the basic services available at considerably lower cost. Those who desired these basic services with more human warmth and higher prices would continue to find both available at the nonprofit hospitals. The proprietary hospitals presumably would not take over any part of the extraordinary services that involved spectacular costs. The responsibility for these would remain with the nonprofit hospitals, but the absorption of their costs would not be indiscriminately levied on the people who desired fundamental medical services. It would seem more equitable that those extraordinary costs would be absorbed at least to

some extent by the taxpayers who were fortunate enough to avoid hospitalization.

Conceivably, some people might feel that it would be terribly callous to provide price competition on basic services to the non-profit hospitals, which might deter them from offering the extraordinary medical services that involve spectacular cost. However, pressure of this type is exactly what is needed. Such pressure would make it more difficult for four hospitals at a single intersection in California to be equipped with costly cobalt machines for the greater prestige of their staffs. Such pressure would also make it more onerous for so many nonprofit hospitals to provide their staffs with the status symbol facilities for open heart surgery.

According to the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, 30% of the 777 hospitals equipped to do closed heart surgery had no such cases in the year under study.⁴ Of those hospitals that had cases, 87% did fewer than one operation per week. Of all hospitals equipped to do open heart surgery, 77% did not average even one operation per week, and 41% averaged under one operation per month. Little of this was of an emergency nature, and the mortality rate for both procedures was far higher than in institutions with a full workload.

GOVERNMENT ACTION

The health care crisis is so immense that massive intervention by business organizations certainly will not obviate any appropriations that might be made available by federal and state governments. Legislation and government funds are needed to effect improvements in three areas: (1) the shortage of doctors, (2) construction of new hospitals, and (3) modification of the terms of welfare programs and insurance plans.

Additional doctors

Although some unscrupulous physicians resort to deceitful practices in order to inflate their compensation, the more typical medical doctor is currently putting in a 16-hour day. Many of these doctors devote one day a week to welfare cases for which no fees whatsoever are charged. Many interns are lucky to get 5 hours sleep a night, and they are paid a ridiculous subsistence wage.

The shortage of doctors in this country is so great that approximately 20% of our new doctors each year are imported from other countries that provide distinctly inferior medical training. The benefits anticipated from national health insurance have little chance of fruition until such time that additional medical personnel are made available to provide the free services that are difficult to obtain today at staggering prices.

Hospital construction

The federal programs aimed at making funds available for new hospital construction have proceeded at a glacial pace thus far. Huge government grants have enabled some impressive hospitals to be constructed which remain only half occupied years later. It is not simply a matter of providing vast sums of money; state planning commissions are desperately needed. These commissions must be given the authority to approve or disapprove the construction of new hospitals. Beautiful hospitals, symbolizing an eternal monument to some millionaire's philanthropy, continue to be erected in spacious landscapes of suburbia; but the denizens of Harlem and Watts continue to be provided with hospital facilities the caliber of which amounts to health brutality.

An example of the type of investment program needed from the federal government is the ill-fated 13-billion Johnson proposal for a coordinated national attack on heart disease, cancer, and stroke. The program, to be headed by a Presidential committee under the direction of Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of

Baylor University, called for the establishment of a five-year program that would create two networks of special facilities to attack the three great killers. There were to be 60 regional centers for clinical investigation, teaching, and patient care; and those were to be ringed by 500 special diagnostic and treatment stations.

The operational efficiency of such a system is transparently evident to every member of the health care community. Despite this, and despite its magnanimous character, the provision was opposed so vehemently by the American Medical Association that it had to be withdrawn from the Medicare Act.

Financial modifications

Some people who oppose national health insurance choose to support their physician with nothing more than a reference to what they consider to be our abysmal experience with Medicare. No one can deny that Medicare's costs have greatly exceeded expectations. The auditing and administrative expense of complying with the paperwork requirements of Medicare have been staggering. Finally, the most significant objection is the absence of some incentive to control costs.

If corporate management were to enter the hospital scene and provide good basic services at lower prices, the private insurance companies should certainly respond by making lower premiums available to those who choose to patronize the hospitals with lower prices. The terms of Medicare should also be modified to either (a) offer some incentive for the patient to avoid the inflated costs of some hospitals, or (b) provide some incentive to the hospital to control costs.

It would be flagrantly imprudent to provide a direct incentive to the patient (a payment to the patient) for patronizing a hospital that offered lower prices, but it would be quite possible to impose a financial disincentive on the patient for patronizing a hospital that charged unusually high prices. The terms of Medicare might be modified in order to cover charges up to certain limits, say, somewhat above the median amounts.

(Earlier in this article, I expressed the opinion that the last thing we need is a national health insurance program which provides for a uniform set of prices for hospital services. In spite of this, it would be viable to have a set of maximum prices for services covered by Medicare. In the first case, we are concerned with just one price for the entire clientele of the hospital. In the second case, we are concerned with just a maximum on prices that applies to a small portion of the hospital's clientele. Although the spirit of Medicare is such that its insured senior citizens are not to be treated like indigents, we should not forget that this is essentially a welfare program with which carpeted hospital rooms and color television sets are rather incompatible.)

One of the simplest means by which the cost of hospital care can be reduced is to amend the terms of Medicare so as to extend coverage to diagnostic services performed outside the hospital. It is estimated that one eighth of patients hospitalized today are hospitalized only to obtain indemnification from Medicare, Blue Cross, or some commercial insurance policy. Commercial laboratories could be utilized for much of the X-rays and laboratory analysis without wasting the use of a hospital bed.

Cost controls: Medicare and most Blue Cross plans provide for payments to hospitals on the basis of the hospital's cost. The absence of upper limits on these costs stands out conspicuously as one area in which improvement is needed. Three methods of controlling cost appear viable:

1. Control might be achieved by simply imposing upper limits on reimbursable costs and by further prescribing that hospitals would not make any supplemental charges to Medicare patients. This would differ from

the current system only in its refusal to pay outlandish costs that would presumably be incurred either by luxury hospitals or by the most mismanaged hospitals.

2. Bonuses might be paid to those hospitals with lower cost levels. Thus, perhaps, no bonus would be paid to hospitals that ranked in the highest quartile of cost, a nominal bonus might be paid to those in the second and third quartiles, and a more significant bonus (as a percentage of cost) might be paid to those hospitals that achieved costs in the lowest quartile.

3. Bonuses might be paid to those hospitals that effected reductions in their costs.

The desirable feature of both the second and the third method is that some incentive would be given to the hospital to control cost. Hospitals would thus be able to finance the acquisition of additional equipment and expanded facilities by achieving lower costs, rather than by performing needless "high margin" services on patients. It would be somewhat inequitable to provide a profit or investment funds to those hospitals that might be accused of offering the lowest quality of patient care. On the other hand, the third method could be criticized for providing a profit or investment funds to those hospitals that had previously been the most wasteful in spending money.

THE EXEMPLARY PROFILE

Instead of attempting merely to patch up the weaknesses in the existing health care system, perhaps it would be more meaningful to consider what the ideal system would be like. There is no doubt that if we were starting from scratch, we would construct networks of hospitals in "cluster systems."

The nucleus of each cluster would be a medical center and medical school. It would be supported by a group of regional specialized hospitals, each of which would have a group of satellite diagnostic clinics. The diagnostic clinic would be equivalent to the neighborhood hospital. It would provide emergency room facilities, out-patient services, an OB unit, and a range of other unsophisticated services.

The patients requiring specialized services, such as ophthalmology or chest surgery, would be transferred to the regional hospital. The patients requiring truly expert services, like open heart surgery, would be taken to the medical center. There they would be treated by the prestigious faculty members, and they likewise would have the benefit of the most advanced equipment.

In terms of business operations, all activities would be centralized at the medical center. A time-sharing computer would handle the purchasing, billing, payroll, insurance records, medical records, and other financial records for the entire network of hospitals. The business office would provide specialized staff functions and training programs to all of the member facilities.

Two brands of service

An industrial engineer or business executive might be quite impressed with the factory-like efficiency with which the large metropolitan hospitals operate. Hospitals of this type constitute an infinitesimal portion of the 10,000 hospitals located throughout the United States. An entirely different impression would be drawn by observing the operations of many of the small charitable voluntary hospitals.

Many of these hospitals operate as though patient care were the expression of a virtue, and concepts of efficiency and cost control are viewed with disgust. The kindness extended to the patients effusively extends to the manner in which hospital management caters to the interests of the medical staff and the employees. These people are characteristically the fine caliber of human being. They are altruistic, dedicated, and diligent. The only transgression of which they are

Footnotes at end of article.

culpable is a monolithic conviction to help the patient recover. Their simplistic financial strategy is to spend all the money that is available.

It is wonderful to have institutions that display an intense concern for afflicted human beings. However, if all hospitals shared the same strategy of providing the very best in loving care without concern for cost, the people of our nation would be provided with just one brand of health care. Medical doctors and hospital administrators are currently empowered with exclusive jurisdiction for the determination of the degree of loving care to be provided to their patients and the resultant cost thereof.

However, it seems more reasonable that our people should be able to exert a choice of two brands of service—that is, whether they want: (1) plenty of loving care at skyrocketing costs, or (2) an efficient though somewhat impersonal caliber of patient care at considerably lower cost.

At least some of the hospitals in our ideal system must be provided with an incentive to offer reasonable patient care at reasonably lower cost.

At least some of the hospitals in our ideal system must be provided with an incentive to offer reasonable patient care at reasonable prices. This does not mean that constrictive bureaucracy should be used to coerce all hospitals to meet certain cost standards. Instead, incentives should be established that would cause at least some hospitals to become concerned with a brand of patient care for those who are willing to do without tender loving care in order to receive medical treatment at more reasonable cost.

As noted earlier, the manufacturers of Cadillacs and Ramblers offer automobiles of different caliber to the people of this country. They serve different segments of the market that have divergent views as to their needs and wants. And our free enterprise system allows the consumer to resolve the question of what caliber of automobile is appropriate for him. It seems that the consumer should be allowed a similar choice in selecting a caliber of health care.

CONCLUSION

The shortage of health care facilities is partially attributable to the expanding population and the dynamic medical technology. However, the most significant causative factor is the emergence of a system which has transferred the sting of paying the bill from the patient to some faceless entities. The willingness of Blue Cross, private insurance companies, and the federal government to reimburse hospitals for their true costs, regardless of how high those costs might be, has had a notoriously propulsive effect on the cost of hospitalization.

It is one thing to theorize what the ideal health care system would be like if we were starting from scratch to build hospitals, buy equipment, and train our medical doctors; however, we are confronted with the realistic task of making today's system better. We must deal with the vanity and emotions of all the people who are now medical doctors or members of boards of trustees. We must address ourselves to the network of hospitals that exists today, not to the physical structures that should have been built to accommodate current needs.

Intervention by business organizations into the health care community will probably be the one thing that can avert a take-over of hospitals by the federal government. The financial resources of business organizations can provide the sorely needed construction of additional health care facilities. These "junior hospitals" can take over the diagnostic and subacute services, so that our large hospitals can confine their activities to the advanced illnesses that require the use of sophisticated equipment.

The management resources of business organizations will abolish the current autocracy by which medical doctors formulate strategy, prescribe operational policy, and deliver to the public the single brand of medical care which they have unilaterally chosen for the people of our country. Business executives will be responsive to today's consumer demand for a "Rambler" brand of health care that accomplishes the task without luxury and without absurd costs.

The efficiency experts of the business organization will also make a badly needed contribution to an industry that for the most part has failed to utilize the developments in computer technology. Hospital payroll expense has soared, at least in part, because the thousands of small hospitals we have in this country cannot afford the services of an industrial engineer or a computer systems expert.

On the other hand, the handful of corporations that have acquired hospital chains have achieved impressive reductions in payroll expense through the application of industrial engineering concepts and computerized operational control. The application of these engineering concepts and the repeated use of the same standardized architectural plans have enabled the hospital chain corporations to achieve enormous economies in the construction of hospitals.

The opportunities available to business organizations extend beyond the ownership of proprietary hospitals. Some of the hospital-chain companies are already running voluntary hospitals on a management fee basis. The opportunity for greatest profit (with no capital investment requirement) is the management consulting services and the training programs that could be offered to voluntary and government hospitals by business organizations which have cultivated expertise in hospital management. The most important opportunity available to business organizations is the opportunity to perform a service for our country that is critically needed right now.

"The engine which drives Enterprise is not Thrift, but Profit," John Maynard Keynes, 1883-1946, "A Treatise on Money."

FOOTNOTES

¹ Carroll Cihlar, "Consumer Views," *Hospitals*, April 1, 1970, p. 53, italics added.

² "Hospitals Need Management Even More Than Money," *Fortune*, January 1970, p. 98.

³ See "How to Make Competition Fair: Have the Same Rules for All Hospitals," *Modern Hospital*, December 1969, p. 104.

⁴ *A National Program To Conquer Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke* (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, February, 1965), Vol. II, p. 55.

INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROCLAIM A PERIOD TO BE KNOWN AS THE "NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY ANNUAL HOPE CHEST APPEAL WEEKS"

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of myself and Congressmen ANDERSON of California, BELL, BROWN of California, BURTON, EDWARDS of California, HANNA, JOHNSON, LEGGETT, McCLOSKEY, MOSS, PETTIS, REES, ROYBAL, SISK, TUNNEY, VAN DEERLIN, WIGGINS,

and CHARLES H. WILSON, I am introducing a House joint resolution which would authorize the President to proclaim the period of Mother's Day, May 9, 1971, through Father's Day, June 21, 1971, as the "National Multiple Sclerosis Society Annual Hope Chest Appeal Weeks."

Mr. Speaker, this dread disease strikes its victims when they are between the age of 20 and 40 years, a time when one's hope and aspirations are in the process of accomplishment. It is a cruel time for this particularly cruel disease to cripple a young man or woman.

Multiple sclerosis is a disease which so far has mystified researchers and physicians. It occurs when the covering matter of our nerve sheaths, called myelin, is destroyed, thus "short-circuiting" messages from the brain to various parts of the body. The results of this disease are speech defects, tremors, paralysis, vision impairment, staggering, and falling.

Mr. Speaker, no two patients have the same symptoms and thus it makes diagnosis almost impossible. Once a person contracts the disease, he has it for the rest of his life.

However, there is some hope. The National Multiple Sclerosis Society is concerned with the discovery of the cause, prevention, and cure of multiple sclerosis. Research is the only hope that multiple sclerosis victims have for the future. The National Multiple Sclerosis Society also provides for the present by giving patients the opportunity for recreation and transportation as well as other vital services.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would designate the period of Mother's Day through Father's Day of 1971, the 25th Anniversary of the Multiple Sclerosis Society, as the "National Multiple Sclerosis Society Annual Hope Chest Appeal Weeks." The resolution additionally calls on the Governors of the 50 States to issue similar resolutions calling on the people of the Nation to join in the effort to find the cause and cure of this disease which has crippled some 500,000 persons.

The joint resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

(To authorize the President to proclaim the period from May 9, 1971, Mother's Day, through June 21, 1971, Father's Day, as the "National Multiple Sclerosis Society Annual Hope Chest Appeal Weeks.")

Whereas five hundred thousand Americans, stricken usually between the ages of twenty and forty years, are affected by the ravages of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases; and

Whereas two million members of American families are deeply concerned with the financial and emotional problems of this disease; and

Whereas multiple sclerosis predominantly strikes young fathers and mothers in their wage-earning and family-building years and reduces the buying power of such families; and

Whereas such reduction results in a \$2,000,000,000 annual economic loss to the Nation and forces the removal of two out of every three disabled multiple sclerosis victims from the Nation's work force; and

Whereas multiple sclerosis remains a disease of unknown cause, unpredictable course, and undiscovered cure; and

Whereas the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, which is celebrating its twenty-fifth

anniversary in 1971, has launched a five-year research development plan to explore as quickly as possible promising clues that may lead to methods which will prevent or more effectively treat, multiple sclerosis. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the period from May 9, 1971, Mother's Day, through June 20, 1971, Father's Day, as "National Multiple Sclerosis Society Annual Hope Chest Appeal Weeks";

(2) inviting the Governors of the several States to issue proclamation for like purposes; and

(3) urging the people of the United States and educational, philanthropic, scientific, medical, and health care professions and organizations to provide the assistance and resources necessary to discover the cause and cure of multiple sclerosis and to alleviate the suffering of persons stricken by this disease.

NIXON COMPILING GOOD RECORD

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in "Nixon Compiling Good Record" the San Diego Union lists the accomplishments of the Nixon administration from the international to the domestic front. The amazing thing, notes the Union, is that "all of this has occurred in a period of less than 2 years and in the face of a Congress that contains a majority of the opposite political faith!"

I agree with the Union that the Nixon administration achievements are remarkable and, therefore submit the editorial at this point in the Record.

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 10, 1970]
DEEDS MATCH WORDS: NIXON COMPILING GOOD RECORD

When President Nixon was inaugurated on Jan. 29, 1969, during a period of great domestic crisis, he said that the United States of America was suffering from "inflated rhetoric."

"We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another, so our words can be heard as well as our voices," he said in his inaugural speech.

He asked also that the Administration be judged on the basis of its deeds as well as its words.

Today the President's words and deeds are being subjected to the scrutiny of public opinion as Labor Day disappears astern and we turn seriously to the fall elections that will determine the makeup of Congress.

President Nixon was in a difficult position in January of 1969. He had inherited a war that had gone politically sour—a conflict that had been a problem for the United States for five years. Inflation was a five-alarm fire. Historic allies were restive, world tensions were high, and domestic problems crowded the capital.

Today, 20 months later, the rhetoric is unfortunately still high on occasion, cloaking to some degree the really remarkable achievements of the Administration.

A presidential trip to Europe, the first order of international business in 1969, mended traditional fences. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization remains strong, and progress has been made toward the dissolution of European tensions.

The Nixon Doctrine, aimed primarily at Asia, clarified the commitment of the United States to self determination and regained some of our eroding credibility.

Progress of the Administration's Latin American policy was dramatized just a few days ago when President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz and President Nixon shared a state dinner in Coronado.

It was an American initiative that launched peace discussions in the Middle East. The United States is talking with the Soviet Union about a reduction of strategic arms. A dialogue has been reestablished with Communist China. The Administration has religiously kept every promise it had made regarding the assignment of our troops to Vietnam. By spring 265,000 fewer American soldiers will be stationed in that unfortunate land, with casualties and capital outlay correspondingly reduced from the 1968 peak.

At home the President is delicately guiding the many faceted transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy during a period of intense inflation. He has moved ahead with methodical precision to guarantee equal opportunities for all Americans. A postal corporation is a reality. The draft has been reformed, an anti-ballistic missile system inaugurated and the federal budget has been trimmed.

All of this has occurred in a period of less than two years and in the face of a Congress that contains a majority of the opposite political faith!

As the subject of the political composition of Congress keeps recurring during this election campaign, Americans might ponder how much more might have been accomplished had the President's actions been complemented by a more sympathetic legislative branch of government.

MISS NATIONAL FIRE PREVENTION 1970 BEGINS NATIONAL TOUR FROM MEMPHIS

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, Miss National Fire Prevention 1970 left Memphis Monday, September 21, for San Francisco, Calif. During the next 12 months, Miss Rhonda James of Florence, Ala., will represent the fire service of the United States and spread the fire prevention story.

It is only fitting that Miss James should leave from Memphis and that the annual national contest should have originated in Memphis. Memphis has the lowest fire insurance rates it is possible to obtain—a tribute to the fire department of Memphis, headed by Chief Edward A. Hamilton. The department also has a class I rating, an honor shared by less than 10 other departments across the United States.

Fire Prevention Week, as proclaimed by the President of the United States, is proclaimed in October during the week in which the 7th falls, commemorating the big Chicago fire of 1871. It is the hope that during this week, the public can be made more conscious of the extreme dangers of fire in millions of dollars in property damage that result each year from carelessness and the tragic loss of life from fire that strike without warning in the middle of the night or even in the

daytime, trapping the elderly, the sick, and the young.

It will be the duty of Miss James, as the Miss National Fire Prevention, to make the citizens of the Nation aware of their individual responsibilities in the prevention of deadly fires, to make them fire prevention conscious, both on the domestic and business level.

Tennessee Ninth District Congressman DAN KUYKENDALL, whose district includes Memphis, was at the airport to see Rhonda off on her tour. Aside from the pleasure of being in the company of a lovely young lady, there is a serious factor in what Miss National Fire Prevention represents.

Fire knows no political lines or geographical boundaries. It can become a common enemy and can only be controlled through the efforts each individual asserts and its growing awareness. In this respect, Miss James is to meet Governor Reagan while in California. One has only to view once the charred stumps of one's proud forest land ravaged by fire, as occurs in California almost annually, to understand why Mr. Reagan would be glad to greet Miss James and support what she represents.

Fire prevention is only one more area where the public needs to become involved, and Memphis, Tenn., through the Memphis Fire Department, with its Miss National Fire Prevention Pageant, is doing its small share in trying to bring about that awareness and involvement.

WYOMING'S ONE-SHOT ANTELOPE HUNT AND THE "GREAT DANE," LAURITZ MELCHIOR

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, for many years, one of the highlights of the one-shot antelope hunt, an annual sporting feature of Lander, Wyo., has been the participation of the "Great Dane," Lauritz Melchior.

The Heldenentor who is as competent with a big-game rifle, as with an opera score, is well known and highly regarded in the town of Lander and among out-publication of the American Association door-sport enthusiasts.

The August-September edition of the of Retired Persons contains an interesting article on the "Great Dane," including reference to the fact that "the big-game hunter recently was on the winning team during the annual one-shot antelope hunt in Wyoming."

Mr. Speaker, I include the AARP article on Lauritz Melchior in the Record with my remarks:

A BUSY OCTOGENARIAN

"The Great Dane," Lauritz Melchior is sentimental over anniversaries and special occasions. He recently was honored on his 80th birthday.

The Heldenentor was feted at gala dinners in both New York and Los Angeles by the Danish Royal Guards Societies. Melchior, who served with the Guards (the personal guards to the King of Denmark) as a young

man, is president of all overseas chapters of ex-Guardsmen.

The West Coast party, attended by 300, benefited the Melchior Heldensten Foundation, which financially assists young, potential heroic tenors.

Melchior, who sang for 24 seasons at New York's Metropolitan Opera, holds the Danish court title of "Kammersanger" (singer to the Royal Court).

An album of his Wagner recordings will be re-issued soon, and his autobiography, "A Matter of Love: The Melchior Story," soon will be on sale.

The big-game hunter recently was on the winning team during the annual "One-Shot Antelope Hunt" in Wyoming. He also found time to attend the opening of the new Juilliard School of Music in New York City, and appeared at a state dinner at the White House honoring Denmark's Prime Minister.

Melchior keeps busy hunting in Denmark, touring Germany by car and entertaining friends in his Beverly Hills home.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF PHILADELPHIA DECLARING A BOYCOTT OF THE ARAB STATES

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the City Council of Philadelphia, has brought to my attention Resolution No. 298, which was adopted by the council on September 10. I am in hearty agreement with the sentiment expressed in the following resolution and feel it is of vital importance to call this important document to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

Memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to declare a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes and those airlines serving Arab countries, in an effort to halt the crime of aerial hijacking.

Whereas, The recent and most barbaric wave of aerial hijackings has focused world concern upon the Arab states who harbor terrorists who prey upon international air travelers; and

Whereas, At the present time more than two hundred innocent people are being held captive in the Jordanian desert by Palestinian air pirates; and

Whereas, These actions emphasize the immediate need for cessation of all American commercial flights to any Arab countries which allow plane hijackers to operate from their territory; and

Whereas, It is long past time for the airlines and governments of the world to declare a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes or those airlines serving Arab countries; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to take all possible steps to effect a boycott of the Arab states and to refuse landing rights to Arab planes and those airlines serving Arab countries, in an effort to halt the crime of aerial hijacking.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the members of Congress from Philadelphia.

STATES GIVEN MAJOR ROLE IN OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY BILL

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the role of State governments under a Federal occupational safety and health law was discussed at great length during 15 days of public hearings by the Select Subcommittee on Labor in the first session of the 91st Congress. It is a subject of much concern to both State administrators and to all those interested in a viable and effective job safety bill.

Based on the excellent testimony of State safety experts, particularly Mr. Martin Catherwood of New York and Mr. Charles Hagberg of Wisconsin, the subcommittee incorporated section 17, "State Jurisdiction and State Plans" into H.R. 16785, the occupational safety and health bill reported by the full Education and Labor Committee on July 9. There was substantial agreement in the full committee over this provision.

Under section 17, whenever a State wishes to assume responsibility for developing and enforcing standards in an area where the Secretary of Labor has already issued a standard, the State may submit a plan to him. It must contain assurances that the State will develop and enforce standards at least as effective as that developed by the Secretary, that the State will have the legal authority, the personnel and the funds necessary to do the job.

As an encouragement for State action, the bill provides also for Federal financial support to assist States in assuming their own program for worker safety. Planning grants with up to 90 percent Federal participation, and program grants with up to 50 percent Federal participation are provided.

I want to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a letter I recently received from the Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Nelson Rockefeller, voicing his interest in the role of State governments in Federal occupational safety and health legislation.

Governor Rockefeller believes that States which have or are willing to develop and maintain adequate safety programs as determined by the Secretary of Labor should have this opportunity. He also feels Federal aid will play a major role in encouraging more States to develop adequate occupational health and safety programs. Governor Rockefeller further declares:

Where States fail to provide and enforce adequate health and safety standards, however, I see no appropriate alternative to Federal standards and enforcement.

The majority of the Education and Labor Committee joined with me in sponsoring H.R. 16785. We are convinced that section 17 is the best vehicle for giving the 50 States the opportunity to assert their authority and carry out their responsibilities for the safety of workers in their respective jurisdictions.

States have the additional latitude to choose to assert their authority over only one industry or several industrial operations within their boundaries, leaving the remainder of uncovered industries or hazards subject to Federal jurisdiction.

Section 17 clearly delineates Federal-State relationships, allowing the States maximum flexibility in determining their respective roles in a national job safety program, while simultaneously placing the final responsibility with the Federal Government for insuring that all workers engaged in interstate commerce have safe and healthful working conditions.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 16785 when it comes before this body for a vote.

The full text of Governor Rockefeller's letter follows:

ALBANY, N.Y.,

September 18, 1970.

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Labor,
House Education and Labor Committee,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DANIELS: Enactment of Federal legislation on occupational health and safety is vital to the well-being of the Nation's work force and I urge your support in assuring that it receives high priority in the Congress.

Although a final bill is not yet available, there need be no disagreement with most of the provisions of the bills which have received serious consideration after extensive public hearings and consideration by labor, management and professional groups.

The State of New York has long held a leadership position in development of an occupational health and safety program and is constantly revising and improving its standards to keep up with changes in methods, materials and toxic agents.

States which have or are willing to develop and maintain adequate safety programs as determined by the Secretary of Labor should have this opportunity, thus avoiding in such states unnecessary duplication of state standards and state inspection by the Federal Government. Fortunately, this objection seems to have been accepted in the various bills under serious consideration. Federal aid, as contemplated in the various bills, can also play a major role in encouraging more states to develop adequate occupational health and safety programs.

Where states fail to provide and enforce adequate health and safety standards, however, I see no appropriate alternative to Federal standards and enforcement.

The areas of agreement contained in the several bills are substantial and I hope that such differences as still exist will not be permitted to delay or prevent the enactment of this legislation to assure occupational health and safety standards for workers throughout the entire country.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

THE TRAGEDY OF DONALD LEE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have brought to the attention of my colleagues the problems surrounding the Washington ambulance crisis.

Recently we have had another glaring example that some action must be taken soon. A WWDC editorial spells out the details of this most recent tragedy and offers a remedy.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues who travel and live in the District of Columbia:

THE TRAGEDY OF DONALD LEE

(NOTE.—Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC Vice President and General Manager William S. Sanders was on September 1, and 2, 1970. We welcome comments.)

The tragic thing is that people continue to die because our Government cannot or will not come to grips with the Washington ambulance crisis.

Sixteen months after our documentary, and our editorials, the situation remains the same. Ambulances still are over-worked. Ambulances still make taxi runs. People still do not grant right of way to ambulances. Our traffic lights still do not go to red when a siren nears.

And so four year old Donald Lee did not live to see five. An ambulance was rushing to what later would turn out to be a needless call. Donald Lee's mother had a green light at Fourth and Bryant. She apparently did not see or hear the approaching ambulance. The light stayed green, and Donald died.

Sixteen months ago we proposed an inexpensive addition to the city's traffic lights, a device which is activated by an approaching siren and which turns all lights in the intersection red.

If the lights at Fourth and Bryant had been red, Donald Lee would be alive today. That is the cost of living for Donald Lee.

Thank you for your interest.

SOLDIER LOOKS HOMEWARD AND SEEKS CAMPUS PEACE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a letter recently appeared in the Los Angeles Times which I feel will be of interest to all my colleagues. It is from a soldier fighting for his Nation in Vietnam who has a few things to say about the college students who are actively working against our war effort.

College students might also heed the advice given by Demosthenes to his colleagues in his second Phillipic when he admonished them to beware "lest in striving to rid of war, you find yourselves slaves."

The article follows:

SOLDIER LOOKS HOMEWARD AND SEEK CAMPUS PEACE

Many of us in Vietnam have been following the stories about the unrest on the nation's campuses with subdued anger.

It is demoralizing to read about our underprivileged counterparts vandalizing campus buildings, manhandling institution leaders and generally making asses of themselves.

It is painful to the thousands of less pampered "students" here who have taken their lesson from instructors in black pajamas and sandals, where the classrooms are sandbagged, hot, sweaty jungle clearings, where the Saturday night date is a cold beer and a letter from home, and where the grades are not A's, B's, C's but sudden

death, crippling wounds or maybe victory. Well, don't worry, people, because someday this war is going to be over and a half million angry men are going to descend on the 50 states with dreams of homes and families and education and jobs.

And when these men hit the campuses, I sincerely hope that someone tries to stop an ex-soldier or marine from attending classes, or that some sorry, flakey, social reject tries to plant a Viet Cong flag next to the artificial leg of a Sea Bee, or spits in the burned face of an Army medic.

I guarantee that it will only happen once.
Pfc. DENNIS J. BUTLER.

REDEDICATION TO CONSTITUTION'S PRINCIPLES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the September 13, 1970, editions of the Knight newspapers carried a column by John S. Knight entitled, "U.S. Must Rededicate Itself to Constitution's Principles."

The Knight newspapers include the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Tallahassee Democrat, the Miami Herald, the Akron Beacon-Journal, the Detroit Free Press, the Charlotte Observer, and the Charlotte News.

Mr. Knight is one of the outstanding newspaper publishers of the 20th century, and his recent column is an incisive analysis of the difficulties that plague us because we have departed from constitutional principles.

Mr. Knight forcefully points out that the right of dissent, guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution, does not provide license for the violence of the revolutionaries who seem determined to destroy our democratic institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Knight's column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

UNITED STATES MUST REDEDICATE ITSELF TO CONSTITUTION'S PRINCIPLES

What has happened to America? Why, in our madness, do we turn to riots and destruction, to contempt for revered institutions which made the American dream possible, to nostrums instead of cures for our economic ills, to sleazy, cheap political devices rather than exercising at least a modicum of statesmanship?

Are we indeed a part of the world revolution which seeks only to destroy while parading under the banners of democracy, Marxist style?

Why are Americans, who enjoy greater freedoms under our Constitution than are permitted anywhere else in the world, berating "the system" which makes these precious liberties possible?

How long must we permit a small band of revolutionaries to disrupt our colleges and universities, to bomb government research centers, kill innocent people and ruin the careers of devoted scientists?

What kind of a country do we live in where the flouting of law has become a national pastime, where a law officer automatically

becomes a "pig," an object of derision and attack by an untutored, undisciplined and unprincipled rabble?

Where indeed, are our leaders, the parents of our youth, the educators and the great body of law-abiding, responsible citizens?

Are the leaders too politically oriented, too concerned with their personal ambitions to stand up and be counted?

Have the educators become so supine, so dependent upon government grants or so cowardly that they stand meekly by while their institutions of learning are defiled and brought to heel by roving bands of professional anarchists?

Must we yield to the sophistry that the right of dissent—as stated so forthrightly in Article I of the Bill of Rights—can be taken as license by those willful violators of the law who cannot distinguish between dissent and disobedience?

Ironically, the destroyers who abuse our Constitutional liberties would find themselves prisoners of the Marxist police state of the authoritarian world to which they give such frenetic devotion.

The greatest of all government documents—the United States Constitution—provides ample safeguards against tyranny and injustice.

Yet the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions has drafted a new Constitution for the United States that would concentrate all authority in the national government, strengthen the Presidency, weaken the national judiciary and create new branches of government to oversee planning, elections and economic regulations.

Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell, 79-year-old former member of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "brain trust" and author of the document, observes that cherished traditions and institutions which no longer serve the needs of modern society must be pulled down as "impediments to progress."

Along with the Black Panthers who have also put together a new Constitution, Dr. Tugwell typifies the fuzzy and radical left who would tear apart our system of government while offering the absolute authority of statism in its place.

These are the true revolutionaries—along with Socialists in the teaching profession—who are more to be feared than college youth expressing their frustrations on the campus.

Yes, our young people are being taught that there is something inherently evil about the capitalistic system, that its rewards for the industrious and thrifty segments of our society are unfair, that a "people's capitalism" would somehow solve all our problems.

Why is it, Americans, that we of the world's most affluent society, now wish to embrace the fatuous economic doctrines which have failed so miserably wherever they have been tried?

Are we like the lemmings who migrate at intervals to their own destruction?

Where were our statesmen when Congress fueled the fires of inflation by passing a "tax reform measure" which insured a huge deficit?

Can you tell us, please, why such responsible Negro leaders as Whitney Young and Roy Wilkins constantly criticize the total community for the excesses of young blacks while making no substantial contribution of their own in the direction of restraint?

Does it bug you that elementary school teachers once dedicated to character building are now setting a sorry example for our youth with their union-directed strikes on the eve of a new school year?

Or that labor's power monopoly is able to cripple the economy by making a farce of collective bargaining?

Can these distortions of an orderly society be attributed solely to the war in Indochina? Or is the current unrest symptomatic of a world society in revolution?

Whatever the cause, this is a time for the rededication of all Americans to the proposition, as stated in the Preamble of the Constitution, that this nation was conceived to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

These were the wise and profound thoughts of our founding fathers.

That we have strayed so far from the paths of righteousness is a serious indictment of the weaknesses of man who in the almost 200 years of our Republic now finds himself for the first time seemingly incapable of constructive self-government.

For our enemies within would destroy the union, make a mockery of justice, insure domestic anarchy, gut the national defense, disregard the general welfare and repress the blessings of liberty.

This is what is happening to America, known in happier days as the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.

MISSOURI'S (AND OTHER STATES) DESPERATE PLIGHT IN MEDICAID

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last year, when the Social Security Act was before the Congress, there were some changes made in requirements of the States in connection with medical assistance, to the end that it would not be permissible for any State to reduce its expenditures. This was accomplished by the adoption of an added subsection (d) to section 1902 of the Social Security Act. The consequence of such reduction would be the loss of Federal funds.

The House has previously passed H.R. 17550 and it is now before the Senate Finance Committee. A fiscal emergency has arisen in my State of Missouri, due to the failure of the residents of the State to accept a tax referendum and the unfortunate reduction by the Missouri State Senate in the amount of medicaid funds by \$3.1 million, has the State faced with the loss of Federal funds. This may also be true in other States. Because of this, the junior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS F. EAGLETON, has introduced an amendment to H.R. 17550 which would amend section 1902 of the Social Security Act which would prevent the State of Missouri or any other State from suffering a complete cutoff of Federal medicaid funds as a result of a temporary fiscal emergency.

The proposed amendment of the Senator from Missouri has great merit and it is my sincere hope that his efforts to have it adopted will be successful.

It would provide a temporary relief until the State of Missouri could put its fiscal house in order. If the amendment is accepted in the Senate, I shall do everything within my power to have it accepted by the conferees when H.R. 17550 is before them, and also to have it adopted by the House of Representatives

when the legislation is returned to this body.

If such action fails, the results to the people of Missouri will be catastrophic. It would mean the loss of medicaid for medical services to 280,000 residents of Missouri who are aged, blind, disabled, mothers, unemployed fathers, and children on ADC, and those on general welfare.

No one knows how it will be possible to transfer the 4,500 persons now in skilled nursing homes to State hospitals, or what will happen to the 5,500 persons who receive inpatient hospital care each month; nor do we know what will happen to the 52,000 welfare recipients who receive doctors' services each month; to the 80,000 persons who receive prescription drugs each month; to the 13,000 persons, many of whom are children, who now receive outpatient hospital or clinical services each month.

Of equal concern is the question of what would happen to the 95,000 welfare recipients who are 65 years of age and over, whose medicare supplemental medical insurance premiums are presently paid by the State of Missouri and which would be stopped if the title XIX program under the social security law comes to an end, leaving them entirely without medical insurance protection.

Without question, the results would be very serious. The amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Missouri would permit the State of Missouri, or any other State that may find itself in similar circumstances in the future, a limited period of time to restore its medicaid effort and thus avoid the cutoff of Federal funds.

It is my belief that this is one of the most important and humane amendments which has been offered and I urge all Members of Congress to accept it.

BILLS INTRODUCED

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st Congress I have introduced 97 bills and resolutions. Many of the proposals they contain have since become law. Below I list those of major interest. Copies and explanations are available upon request.

H.R. 8773, to limit to \$20,000 annual payments to farmers and increase water-sewer grants to rural communities. A \$55,000 limit was included in the final farm bill.

H.R. 9009, to adjust agricultural production and to provide a transitional program for farmers. Later cosponsored by 50 Members and 21 Senators.

H.R. 9251, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Lincoln Home as a national park. Cosponsored by 65 Representatives and four Senators.

H.R. 12018, to prohibit the use of the mails to convey obscene material to minors. Passed the House.

H.R. 12019, to prohibit the use of the mails to convey salacious materials to anyone. Passed the House.

H.R. 13056, to establish a Police Heroes Fund to benefit law enforcement officers and firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty.

House Concurrent Resolution 305, urging joint exploration of space by United States and other nations of world. Now adopted as official policy of NASA.

H.R. 13379, to establish an all-volunteer army.

H.R. 13446, to increase to \$3,000 amount individuals may earn without suffering a deduction in social security benefits. Amount was later increased to \$2,000.

H.R. 13447, to provide cost-of-living increases in social security benefits. Passed the House.

House Concurrent Resolution 454, urging North Vietnam to provide humane treatment of U.S. prisoners of war. Passed the House and Senate.

H.R. 13923, to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to include "maximum price stability" as a primary goal of economic policy.

House Resolution 564, supporting President Nixon's withdrawal policy in Vietnam. Cosponsored by 114 Members.

House Resolution 613, supporting President Nixon's efforts to negotiate peace in Vietnam.

H.R. 14388, to authorize elderly to exchange food stamps for meals prepared by nonprofit organizations.

H.R. 14496, to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations to provide for orderly marketing of agricultural products.

H.R. 15125, to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice to study problem of juvenile delinquency.

House Joint Resolution 1037, to require congressional approval before U.S. combat troops can be sent into the Middle East.

H.R. 16038 through 16044, seven bills to clean up the environment by setting air standards, studying recycling of solid wastes and providing funds for water pollution control, and providing penalties.

House Joint Resolution 1089, proposing an amendment to the Constitution to guarantee equal rights for women. Passed by House.

H.R. 16263, to prohibit diversion of highway revenue by States for nonhighway purposes.

H.R. 17323, to make use of a firearm to commit a felony a Federal crime where such use violates State law. Cosponsored by 16 Members.

H.R. 17349, to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing.

H.R. 18654, to require presidential reports concerning U.S. military units on foreign territory in order that the Congress may fulfill its primary responsibility for the commitment of the Nation to war, and for the regulation of its Armed Forces. Adopted substantially by Foreign Affairs Committee.

H.R. 19308, to control aircraft hijack-

ing by boycotting those countries which harbor hijackers.

H.R. 19380, to grant tax deductions to families of prisoners of war for expenses made to secure information about them or their release.

NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL WEEK

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a resolution which I introduced and the Congress passed, President Nixon has designated this week, September 20 through September 26, 1970, National Machine Tool Week in recognition of the important contribution the machine tool industry has made to this great Nation of ours. For those not familiar with the term, let me explain that machine tools are a distinct class of machinery which are used to make all other tools. For instance, machine tools alone can make the machinery for farms, factories, mills, and powerplants; machine tools alone can make the special machinery for turning out building materials, office equipment, printing, clothing, and medicines; machine tools also directly make parts for products like household appliances and motor vehicles. In essence, everything we eat, wear, and use depends upon the performance efficiency of the Nation's stock of machine tools.

As President Nixon put it in his proclamation designating this special week:

A strong machine tool industry improves the productivity of all industries and places a greater quantity of consumer goods within the reach of more people. It is vital to the continuing growth of our economy, and contributes to improving the quality of American life.

And our original joint resolution called for the designation of this special week as "a tribute to the importance of the national machine tool industry to the American economy, in recognition of its efforts on behalf of the Nation in peace and for our national defense and with the realization of the role it must play in the development of the sophisticated machinery and equipment necessary to eliminate and prevent pollution."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my commendations and gratitude to the machine tool industry of America, and particularly to those industries in the Rockford, Ill., area—the machine tool capital of the Nation. These are the people who have done so much to make our country great, and these are the people who will be in the forefront of efforts to build a better America.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I am including an article from the Sunday, September 13, 1970, New York Times, on the machine tool industry, its problems and prospects. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1970]
IN MACHINE TOOLS, NOW THE LEAN YEARS
(By Robert Walker)

Successful builders of machine tools need the steady nerves of a bomb-disposal squad. They have lived through recessions before and they are about to do it again, expecting a 1970 sales decline of perhaps 12 per cent from last year's volume and 20 per cent from the record business they did in 1967.

Their understanding of the cyclical nature of the industry does not mean they welcome the slump they know they must weather—without panicky cost cutting—for at least the next two or three quarters.

For one thing, through bad times as well as good, these manufacturers must keep spending for competitive research and development. The machine tools that rifled the barrels of World War II naval guns to what seemed in 1945 like miraculously fine tolerances would look like stone axes beside today's equipment. An operator can tell a computer in Cincinnati to instruct an automated cutting tool in Detroit to adjust itself for a slightly harder grade of steel in the next batch of engine parts it is going to make.

"You could keep your earnings up through one dip in the business cycle, and look pretty shrewd for a while, simply by firing almost everybody," Henry D. Sharpe Jr. observed last week.

Mr. Sharpe, president of the Brown and Sharpe Manufacturing Company, a machine-tool builder based in Rhode Island, added, "But then you'd have no sales, service or research capability when the next upturn arrived—which is why management in this industry has to be assessed over decades of performance and on the basis of long-term profit growth."

A minority faction in the industry has been saying recently—especially to Wall Street stock analysts—that the feast-and-famine character of the business is diminishing. In rebuttal, the majority of the 350 American machine-tool concerns merely point to the current rate of shipments and new orders. They concede that some diversified concerns might be exceptions, like the industry's biggest company, Cincinnati Milacron, Inc.—formerly the Cincinnati Milling Machine Company. But only because items other than machine tools have grown to form more than a quarter of its dollar volume.

Most of the industry is cyclical because its products—the basic and generally expensive machines used to manufacture nearly all other machines—can only be sold to industrial customers that are planning or building new or enlarged production lines. Almost by definition, a machine tool is not a consumer product. For example, the hand-held drill press in a basement workshop does not qualify, although the heavier version of the same thing, bolted to the floor of a metalworking plant, does fit the definition.

Indeed, the value of new orders announced each month in Washington by the National Machine Tool Builders Association, is an eagerly awaited and closely watched indicator of the future capital spending of American industry.

INVESTMENT BUDGETS CUT

In the final stages of a recession—which is where most Americans devoutly hope the economy stands today—industry is feeling the pinch of reduced consumer spending and capital-investment budgets are being cut.

One of the first signals of this corporate belt tightening is in the new orders for machine tools—which were \$538-million in the first half of this year, down a shattering 48 per cent from slightly more than \$1-billion in the first six months of 1969.

Because of the time lag between order and delivery—usually between three and nine months the machine-tool builders already can see a disappointing sales year. Volume is expected to be about \$1.4-billion in all of 1970, down from \$1.6-billion last year.

Thus, as the industry prepares to play host to about 100,000 executives and prospective buyers at the 1970 Machine Tool Show, scheduled from Sept. 21 through Oct. 2 in Chicago, the outlook is depressingly different from that of 1965, when the last show was held.

BOOM 5 YEARS AGO

Five years ago, the domestic industry was plunging into the biggest boom in its history. In the four years from 1965 through 1968, it would sell more than \$6.5-billion worth of machine tools. At the beginning of that boom, foreign tools had perhaps 5 per cent of the United States market, but when the bonanza was over they had about 10 per cent, in terms of dollar volume.

A full-scale showing of machine tools is such an enormous undertaking that the United States events have been held only once every five years since World War II. They also have excluded all but American-built products, but both these policies have been changed.

The Washington-based trade group, the National Machine Tool Builders Association, has announced that shows will be held in 1972 and every two years thereafter, welcoming exhibitors from all nations, despite the staggering problems of logistics and accommodations that this decision will create.

The show that will begin next week in Chicago will operate in conjunction with the 1970 Production Engineering Show, where prospective customers will see practically every type of industrial equipment other than machine tools—computers, conveyors, cranes, safety goggles, factory telephone systems, pulleys, clutches, gears and pumps.

TWELVE-ACRE SHOW

The Production Engineering Show will fill the Navy Pier, while the Machine Tool Show will test the capacity of the International Amphitheatre. The latter event alone will occupy more than 12 acres of floor space and will offer demonstrations of about 2,000 machine tools worth about \$30-million, nearly half of them being shown for the first time.

It will attract representatives of nearly every major manufacturing corporation in the United States and most other developed nations, as well as observers from most branches of domestic and foreign governments. In view of the size of this expected crowd, the shows will not be open to the public.

For the first time within the United States, the Export-Import Bank will have an office at the scene, prepared to process applications for export financing on the spot or, at least, before the foreign buyer leaves Chicago at the end of the show.

NUMERICAL CONTROL

Just as the hottest topic at the 1965 show was the automatic operation of machine tools by punched tape—known as "numerical control"—the watchword of this year's show is expected to be "direct numerical control." It is a complex subject, but the techniques, in broad terms, are those that already are making the punched tape obsolete.

A computer, which need not be in the same metalworking plant or even in the same country as the machine tool, can adjust and revise the instructions to one or more automated tools.

These developments have led to a brisk market for small computers and related control devices, one of the several product categories into which Cincinnati Milacron has diversified.

"Business is tough, but it's been tough be-

fore," one industry veteran said last week. "But this show will prove once again that the long-term future looks great."

"Our only real worry is whether Chicago can handle 100,000 expense-account guys who are used to the best in food and service and will want it instantly."

FIGURING HIGHWAY COSTS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, having often pointed critically to our overwhelming national investment in highways at the expense of improvements in our urban mass transit system, I was most interested to read in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal that from an accounting point of view the cost of our highways is systematically underestimated and the cost of urban mass transit overestimated. Precisely how that is so is spelled out in "Figuring Highway Costs," a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal by Prof. Robert B. Shaw. The item follows:

FIGURING HIGHWAY COSTS

Editor, the Wall Street Journal:

In order to rectify the present extreme imbalance in the allocation of governmental funds between highway construction and mass transit, two fundamental revisions in public attitude are essential.

First of all, the highways must be charged with the burden of their terminal functions and properties, viz., local roads, streets and parking lots. Highway proponents, including public agencies like the Port of New York Authority, have always asserted that highway projects are self-supporting, whereas rapid transit is unable even to cover its operating expenses, let alone its capital costs. This position is conveniently buttressed by the arbitrary separation of major highways, bridges, tunnels and the like from the feeder and terminal functions. Only by this device does it become possible to say that highways are "profitable," while the heavy burden of local streets, congestion, traffic control and parking are conveniently thrust upon communities and their taxpayers. Equally well, of course, the railroads could still claim that the Park Avenue tunnel or the converging lines across the Jersey Meadows were profitable—if only the towns and city at either end would assume the heavy cost of operating the terminals.

As a second point, automobile and truck users should be held liable for, not merely the actual public expenditures which they occasion, but for their usurpation of valuable space which could be used much more efficiently by other forms of surface transportation. This space belongs to everybody—not just to motorists—and should have been used to the best advantage in transporting the largest number of people—not vehicles. In practice, however, the motor vehicles were allowed, years ago, to crowd the far more efficient trolley cars off the streets, and to drive mass transit underground. This being the case, the enormously multiplied cost of building mass transit underground or on private rights-of-way is not properly chargeable to mass transit patrons, but to the motorists who have commandeered the use of public property for an extremely inefficient utilization.

In brief, to say that highways are normally self-supporting while mass transit is always

a loss proposition is simply to perpetuate several superficial concepts, really nothing more than accounting conventions, widely accepted to be sure, but essentially political in nature. More thorough analysis suggests that these concepts were erroneous from the beginning, and today their replacement by sounder economic planning is imperative.

ROBERT B. SHAW,

Associate Professor of Accounting and Finance, Clarkson College of Technology.

POTSDAM, N.Y.

FEDERAL GRANTS, LOANS, AND CONTRACTS IN 20TH DISTRICT

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, taxpayers from Illinois' 20th Congressional District will be interested to know where their hard-earned dollars are going. In fiscal 1969, the total Federal dollars paid into the 20th Congressional District was \$363,264,066. This figure includes everything from social security and veterans' benefits paid to individuals to project grants to cities. On a county basis, the breakdown of Federal payments for the 12-month period is:

Adams	\$39,521,942
Brown	4,253,134
Calhoun	3,344,101
Cass	10,185,652
Greene	11,974,357
Hancock	18,683,654
Jersey	8,993,292
McDonough	17,058,121
Morgan	20,610,794
Pike	13,420,762
Sangamon	204,548,656
Schuyler	6,047,396
Scott	4,622,205

Below is a listing of major Federal grants, loans, and contracts for each county during 1969 and 1970, the years of the 91st Congress. Where more than one county benefits from a program, the item appears where the primary effect is felt. Payments to individuals are not listed:

MAJOR FEDERAL GRANTS

ADAMS COUNTY

- \$945,000 loan to Quincy College by HUD for new women's dormitory.
- \$480,000 loan to Adams Electrical Co-Operative by REA for distribution lines.
- \$346,419 loan to Camp Point by HUD for 24 low-rent housing units for elderly.
- \$313,991 loan to Clayton by HUD for 22 low-rent housing units for elderly.
- \$297,088 to Quincy College by HEW for work-study programs, library materials, financial assistance to needy students, and National Defense Student Loans.
- \$134,995 loan to Payson by HUD for 10 low-rent housing units for elderly.
- \$125,000 contract for construction of Quincy Social Security office.
- \$110,024 to Quincy Public Schools for Head-Start Program.
- \$46,406 grant to St. Mary's Hospital by NIMH for Mental Health Authority for West Central Illinois.
- \$30,000 for purchase of site for new Quincy post office.
- \$23,400 in grants to Gem City College School of Business for work-study program and National Defense Student Loans.

\$22,050 to Baldwin Field by FAA for runway improvements.

\$9,964 loan to Blessing Hospital School of Nursing for student loans.

\$8,600 contract to Quincy Civil Defense Agency for Community Shelter Plan for Adams County.

\$3,500 to purchase site of new Liberty post office.

BROWN COUNTY

\$206,000 grant and loan to Versailles by FHA to build sewer system.

\$100,640 by DOT for improvements to U.S. Route 24 near Mt. Sterling.

\$34,562 contract by GSA for improvements to Mt. Sterling post office.

CALHOUN COUNTY

\$155,000 grant and loan to Batchtown by FHA for central water system.

\$19,038 to Calhoun County by Office of Emergency Preparedness for disaster assistance from 1969 summer floods.

\$13,380 grant to Hardin by Dept. of Interior for sewage treatment facilities.

CASS COUNTY

\$1,014,000 authorized for longterm Clear Creek Watershed Project.

\$91,372 loan by SBA for Big Indian Camp and Recreation Park.

\$47,060 to repair banks of Indian Creek by Army Corps of Engineers.

\$30,800 contract for improvements to Beardstown post office.

\$13,998 in grants to Beardstown School District by HEW and OEO for summer Head-Start Program.

\$6,000 for remodeling of Chandlerville post office.

GREENE COUNTY

\$32,873 contract for improvements to White Hall post office.

\$29,400 contract for improvements to Carrolton post office.

HANCOCK COUNTY

\$515,172 to Hunt-Lima Lake Drainage District for work by Army Corps of Engineers.

\$326,000 loan to La Harpe Telephone Company by REA for improving service.

\$35,113 to Dallas City School District by HEW for aid to federally affected areas and summer training of migrant children.

\$34,190 to Nauvoo School District by HEW for aid to federally affected areas.

\$32,207 to Robert Morris College by HEW for work-study programs, library materials, student financial assistance, and National Defense Student Loans.

\$24,000 loan to Nauvoo by USDA for waste disposal system.

\$18,270 to La Harpe School District by HEW for aid to federally affected areas.

\$2,772 to Carthage School District by HEW for aid to federally affected areas.

JERSEY COUNTY

\$159,886 contract to Grafton Boat Company by Army Corps of Engineers for six launches and one diesel engine.

\$120,364 to Principia College by HEW for National Defense Student Loans.

\$49,351 to Jerseyville Industrial Commission by EDA for administrative expenses.

\$3,000 to Grafton by Office of Emergency Preparedness for disaster assistance from 1969 summer floods.

MCDONOUGH COUNTY

\$3,427,857 by HUD for purchase of 209 low-rent homes in Macomb.

\$547,290 grant to Macomb by Dept. of Interior for improvements to sewage treatment plant.

\$432,205 to Western Illinois University by HEW, Dept. of Justice, NIMH, and Nat. Science Foundation for work-study programs, library materials, financial assistance to needy students, National Defense Student Loans, research projects, and training for

physics teachers and law enforcement career prospects.

\$170,000 loan to Prairie City Community Corp. by SBA for 48-bed nursing home.

\$9,980 grant to McDonough County Regional Planning Commission by FHA for water and waste disposal plan for rural areas of county.

\$4,857 to Sciota School District by HEW for aid to federally affected areas.

MORGAN COUNTY

\$644,008 to MacMurray College by HEW for work-study programs, library materials, financial assistance to needy students, National Defense Student Loans and training for service to mentally retarded children.

\$128,309 grant increase to Jacksonville by HUD for urban renewal.

\$115,098 grant to Wilbur Freitag Laborers Homes Development, Jacksonville, to supplement rental rates.

\$108,392 to Illinois College by HEW for work-study programs, library materials, financial assistance to needy students, and National Defense Student Loans.

\$67,620 grant to Jacksonville by Dept. of Interior for building sewage treatment plant.

\$57,926 grant to Jacksonville Airport by FAA for improvements to runway.

\$24,986 to Jacksonville State Hospital by NIMH for staff development and training program.

\$22,660 to Elm City Rehabilitation Center, Jacksonville, by HEW to expand services.

\$12,229 grant to Jacksonville School District for summer Head-Start Program.

PIKE COUNTY

\$971,748 loan to Pike County Housing Authority by HUD for construction of 72 low-rent homes in Pittsfield for elderly.

\$451,200 for Mississippi River bank repairs by Army Corps of Engineers.

\$59,988 to Pike County by Office of Emergency Preparedness for disaster assistance from 1969 summer floods.

\$55,000 loan to Milton by HUD for improvements to existing water facilities.

\$27,996 grant to Pike County Summer Head-Start Program in Pittsfield.

\$12,585 grant to Pike County by HUD for comprehensive urban planning.

SANGAMON COUNTY

\$6,020,869 in contracts and loans to Springfield Housing Authority by HUD for 263 units of low-rent housing and modernizing existing low-rent housing.

\$2,660,220 grant to Springfield Sanitary District by Dept. of Interior for improvements to existing sewage treatment plant and a new plant.

\$2,314,430 in contracts to Sangamon Electric Company by Dept. of Navy and GSA for sonar trainer units and data processing equipment.

\$1,750,700 grant to St. John's Hospital by HEW for an addition.

\$1,055,045 in grants to Lincoln Land Community College by HEW and Dept. of Justice for work-study program, library materials, financial assistance to needy students, National Defense Student Loans, addition to library building, and Law Enforcement Education program.

\$740,000 loan to Auburn-Divernon-Girard-Pawnee-Thayer-Virden Water Commission by FHA for lake, water treatment plant, and distribution systems.

\$622,736 contract to Allis-Chalmers by GSA for crawler tractors.

\$300,966 in grants to Springfield and Sangamon County Community Action Agency by OEO for neighborhood services, community organization, day-care, food and medical services for poor and activities for low-income youths.

\$290,000 loan to Rochester by HUD for

water supply main and additions to sewage treatment facilities.

\$212,378 grant to Springfield by HUD for acquisition of land in Lincoln Home area.

\$161,789 to Springfield and Sangamon County Community Action Agency by OEO and HEW for Head-Start program for preschool low-income children.

\$139,512 to local contractor for improvements to 7 Illinois post office buildings.

\$117,000 grant to Springfield by HUD to rehabilitate housing areas.

\$109,375 supplemental grant to Springfield Mass Transit District by DOT for buses.

\$95,775 grant to Springfield Recreation Commission by Dept. of Interior for developing Riverside Park.

\$82,000 in loans to small businesses in Springfield by SBA, such as janitor service, car wash, motel, potato chip company, and optical service.

\$29,362 to Sangamon State University by HEW for work-study program, financial assistance to needy students, and National Defense Student Loans.

\$27,612 grant to Land of Lincoln Goodwill Industries by HEW for equipment to improve vocational rehabilitation services.

\$16,890 to Springfield Area Vocational Center by HEW for training welders.

\$15,125 grant to Illinois State Historical Society for microfilm publication of Pierre Menard Papers.

\$6,943 to Concordia Theological Seminary by HEW for work-study programs.

SCHUYLER COUNTY

\$114,000 grant to Rushville by Dept. of Interior for improving existing sewage treatment plant.

\$47,485 to Coal and Crane Creek Drainage and Levee Districts by USDA for sediment control.

\$29,623 contract for improvements to Rushville post office.

SCOTT COUNTY

\$703,000 loan to Illinois Rural Electric Company by REA for distribution lines.

\$298,750 in loans to Winchester Area Development Corp. by SBA to assist Winchester Packaging Corporation.

\$5,200 grant to Scott County Regional Planning Commission by USDA for comprehensive water and sewer planning.

ILLINOIS VALLEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, SERVING CALHOUN, GREENE, JERSEY, AND MACOUPIN COUNTIES

\$162,482 in grants by OEO for anti-poverty program administration, planning and community organization, family planning and medical services to low-income families, job training, recreational and educational programs for low-income youths.

\$104,614 in grants by OEO and HEW for summer Head-Start Programs.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 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?

ROGERS PRAISES CHANGE OF TV MOOD DRUG ADS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the impact of television on adults has been, without question, tremendous. The impact on children is even greater.

For that reason, I have been concerned about the impression that young children are given in TV advertisements showing great changes after an individual has taken some sort of pill.

These mood drug ads have given the impression that all one has to do when he is having a bad time is to take a pill and he can change his mood in very short order.

In addition, the fact that these ads run all the time and children see adults taking pill after pill tends, I feel, to create an acceptability to taking pills in general.

I also felt that a young person who has seen these ads for 4 or 5 years would have a hard time in discerning the difference if one of his school friends offered him another type of "pill" on the school grounds, one to pick him up or make him feel better.

Because of this concern, I wrote to the manufacturers who used television for this mood drug-type advertising. I also wrote to the networks, the National Association of Broadcasters, and the Federal Trade Commission, asking each to restrict this type of ad.

During the past 5 months individual companies have responded to my request for voluntary restrictions in television ads by reviewing their ads and, in several instances, changing them or limiting them to adult-only-type programs.

One company, for instance, completely dropped all their ads until they had the opportunity to review them. Another was ready to enter a new product in the mood drug field. The company had gone to the expense of trying the product in a test market, preparing advertising, labeling, and packaging. But rather than take even the slightest chance of entering the market at a time when there is such national concern, the company has decided to drop the plan to market the product.

This week, I was pleased to receive assurances in response to my requests that the National Association of Broadcasters has issued a set of guidelines for its subscribers dealing with mood drugs.

Several of the recommendations which the NAB committee has come up with go directly to the point which I made in my early correspondence. NAB has recommended that there be no pill taking on camera, that no children be used, that no dramatic or extreme before and after presentations be made and no language indicating that a product will heighten one's spirits shall be avoided.

I would hope that the members of NAB will act favorably on these rec-

ommendations and the pharmaceutical manufacturers will also do so.

I think that the voluntary action taken thus far on this matter is proof that there is still a means of solving a problem within voluntary measures and without Federal intervention. Of course, if the companies involved do not adhere to these guidelines I think the Congress will respond with legislation. But I hope this will not be necessary.

REFUSE ACT REVIVED

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of September 23, 1970, carried a most perceptive article by Peter C. Stuart concerning the revived interest in the Refuse Act of 1899.

The article appropriately credits Congressman HENRY S. REUSS with stimulating new interest in the provisions of the Refuse Act. It was Congressman REUSS, as chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources, who pointed out not long ago that the Refuse Act contained provisions which could serve as a valuable tool in the drive to control and abate water pollution.

The Christian Science Monitor article also points out that the Army Corps of Engineers has taken action to update its regulations to bring them into conformity with the act, but it finds that the Department of Justice under Attorney General John Mitchell is reluctant to carry out its obligations under the act. With regard to Attorney General Mitchell's agency, Mr. Stuart said "the Department of Justice—so militant on 'law and order' in other fields—has been oddly permissive" insofar as polluters are concerned.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be familiar with the Christian Science article, I include the text at this point in the RECORD:

REFUSE ACT REVIVED—OLD DOG WITH NEW TRICKS

(By Peter C. Stuart)

WASHINGTON.—It was a year—1899—of environmental innocence.

The automobile, today's prime air polluter, still was outnumbered by the nonpolluting horse.

DDT was the newfangled experiment of a German laboratory. Detergents hadn't been invented.

When Rep. Theodore Elijah Burton of Ohio introduced a bill to keep shipping channels free of sediment, it slipped quietly through President William McKinley's Congress—and into obscurity.

Seventy-one years later, the Refuse Act of 1899 is being rediscovered—and used. The old law is the newest weapon against the environmental pollution of 20th-century urban America.

It's easy to understand why. Yesteryear's law cuts through much of the red tape and loopholes of "more sophisticated" modern clean-water legislation.

The act is bitingly simple. It flatly bans the discharge of refuse (all foreign substances except liquid sewage) into navigable waters without a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers.

While recent water-pollution legislation gives polluters six months to clean up, the 1899 law demands compliance immediately.

But the real reason for the law's sudden popularity is that it invites citizen involvement. Anyone can report a violation to a federal district attorney, and collect one-half of any resulting fines (from \$500 to \$2,500 a day).

Citizens have caught on quickly. Since the old law was resurrected earlier this year, the public has peppered district attorneys in all parts of this country with charges against hundreds of alleged polluters.

VOLUNTEERS

The do-it-yourself volunteers are aided and abetted from Capitol Hill. Rep. Henry S. REUSS (D) of Wisconsin—whose conservation and natural resources subcommittee rediscovered the Refuse Act—has mailed more than 3,000 instruction kits.

Rep. Edward I. KOCH (D) of New York offers a similar mail-order packet.

Some early results from the 1899 law:

The city of Bridgeport, Conn., was compelled to stop dumping half-burned raw sewage into marshland being filled for an airport runway.

The Bass Anglers Sportsman Society of America (BASS) brought charges in Alabama against 214 corporations and municipalities.

Rep. Michael J. Harrington (D) of Massachusetts notified authorities of 151 alleged Bay State polluters.

Rep. REUSS listed 270 alleged polluters in Wisconsin and personally sued four firms. Representative KOCH turned in the names of the 10 "most flagrant" industrial polluters in New York City.

DILIGENCE CONTRASTED

The citizen diligence contrasts sharply with federal enforcement over the years.

Since 1899, the government has issued but 415 dumping permits. Only 266 of these apparently remain in effect. No permits have ever been granted in 22 states—including such industrialized ones as Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Virginia.

Nor has federal enforcement improved much lately.

The Army Corps of Engineers this summer updated its permit regulations, with new alertness to environmental protection.

But the Department of Justice—so militant on "law and order" in other fields—has been oddly permissive.

Mr. REUSS recently reminded the department that the 1899 act specifies "vigorous prosecution." Assistant Attorney General Shire Kashiwa replied that "it would not be in the genuine interest of the government" to prosecute corporate polluters that spend "significant amounts of money" trying to clean up.

POSITION RETREATED FROM

The Justice Department later retreated to the position that it would prosecute only "infrequent or accidental" polluters, leaving "consistent" polluters to the Federal Water Quality Administration.

The department's reversal became complete when, under persistent prodding, it resorted to the Refuse Act to seek court injunctions against 10 "consistent" polluters for daily dumping mercury into public waters.

Nevertheless, the Justice Department now finds itself in the awkward spot of being sued—by Rep. Richard L. Ottinger (D) of New York—to vigorously enforce the Refuse Act.

Others, meanwhile, are trying to shore up the old law in different ways. Sen. Philip A. Hart (D) of Michigan and Representative REUSS want to give the corps of engineers \$4 million to hire 400 new pollution inspectors.

Sen. Theodore F. Stevens (R) of Alaska proposes boosting the maximum penalty from \$2,500 to \$100,000 to make it effective against "large-scale violators."

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Col. Frank Borman gave us a dim report on the condition of American prisoners in North Vietnam. Presently there are approximately 1,500 American servicemen held in their prison camps; 1,500 men who, according to all reports, are treated like animals.

I have today written again to President Ton Duc Thang urging him to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Convention. This includes not only publishing the names of the prisoners, but providing them with proper food and medical care, permitting inspection of war facilities, and allowing the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families.

At the very minimum, I strongly urge the North Vietnamese to release the names of the American prisoners whom they hold. There are hundreds of families in this country whose husbands or sons or fathers are listed as "missing in action." The anxiety of these families, not knowing whether their loved ones are alive, is overwhelming. In the name of decency, I ask President Ton Duc Thang to send a list of their prisoners' names to our State Department.

I have also written to President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam, calling on his government to observe these same Geneva Convention provisions. It is difficult to maintain pressure on North Vietnam when the government in South Vietnam, which we are fighting for, also refuses to treat its prisoners humanely. It is very much in the interest of American prisoners held in North Vietnam for South Vietnam to abide by the Geneva Convention.

I am not at this time attempting to debate the merits of present American policies in Southeast Asia. The issue involved far transcends the question of international politics. It is neither a political nor a military question. It recognizes a kindred humanity of all men. It concerns basic standards of human decency and morality. For these men and women who are held prisoners do not initiate policy, but merely carry out policies which others have formulated.

The public outrage against man's continuing inhumanity to man must be voiced again and again, for world opinion is a powerful force. We must continue to speak out until the dignity of man is recognized and respected by all involved.

NINTH CONVENTION OF
BYELORUSSIANS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on September 5 through 7, the Byelorussians of North America held their ninth convention in New York City. On a number of occasions in the past I have joined with other Members of the House to review the positions and resolutions adopted by the Byelorussians of North America and to state our concern with the cultural and political oppression which these people face as a result of the Soviet dictatorship.

At this time I insert in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues, the resolution adopted by the ninth convention of Byelorussians of North America:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Byelorussian people in their land have been subjected to a colonial oppression from Moscow; and

Whereas the Russian Communist dictatorship in its dealings with Byelorussia's neighbors has torn away parts of the Byelorussian ethnographic territory having incorporated the largest part of it into the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; and

Whereas the key positions in the Byelorussian SSR are occupied mainly by foreigners subservient to the Moscow center and unresponsive to the needs of the Byelorussian people; and

Whereas the Byelorussian people suffer from an incredibly low standard of living as a result of exploitation of their natural and human resources which have been used by Moscow to conduct its international schemes in Latin America, Indochina, Africa and now especially the Middle East, as well as in other parts of the world; and

Whereas a policy of forcible Russification is being carried out in the Byelorussian SSR, the Byelorussian language being eliminated more and more from administration, science, education, and publications in the BSSR; and

Whereas Byelorussia is deprived of genuine diplomatic and cultural ties with the outside world, is unable to participate independently even in such international events as the Olympic games, her only foreign representation in the United Nations being a tool of Moscow's policies; and

Whereas the Government of BSSR, fully controlled by the Communist Party center in Moscow, does not care for any improvement of Byelorussia's political status and the economic and cultural well-being of the Byelorussian people, nor does it protest against economic exploitation and Russification of Byelorussia; and

Whereas the Byelorussian nation has and will never become reconciled to a state of colonial dependence, but has decidedly resisted Muscovite oppression in defense of its natural rights to be its own master; and

Whereas the Byelorussian people are still conducting their freedom fight—

We the Byelorussians of the United States and Canada unanimously reaffirm our will to support the fighting Byelorussian people in the Soviet Union in their struggle for cultural freedom and political independence. We are determined to seek further support for fighting Byelorussia among political leaders and statesmen of the United States of America and Canada. We and our children shall never cease our effort until Byelorussia will again become a free and democratic na-

tion in accordance with the postulates and principles enunciated in the constitutional charters of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic whose freedom and independence were proclaimed in Minsk (Minsk) on March 25, 1918.

Long live Fighting Byelorussia!
Long Live the Byelorussian Democratic Republic!

New York City, September 6, 1970.

J. ZAPUDNIK,

Chairman of the Convention.

W. STANKIEVOCH,

Chairman of the Byelorussian-American Association.

A. HRYCUK,

Chairman of the Byelorussian Canadian Alliance.

TWO ARTICLES DEALING WITH THE
LEGAL DOCTRINE OF COLLAT-
ERAL ESTOPPEL

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent who specializes in tax law has written two articles dealing with the legal doctrine of collateral estoppel. While a highly technical subject, he has put in simple terms the civil liability an individual may incur by being found guilty in a criminal case for income tax evasion. The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Aug. 14, 1970]

PLEA OF GUILTY ADVISED HERE

(By E. Edward Stephens)

DEAR COUNSEL: I live in Falls Church, Va. When the time came to file my 1967 tax return, I couldn't scrape up enough cash to pay the tax. So I didn't file the return, and I haven't done so to this day, although I was on time in filing returns for 1968 and 1969. Now the Internal Revenue Service and the Justice Department have caught up with me. An Assistant U.S. Attorney has told my lawyer that, if I'll plead guilty, he'll charge me only with violation of Internal Revenue Code section 7203, willful failure to file a 1967 return; but if I decline, he'll ask the grand jury to indict me under code section 7201, willful attempt to evade my 1967 tax by willfully failing to file a return. Is the deal worth considering?

Yes, Here are some points that your lawyer will discuss with you:

If you take the deal, you'll be convicted of only a misdemeanor. The punishment can't exceed a fine of \$1,000 and imprisonment for one year. Chances are you'll be fined and put on probation for a year or less.

If you don't deal, the grand jury most likely will indict you under section 7201 in accord with the prosecuting attorney's request. Then you'll have the expense of defending yourself and, if convicted, you can be fined up to \$10,000 and jailed up to five years. Furthermore, you'll stand convicted of a felony—far worse on your record than a misdemeanor.

Whether you make the deal or not, IRS will go after you, later, for a 1967 deficiency plus the 50 percent civil fraud penalty. And here's an important point: If you've been convicted only under section 7203, IRS will have to prove that you intended to defraud the government. You might beat the rap. In

a Tax Court decision filed July 28, George Arconti, of Lutherville, Md., was relieved of civil fraud penalty liability after he had failed to file returns for three years and had been convicted under section 7203. But if you've been convicted under section 7203 you'll automatically be held liable for the civil fraud penalty whether you go to the Tax Court, the U.S. Court of Claims, or the U.S. District Court.

You'll be held liable for the civil fraud penalty under the highly technical doctrine of "collateral estoppel." That is, you'll be precluded from trying to prove that you're not liable for the penalty. Reason: the government already will have proved—in the criminal case—that you intended to defraud the United States. This is now the rule that's applied in the Tax Court, the Court of Claims and all District Courts in the Fourth and Fifth Circuits.

The harshness of this rule can best be illustrated by turning to the case of O. K. Armstrong v. U.S., decided in 1965 by the Court of Claims. Armstrong was convicted, under section 7201, of willful tax evasion for '47, '48 and '49. Then IRS went after him for deficiencies for the years '45 to '50, and added the 50 percent civil fraud penalties. Trial Commissioner W. Ney Evans allowed Armstrong to present evidence to show his lack of fraudulent intent for each of the six years. He then concluded that Armstrong had cleared himself of fraud for all six years.

Then the judges upset the apple cart. Applying the collateral estoppel doctrine, they held that, since Armstrong had been found guilty of willful evasion for '47, '48 and '49, he was automatically liable for the civil fraud penalties for those years, even though the evidence showed that he was in the clear.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Aug. 21, 1970]

ONE-WAY STREET FOR THE IRS

(By E. Edward Stephens)

DEAR COUNSEL: I was surprised to learn from last Friday's column that if a person is convicted of willfully attempting to evade his taxes, and is punished under Internal Revenue Code section 7201, the technical "collateral estoppel" rule—now applied by some courts—makes him automatically liable for additional stiff civil fraud penalties under code section 6653(b). Does the doctrine work the other way too? If he's acquitted on the evasion charge, is he automatically relieved of liability for the civil fraud penalties?

No. In a historic 1938 decision, *Helvering v. Mitchell*, the Supreme Court held that the Internal Revenue Service can still go after him for the civil fraud penalties.

Here's the reasoning: Even though IRS must prove the same fraudulent acts and intentions in both cases, it's easier to prove them in the second case. Since Round One is a criminal action, IRS must show that the taxpayer is guilty "beyond a reasonable doubt." But Round Two is a civil proceeding, and IRS has only to prove that the taxpayer is liable "by a preponderance of the evidence." Therefore, although IRS may lose the criminal case, it still might win the civil action, and it should have a chance to try.

As you have indicated in stating your question, some courts now sing a different song when the shoe's on the other foot. If the taxpayer loses the criminal case, these tribunals deny him the opportunity to contest his liability for the civil fraud penalties—which, in most instances, are far greater than his fine for the tax evasion conviction. This rule is now being followed by the Tax Court, the Court of Claims, and all U.S. District Courts in the Fourth and Fifth Circuits—Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia.

and the Carolinas, as well as Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and the Canal Zone.

These courts reason: IRS can win both cases by proving the same fraudulent acts and intentions of the taxpayer. Since IRS has proved them in the first, more difficult action, it should not have to establish them again. However, there are some mighty strong objections to this position:

Collateral estoppel is unfair when applied in this manner. It favors IRS. It's a one-way street.

Many legal scholars are convinced that the rule enables IRS to take a taxpayer's money in violation of the Constitution's celebrated Fifth Amendment, which says that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

Even though a taxpayer has been convicted in the criminal court, he still may beat the second rap if he's given an opportunity to defend himself. For instance, he might discover new evidence, between the two trials, that will clear him.

Congress has given the Tax Court "exclusive jurisdiction" to approve or disapprove IRS determinations of civil penalties. By applying the collateral estoppel rule the court has, in effect, abandoned part of its exclusive jurisdiction, without any authority to do so.

Congress can render a great service to the public by enacting legislation that will make it clear that every taxpayer is entitled to his day in court when IRS goes after him for civil fraud penalties, even if he has been convicted of attempted tax evasion.

"DOOM-CRYING" CANNOT FOOL MANY PEOPLE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate Democratic policy committee produced a report on the economy by three Johnson administration economists which was critical of the Nixon administration policies. The fact that the release of this report happened to be on the same day as the encouraging news on the cost of living index was a pleasant coincidence for the Democratic Party. However, it must lead a few cynics around the country to wonder if the Democrats were not just keeping this report in their back pocket to serve up to counter Republican good news on the economy.

The opposition party is in the sad position of having to cry bad news in the face of obvious good news. However, there is a basic difference in the opposing views offered on the economy yesterday. The announcement by the administration of a slowing in the rise of the cost of living was a statistical fact. The report by the Senate policy committee was based on partisan opinion.

This type of doom-crying is not going to fool many people. Even the Washington Post, which has not been overly kind to the administration's economic policies, said this morning:

With the September figures in, the clear-cut trend toward a much lower rate of inflation so long sought by the Nixon Administration is unmistakable.

SAGINAW STEERING GEAR HONORED BY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege yesterday to participate in special ceremonies at the Department of Transportation as the Saginaw Steering Gear Division of General Motors was singled out by that Department for the production of the 20 millionth energy-absorbing steering column by the division since its introduction in 1966.

Under Secretary of Transportation James M. Beggs most graciously and ably substituted for Secretary John A. Volpe as Mr. Ellis M. Ivey, general manager of Saginaw Steering Gear, presented the actual 20 millionth steering column to the Department.

In turn, Under Secretary Beggs presented to Mr. Ivey a special plaque bearing the Department of Transportation seal with the following inscription:

The Department of Transportation salutes the Saginaw Steering Gear Division, General Motors Corporation, on the production of the 20-millionth Energy-Absorbing Steering Column.

This device, since its introduction in 1966, is credited with saving an estimated three thousand lives.

Awarded in grateful appreciation for an outstanding contribution to improved safety for the American motoring public.

The plaque is signed by John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation and is dated September 1970.

Naturally, I share with great pride this marvelous development of an outstanding automobile safety device and the deserved recognition now accorded the nearly 9,000 employees of the Saginaw Steering Gear Division.

At this time I would like to include with my remarks, a very fine statement of Mr. Ivey's relating to the events of yesterday and the energy-absorbing steering column:

STATEMENT BY ELLIS M. IVEY

Earlier this afternoon we received a citation from the Department of Transportation, signed by Secretary Volpe, honoring Saginaw Steering Gear and General Motors for its "outstanding contribution to improved safety for the American motoring public. The citation credited the energy-absorbing steering column with saving an estimated 3,000 lives since its introduction on the 1967 model GM cars.

Such recognition is high praised, indeed, and we are grateful to Secretary Volpe and Representative Harvey for making it possible. I am proud to accept it on behalf of the 8,600 employees who conceived, designed and are producing the column.

I certainly don't want to bore you with statistics about the energy-absorbing steering column. However, it is worthwhile to note one or two salient facts concerning its development—an achievement in which we take considerable pride. Our divisional advanced engineering section started development of the column early in 1960. It was not a matter of improving upon an existing design. We were entering a brand new ball game. No one ever had produced such a column before. Almost no medical data

existed concerning the impact forces the human body can survive. Many designs were painstakingly conceived, built, tested, and discarded—at the same time that the medical researchers were slowly and laboriously working out the parameters within which the ultimate design would have to fall. When the final design was approved late in 1965, and impact tests using dummies and cadavers proved its merit, General Motors ordered an all-out effort to produce it for the 1967 model cars. To make this almost impossible short deadline, we launched an around-the-clock, three-shift, effort to simultaneously complete a plant, fill it with the necessary production equipment, and convert an engineering design into a fully-tested, mass-produced assembly.

It was an agonizing job, but we made it—and put the life-saving steering column on our cars one year ahead of the Federal regulation calling for a production of this type. We also were one year ahead of our competitors. Since that time we have developed and marketed a still better, second-generation energy-absorbing column. In addition, we have developed and added a steering column lock that simultaneously locks the steering wheel, gear-shift, and ignition. This adds significantly to the safety value of the column by reducing the number of car thefts. National Safety Council statistics show that one out of every six stolen cars is involved in a collision.

The honor that has been paid us today by the Department of Transportation, and by you gentlemen, helps make our investment in time, effort, and money still more worthwhile. Our industry has no scarcity of vociferous critics, who do not hesitate to call attention to our faults, either real or imagined. We are, therefore, doubly appreciative of your recognition of this successful phase in our continuing effort to increase the safety of the American driving public.

INDUSTRY HELPS TO REDUCE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION IN ILLINOIS

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in my hometown paper, the West Frankfort Daily American, has brought to my attention another outstanding illustration of how an industry in my district is helping to reduce air and water pollution. The article states:

Construction on a third electrostatic precipitator at Grand Tower Power Station of Central Illinois Public Service Co. is approximately 70 percent complete, with the project expected to be finished by early December. The work is part of the utility's \$16 million, five-year air quality control program to install the anti-pollution devices at all four of its power stations. Two precipitators serving generating unit No. 3 at Grand Tower have been in operation since early this year.

The equipment now being installed will remove fly ash . . . which is residue from burning coal . . . from stack emissions of unit No. 4 at the Jackson County power plant. In addition to installation of the precipitators, a new sewage treatment plant and new ash ponds were constructed at Grand Tower as part of CIPS' anti-pollution program. The ponds, a large scooped-out area enclosed on all sides by dikes, are used to store ashes resulting from coal being burned in the power station boilers.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent example of how private initiative in my district is meeting a pressing, present-day problem.

I know my colleagues would join me in extending congratulations to the Central Illinois Public Service Co. for taking this important step to "clean up our air."

ECONOMY LOOKS UP

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, after more than a year and a half under the policies of the Nixon administration, the Nation's economy shows strong signs that we have successfully brought under control the most rampant inflationary forces that afflicted the United States when Mr. Nixon became President. The President did not create the fiscal chaos that set the wage and price spirals in motion and pushed up interest rates to record highs. Neither did he undertake the war in South Vietnam and then try to pay the costs of that war through huge deficit budgets that provided the major impetus for the inflationary forces at work in the economy.

For more than a year and a half, however, it has been the President's responsibility for curtailing both inflation and the war. He has been able to move the Nation ahead on both fronts, despite minimal cooperation on holding down spending from the Democratic-controlled Congress which has often seemed oblivious to its own support of the past policies of overspending that got us into the present inflationary mess in the first place. It is to the President's credit that he has been able to score the successes he has in spite of this major obstacle.

Wall Street Journal writer John O'Riley, in an article published last Monday, put the present picture of the economy into some needed perspective, especially for those who would rather spend all of their time pointing out the present difficulties without also noting what developments have taken place to move us beyond those challenges and into a more promising period. I am placing the article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues who might not have had a chance to read it:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By John O'Riley)

Summer's gone. So is a decade. The stock market rises once again. And, despite the auto strike, the economic wise men are now nearly unanimous in the opinion that the recession—or whatever it was that hit us—is finally on the way out. What, if anything, have we learned in the 1960s about the workings of the vast and complex American economy? And where do we go from here? It may be presumptuous to say we've learned anything. It may be foolhardy to forecast the future. But some answers seem pretty clear as far as the human eye can discern.

One thing written pretty clearly on the record of the 1960s is the picture of Americans as an economically nervous people. You

might almost call them economically neurotic. Rarely has a people fretted so much about recession-depression while experiencing so little of it.

The massive dynamism of the period hardly needs documenting. Starting in 1960 at \$503 billion, the GNP reached \$971 billion in the second quarter of this year. That's almost doubling in a decade.

Some of this has been inflation, of course. But most of it has been solid growth. The Federal Reserve's 1957-59 based industrial output index stood at 108 in 1960 and at 169 last month. In 1960 there were 65 million people with jobs in the country. And today there are nearly 80 million.

This is not to deny at all that there has been much economic pain felt by both individuals and companies in the slowdown of the past year or so. Many, many individuals have lost jobs. Many, many companies have felt sharp profit shrinkage. And people with much of their substance in stocks and bonds have suffered extremely painful losses. Still—on the larger scene—total employment, personal income, industrial production, GNP—all are at or within a whisker of their all-time highs. It scarcely adds up to a depressed economy.

What about the stock market? Have we learned anything in that area? Probably not. But one lesson does seem to be offered—whether we learn it or not: A stock market bust certainly does not always portend a bust in the economy.

During the past decade, the most sustained period of prosperity in modern times, the stock market managed to record not just one but all three of its biggest breaks of the past quarter century.

Measured by the Dow Jones Industrial Average, the declines were:

[In percentages]

Periods:	Stock Market
1961-62	Down 27
1966	Down 23
1969-70	Down 36

The 1961-62 period saw a barely measurable recession (actually in 1960-61) that lasted only nine months. In 1966-67 there was a slight slowdown never officially called a recession—labeled by some a "mini-recession." And the slowdown now believed to be ending has never gone far enough to bring agreement on whether it has or hasn't been a recession, as measured by historical standards.

The stock market is partly a barometer of hard economics and partly a barometer of mood. The stock-buying public's mood swings violently from unmitigated optimism to the darkest gloom, and back again. Thus the market, swings also—too far up when it's rising and too far down when it falls. Much of the steepness chronicled in the breaks above lies in the fact that the market simply got unjustifiably high in each case before the tumble.

And every big break, of course, is helped along by those who always see "the end of the world" in the bust, or at least "another 1929." This scares people. But people like to be scared. And many pay well for a steady diet of frightening advice, however unfounded it may be.

One lesson taught before but reiterated in the 1960s is this: You can't have "full employment" and price stability at the same time. Some political wizard may some day join the two together in a compatible marriage, of course. But the trick has yet to be turned.

Full employment, with the unemployment rate under 4%, for this country at least has been a phenomenon of war periods. We had it in World War II. We had it with the Korean War. And we had it with the Vietnam conflict prior to the recent throttling down of defense expenditure. But these are the only times we

have had it. And each period, of course, has been marked by inflation.

If American fingers can really be withdrawn from the sticky mess in Vietnam, and if somehow the threatening fire can be smothered in the Middle East, the 1970s may be the stage for a new attack on the full-employment-no-inflation riddle. A solution won't come easy.

War and threatened war, of course, is the big shadow over the 1970s. In comparison, the General Motors strike is peanuts. The strike will hurt the economy; but it will pass. The possibility of trouble in the Middle East escalating to a point of direct confrontation between Russia and the U.S. raises the spectre of danger far beyond the scope of mere economics.

But, with peace postulated, the years just ahead should bring more prosperity to the American economy. Public buying power is high and, more important, there is no good reason to think it won't continue high.

Personal income is the backbone of buying power. And public buying power is the stuff on which all business feeds. Despite the much publicized problems of the last year, personal income in the U.S. last month reached an all-time high of \$807 billion yearly. It has risen nearly \$50 billion in the past twelve months. It was under \$500 billion as recently as six years ago.

Despite the payroll trimming of months just past, total wage and salary payments in the nation, now at the rate of some \$544 billion a year, have climbed nearly 30% in less than three years.

Personal saving as a percent of disposable income is now at the highest level in nearly 20 years. And, Puritan ethic or no Puritan ethic, it is not in the nature of the American consumer to sit on savings forever.

DRUG SONGS AND MOVIES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, WBBM Radio, Chicago, in an editorial commentary on September 17 effectively emphasized the relationship between songs and movies and the so-called drug culture. In view of the very grave concern that Members of Congress are showing in this issue, I insert into the RECORD at this point this most effective and timely editorial:

DRUG SONGS AND MOVIES

When it comes to attacking various elements of our society, Vice President Agnew has no peers. Let's make it perfectly clear we don't always agree with him, as in the case of his attack against elements of the press and broadcasting.

Nevertheless, he does make some sound arguments. Vice President Agnew says that some song writers and movie makers are glamorizing the use of drugs. In our opinion, he's absolutely right about this matter.

Just listen to what's being sung or really examine some of the movies we are being shown. Often, both songs and movies make it appear that living with drugs is the natural order of things. In fact songs and movies in many cases make it seem to be desirable to take drugs. It's helping to create a drug culture.

With all the talk of pollution these days—it's about time we became concerned about another kind of pollution—and that's the pollution of the minds of our young people.

The song writers and movie makers are

wrong. They make money, oh yes. But they're wrong nevertheless. If you don't believe me, just ask the youngsters who are getting help at Gateway House. They tell you all about the elusive joys of drugs once you're hooked. If this makes us "squares"—then so be it—we're glad to hold that title. It's better than being a dope addict—even if that's supposed to be the "in" thing.

Song writers and movie makers owe some responsibility to the public. And that responsibility includes not making the use of drugs appear to be a good or even happy experience. Drug use is bad. Songs and movies are dead wrong when they try to make it appear otherwise.

VOTING RECORD

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, each year hundreds of votes are taken in the House of Representatives. Some are on controversial subjects where the vote is close, while others receive lopsided majorities.

It is not practical to list every vote I cast during the 91st Congress. However, here is my record on some of the more important bills. A fuller explanation on these or other votes is readily available.

I voted in favor of the following bills:
Military procurement authorization for fiscal 1971.

National Science Foundation authorization for fiscal 1971.

Office of Education appropriations bill. Voted for bill as it passed House, but voted to sustain President's veto of higher inflationary conference version.

Independent Offices—HUD appropriations for fiscal year 1971. Voted for original bill, but supported the President's veto of higher inflationary conference version.

Amendment to Constitution providing for election of President and Vice President by direct popular vote.

To allow the President to institute a lottery system for selecting draftees.

To require Members of the House to report honorariums of \$300 or more, and unsecured loans for more than 90 days in excess of \$10,000.

To lower voting age to 18, set up a nationwide 30-day residency requirement for presidential elections, and extend provisions of the previous Voting Rights Act.

Postal reform bill including a prohibition on postal workers strikes and containing a right-to-work amendment.

Amendment to the Constitution providing equal rights for women.

To provide for reform procedures in the House of Representatives.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizing \$5.3 billion per year through 1972.

To provide milk for school children at reduced cost.

Amendment to deny Federal interest subsidies on college construction loans to colleges which fail to cut off Federal aid to students who willfully violate college regulations of a serious nature and contribute to substantial disruption.

To provide for a National Center on

Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped.

To provide guaranteed Government loans at 7 percent interest to college students.

To authorize a 3-year program of research, advanced training, and remedial programs to help children with learning disabilities.

To authorize special educational programs on the dangers of drugs.

To provide for programs on environmental education.

To extend the Hill-Burton hospital construction aid program for 3 years. Later voted to uphold the President's veto due to the acceptance in the compromise proposal of the Senate's higher inflationary authorizations.

Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act with provisions for mentally-ill children.

Amendments to the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Health Act extension bill for research and training in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other diseases.

Family assistance bill providing for comprehensive reform of the present welfare system.

To provide additional safety standards, require closing of unsafe mines, and provide compensation for miners suffering from black lung disease.

Unemployment compensation bill to provide coverage for 4.5 million additional workers.

Food stamp program authorization for \$610 million for food aid to needy people.

To authorize \$348 million for a 3-year period to control water pollution.

To establish the Council on Environmental Quality.

To authorize \$775 million to control air pollution.

Golden eagle program for Federal recreation areas.

To investigate crime in the United States.

To increase education benefits for 736,000 veterans.

To provide necessary hospital or domiciliary care to veterans over 70.

To provide additional mortgage guarantees for veterans.

To raise social security benefits by 15 percent.

The 1970 social security bill increasing payments by 5 percent and providing for cost-of-living benefit increase and increasing to \$2,000 the outside earnings limitation.

To provide for a 15-percent increase in benefits for retired railroad workers.

To authorize \$4.8 billion for housing and urban development programs.

To provide additional funds for the home mortgage market.

Antismut mail bill prohibiting such mailings to minors under 17.

To prohibit use of mails for unsolicited salacious advertising.

To provide tax relief to most taxpayers and to close many tax loopholes. Major provisions included: Increase in personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$750 over the next 3 years, reduction of income tax surcharge to 5 percent through June 30, 1970—presently re-

moved altogether—reduced depletion allowance on gas and oil from 27.5 to 22 percent, increased in stages the maximum standard deduction for taxpayers who do not itemize from the present 10 percent of income with a \$1,000 ceiling to 15 percent with a \$2,000 ceiling, fully effective in 1973.

Calling for humane treatment and release of prisoners of war held by North Vietnam.

Supporting President Nixon's effort to negotiate a "just peace" in Vietnam.

I voted against the following bills:

Pay increase for Members of Congress, which was untimely, ill-advised and which contributed to inflation.

Agriculture Act of 1970, which provided little progress toward market-oriented agriculture and high payments to wealthy farmers with little special aid to low-income farmers. My amendment to limit payments to \$20,000 was defeated on a close vote.

Radio-TV campaign spending bill which would discriminate against broadcasters and against minor candidates.

Resolution disapproving reorganization of the executive branch, which would have prohibited President Nixon from streamlining the executive branch.

Commission to study proposals for national holidays.

To authorize each Member of the House to hire an additional staff member.

To authorize \$475 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission which excluded most of the United States from benefits.

To authorize a new sports arena in Washington, D.C.

To permit retirement of U.S. judges at full pay after 20 years of service.

Proposal to override President Nixon's veto of hospital construction bill which was inflationary and would deny the President the right to manage the budget.

Senate amendment to add \$587.5 million in urban renewal funds.

Local withholding tax bill under which Federal Government would serve as tax collector for cities.

TAX EXCLUSION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FIREMEN

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would permit a \$200 tax exclusion per month for law enforcement officers and firemen nationwide. The proposal would give these deserving public servants up to a \$35 per month reduction in Federal income taxes and in effect provide an "instant pay increase." The rationale of this bill is that it is justified as the equivalent of combat pay, a position, unfortunately, that becomes more apparent daily.

When I originally introduced this proposal in 1967, I did not include firemen. Indeed, the record with reference to the

service of firemen during civil disturbances indicates that they are subject to equal danger.

ELECTORAL REFORM TIEUP

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the importance and need for electoral reform, I thought the following editorial from the Evening Star yesterday was a very good analysis of the problem. I supported the amendment to provide for the direct presidential elections as I believe it reflects the direct relationship between American citizens and the Presidency which has grown in recent years. The Presidency is the last major office in the country for which the people do not have a direct vote. The American people want this amendment; it is time to stop talking and act.

The editorial follows:

ELECTORAL REFORM TIEUP

From the standpoint of popularity with the public, probably no measure before Congress is the equal of the proposed amendment for direct election of presidents. If the polls are to be credited, about 80 percent of the people regard the electoral college system—at least as it is now functioning—as an absurdity. They want a new process in effect before the 1972 election.

This sentiment is recognized in Congress, and by the President. Still as pre-adjournment pressures mount, the proposal is locked in a procedural vise. Last Thursday, a motion to shut off the Senate debate on it and bring it to a vote failed, and its fate now hangs on a thin thread. We hope the cloture decision will be reversed, and that the President will choose this moment to enter the battle so that that can be achieved.

The cloture motion fell six votes short of the required two-thirds approval. Thirty-six senators held out against breaking the impasse. Perhaps some of them voted that way out of devotion to the principle of extended debate, rather than because of strong feelings against the amendment. In any case, the proposition is being subjected to a double-barreled test.

Since a constitutional amendment must finally receive a two-thirds majority for Senate approval, it seems unfair that this one is having to buck a preliminary two-thirds hurdle just to be advanced for a vote on its merits. While there is a strong case for the Senate's traditional filibuster sanction, as a brake on ill-considered plunges, surely on this question the requirement for a two-thirds majority on the finished product should be sufficient. Senator Mansfield correctly observed last week that the forcing of a cloture vote on the amendment "abuses the clear purpose and interest of the Senate rules" by imposing "an additional, unnecessary, uncalled-for roadblock."

Senator Bayh, the chief sponsor of the electoral proposal, has assured that he is willing to consider compromises on both content and procedures. Hence senators wishing to alter or even eliminate some parts of the Bayh resolution, including the controversial runoff election provision, will have opportunities to do so if the whole effort doesn't die aborning under the filibuster.

There still may be time for ratification of the amendment by the states so it can be applied in 1972, if the Senate moves speedily. It already has been approved, almost five-

to-one, by the House. The Senate probably will settle the matter one way or the other within the next week, when a second vote on cloture is called. It should shut off the debate, consider revisions and bring the proposal to a vote. A minority should not be allowed to—indeed should not want to—foreclose a decision on an issue of this magnitude.

THE FIRST OPTION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Adm. C. Turner Joy said:

It has been said that in war there is no substitute for victory. It can also be said that in debating with the Communists, there is no substitute for the imperative logic of military pressure.

Last week I introduced a resolution calling for a formal declaration of war against the North Vietnamese Communists unless they release all American prisoners of war and start moving their armies back within their own borders. There were two major reasons for this resolution. The Communists will hardly be likely to concede anything if they are sure that all they have to do is prolong the conflict and in the end attain all their primary objectives. With the Senate debating whether or not we should surrender South Vietnam, by way of the Hatfield-McGovern amendment, which failed by only 16 votes, the Communists surely did not feel compelled to make major compromises. With the House discussing a resolution for possible Communist defeat, they may be more amenable.

The very concept of victory has been lost in the shuffling of options. It is necessary to revive this prospect in the light of the present situation, and to have our citizens reflect upon this possibility. Victory is not only possible but by far the most desirable solution to the whole question of what to do in Vietnam. It is the first option.

Three principal reasons have been advanced for not seeking a military victory: First, that it would provoke the Soviet Union; second, that the war is primarily a civil war along the lines of a popular uprising, and therefore, beating the North Vietnamese would not end the conflict; and third, that a strategy of victory would "polarize" our Nation and be divisive. As time wore on, a fourth reason crept in. People began confusing the fact that we were not trying to win with the notion that it was impossible to win.

Actually, it is almost inconceivable that the United States cannot defeat North Vietnam. If we truly cannot now achieve a military victory over North Vietnam, then why to the same people who tell us this also advocate drastic cuts in funds for national defense? If our military forces have deteriorated to the point where they are not capable of beating the North Vietnamese, where, one might ask, would further cuts leave us? Safe and sound, say the same voices, although usually in different speeches. Fortunately, most Americans understand that will and capability, while interrelated,

are not the same. We have the capability; it is our will which is paralyzed.

The second and third major reasons adduced in opposition to victory have been clearly disproved by time itself. No one seriously contends any more that the war is some type of spontaneous revolt. Neither will anyone contend today that the policy of prolonging the war through refusing to win it has not been internally divisive. The ambiguous, uncertain, and hesitating nature of our policy has resulted in what amounts to a revolutionary situation in our own Nation.

Once our citizens, especially the young people, saw that we were not attempting to win the war, they began to wonder why. The LBJ administration, confounded by its own rhetoric and afraid either to win or to lose, could give them no cogent answer. Others did. They said we did not win because we were embarrassed to be fighting an unjust war; that our uncertainty and hesitation stemmed from guilt. Their logic, if not their facts, sounded a bit more reasonable than sophistries about limited war, gradual escalation, and flexible response. Even a child could see the gaping fallacies inherent in these theories—and young people did.

When one's cause is just and he has the capability, he presses on to victory. Our cause is just; we have the capability; it is time to press on. The minority, whom this might alienate, must not be allowed to determine our policy.

Fear of the Soviet Union is the major stumbling block in our path today as it was 5 years ago. The substance behind this reason for not winning has increased because Soviet power has increased. The Soviets moved into high gear in nuclear rocket production as we muddled along in neutral in Vietnam. Today, Secretary of Defense Laird says our strength is "at the edge of prudent risk."

Although the substance behind this rationale itself is as spurious as it was when first advanced back around 1950. The Soviets will not attack until they are assured a probability of success. When their strategic capability gives them the prospect of success, they will attack—but not until then. To launch an attack on the United States in response to our victory in Vietnam would be, in effect, to allow us to pick their time for attack—a time before they are assured success. This they would hardly allow us to do. Soviet Minister of Defense, Marshal Grechko, realizes full well that "the edge of prudent risk" does not mean that we have fallen into the valley of probable defeat.

It will take courage to strive for victory. It will be a disaster if we do not. If the majority of Americans who have always been for victory give their support to a formal declaration of war, I am sure our leadership will respond. The forces of surrender have taken the initiative and gained the upper hand. This must be changed. For the sake of our men suffering in enemy prisons; in memory of our good men who have died young fighting for the freedom of others; for the future of our Nation, we must work to win. We must promote the first option—Victory.

The joint resolution follows:

H.J. RES. —

Joint resolution providing for a formal declaration of war against the Government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam) unless certain conditions are met, and for other purposes.

Whereas the Communist dictatorship controlling the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam has for the past fifteen years been waging a ruthless war of aggression against the peoples of Indochina, in which at least three-fourths of a million men, women and children, including over 50,000 American soldiers, have lost their lives; and

Whereas the above-mentioned Communist dictatorship has shown itself to be barbarous and repulsive to all civilized men by, among other things, its inhumane treatment of United States servicemen captured in the line of duty and its failure to abide by the Geneva Convention regarding the treatment of prisoners of war, to which it is a signatory; and also by its continuing acts of savage terror against the civilian population of the Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos; and

Whereas the above-mentioned Communist dictatorship has, in the face of continued efforts by the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to arrange for an end to the bloodshed with something less than abject and complete surrender of the noncommunist nations under attack, shown itself absolutely opposed to any cessation of its aggressive activities short of the complete conquest of its intended victims; and

Whereas in the face of continuing arrogance, intransigence, and unremitting hostility the United States has shown restraint to the point of severe injury to its own national interests; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, unless within thirty days following passage of this joint resolution the government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam indicates a genuine desire for peace in Southeast Asia by (1) the release of all United States prisoners of war and also (2) the large scale withdrawal of its fighting forces back within its own territorial limits indicating to the satisfaction of the President of the United States that their aggression is ended the state of war between the United States and the Communist government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire air, naval, and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Communist government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. The sending of any ground, naval or air forces to the assistance of the above-mentioned Communist government after the passage of this joint resolution will be regarded as an act of war against the United States itself.

VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in May 1968, Cpl. Gary Daffin, of Dundalk, Md., wrote a very moving letter to his mother in which he describes Viet-

nam and his own reasons for being there:

This country is so beautiful, it's hard to put into words. Winding rivers play touch with mountains that shoot up out of the valleys as if someone had come along and carved them . . . Small towns are spotted along the winding river that flows so gently towards an even bigger body of water . . .

Death is not uncommon in this country or in any other country. True, there's more during war, but men give their lives because it's what they believe in. This is what I want to put across. I am here because I believe in what I am doing. I believe in fighting for what is right. I would do it again if I had to . . .

I have only seven months left, but in these last seven months a lot can happen. I will be home, I promise that . . . to see all the loved ones again that I have missed so dearly . . .

There's only one more thing I wish to say and that is, that this country has two sunsets. It's so beautiful that it's beyond words. I miss you all and will be home soon.

This was the last letter that Mrs. Daffin received from her son. In September Corporal Daffin died in Vietnam from wounds received from hostile mortar fire.

MAKING CONGRESS MORE EFFECTIVE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Economic Development released today its study of the Congress.

While the House has just completed its action on legislative reorganization the CED report entitled "Making Congress More Effective," will, I hope, give aid to the effort to get the bill passed by the other body.

Chapter 1 of the report, "Why Changes Are Imperative," outlines well the reasons for both this study and the actions of the House in passing the legislative reorganization title.

I commend this chapter along with the summary of the recommendations to all in both Houses for your study and attention:

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: WHY CHANGES ARE IMPERATIVE

This country is in the throes of change. Congress, like every institution, must respond to transformations wrought by science, technology, and education upon every aspect of urban and rural life. Business concerns of all kinds, universities, even religious organizations and the family are subject to continuous modification. There is now a rising insistence that government must also adapt itself to deal more effectively with new and challenging conditions.

As its burdens have grown in range and scope far beyond anything foreseen only a few years ago, a competent and vital Congress is more essential than ever before. The formulation of public policy is a joint responsibility shared with the Executive Branch, but in the final analysis it is Congress that adopts (or rejects) legislation that determines the health of the economy, the national security, the character of life both urban and rural, the condition of the envi-

ronment, and levels of generational, racial, and other group tensions. The people of this country have every right to insist upon a responsive and effective Congress.

This Committee has recommended modernization—legislative, executive, and judicial—of state and local governments to permit them to solve currently pressing problems.¹ We have also called attention to the urgent necessity for better personnel, budgetary, and other management practices in the federal establishment.² Our concern in this statement is with the tasks and burdens of Congress, and with growing doubts about its ability to master them. Without improvements at all levels and in all branches of government the federal system cannot cope successfully with the swift pace of social, economic, and political change.

The quality of management throughout the federal establishment depends heavily upon Congress. The nature of basic legislation, appropriations, and legislative oversight can either impair an agency's effectiveness or make successful operation possible. Congress exercises powers in fields far beyond policy determination. It decrees organizational patterns, administrative standards, personnel arrangements, program priorities, and pay levels. The most able of executives cannot manage effectively without Congressional support. Congress is, therefore, the keystone in the governmental arch and deserves strong public support in its modernization efforts.

The Member of Congress has a very different job today from that of years past. Service is full-time, year-round, in contrast to the part-time approach of the early 1930's when, during the depths of a serious depression, Congress was in session only nine or ten months of each two-year term. The average Congressional district now contains more inhabitants than any of the original 13 states, except Virginia. The activities of the national government conducted in each district exceed those of the entire federal establishment throughout the administration of the first President. The range of knowledge expected of each Member expands steadily, while the burden of continuous campaigning grows. The hard work of dedicated Members commands sympathetic understanding and justifies a determined effort to eliminate needless workloads so that the energies of Congress may become more productive.

Each Member of Congress provides a channel for communication between the people of his constituency and the seat of government in Washington, D.C. There is a vital two-way flow of information—on governmental affairs to the citizenry and on public opinion to the nation's policy makers. Those aggrieved by actions of the bureaucracy or bewildered by governmental complexities may secure guidance from the Member in obtaining pertinent facts or finding the proper forum for a specific problem. In devising corrective measures, legitimate complaints form grist for the legislative mill.

Our primary concern in this statement, however, is with the functioning of Congress as a collective body. In this perspective, Congress has two primary responsibilities. One is to reconcile or compromise divergent interests so that the informed will of the people may find expression in legislation. The other is to review program execution and agency performance in order to check tendencies

¹ *Modernizing Local Government* (July 1966), *Modernizing State Government* (July 1967), *A Fiscal Program for a Balanced Federalism* (June 1967), *Reshaping Government in Metropolitan Areas* (February 1970).

² *Improving Executive Management in the Federal Government* (July 1964), *Budgeting for National Objectives* (January 1966), *Financing a Better Election System* (December 1968).

toward improper exercise of executive authority or perpetuation of obsolete programs. Both functions are indispensable, but Congress as it now operates is unable to fulfill either satisfactorily.

Too many committees and subcommittees fragment broad policy issues into bits and pieces of legislation. There is inadequate communication between separate, independent power centers. The coordination essential to consistent and coherent decision making is lacking. Review of agency performance is badly subdivided and variable in quality, often focused upon trivia while neglecting evaluative inquiries into over-all achievement. Continuous feedback review of agency progress on approved projects and ongoing programs is the exception rather than the rule.

Congress has not brought its methods, approaches, or structures into conformity with the dynamics of change. Consequently—and regrettably—public attitudes toward Congress as a collective body are increasingly critical. The esteem accorded to individual Members cannot obscure widespread discontent with the institutional performance of Congress.

We believe that the growing difficulties encountered by Congress stem not from within but from new and powerful forces in a swiftly changing world outside legislative halls. The issues facing Congress today are far more challenging in range and intensity than those of 1900, or even of 1940. The difference in degree is of such magnitude that it has become a difference in kind. This is the basic justification for modifying the ways Congress has been doing its work and for the specific proposals advanced in this statement.

The changes visible in three primary fields of policy formation illustrate the critical need for better Congressional mechanisms to cope with the effects: (1) maintaining a healthy economy, (2) solving the interconnected problems of rural and urban America, and (3) setting policy for national security and foreign affairs. If the limitations of space permitted, other examples with comparable implications could be cited. None of these responsibilities can be adequately met within the existing framework.

EXPANDING RESPONSIBILITIES

Maintaining a healthy economy involves complex, interrelated issues including price levels, the availability of credit, interest rates, unemployment, the balance of international payments, and federal budgets. By adopting the Employment Act of 1946, Congress placed upon the government of the United States major responsibility for actions to sustain the health of the national economy.

The magnitude of this function grows geometrically from decade to decade. The annual gross national product (GNP), about \$17 billion in 1900, now approaches \$1,000 billion. Federal revenues were half a billion or 3 per cent of GNP in 1900 but are now \$200 billion, 21 per cent of GNP. State-local expenditures, \$1 billion in 1900, are over \$100 billion. Federal-state-local debt was only \$5.6 billion in 1916 and is \$500 billion. Federal aids to state and local governments that were \$7 million in 1900 are budgeted at \$27.6 billion or 4,000 times as much today.^{*} Per capita personal income has grown from about \$200 in 1900 to approximately \$3,500 in 1969, about three and a half times as high in real terms.

Complexity and interdependence have made the health of this expansive economy

^{*} The comparisons shown should be read in full recognition of changes in the purchasing power of the dollar. It takes about \$5 to buy what \$1 would obtain in 1900, and the ratio is about four to one between 1968 and 1916. Many kinds of goods and services now in use were not available for purchase in 1900, or in 1916.

vulnerable to dangers different in many ways from those of the 1920's or 1940's. In recognition of this challenge Congress has strengthened executive capabilities by establishing the Federal Reserve System (1913), the Bureau of the Budget (1921), and the Council of Economic Advisers (1946). Congress gave approval in 1970 to reorganization of the Executive Office of the President involving establishment of a Domestic Policy Council and a revised Office of Management and Budget. These measures have given the Executive Branch greater ability to develop and coordinate comprehensive economic plans; there were no tools to build such plans in earlier years.

But Congress retains a vital role in these matters. Executive plans and programs lack substance without statutory confirmation, even though Congressional response often takes the form of modification rather than outright rejection or adoption. Yet except for creation in 1946 of its Joint Economic Committee (which lacks power to sponsor legislation), Congress has not equipped nor structured itself to deal coherently, consistently, or effectively with wide-range economic issues.

The condition of the national economy affects every citizen of the United States. Since the federal government has assumed major responsibility for that condition, Congress must organize itself and its procedures to discharge its resulting obligations properly and in timely fashion.

The "urban crisis" deserves high priority in Congressional deliberations. Concern is commonly focused upon grave problems typical of the central sections of the nation's great cities, but the urban crisis results, in a basic sense, from phenomenal changes in American agriculture.

Fifty years ago, 30 per cent of the country's population lived on farms; now less than 5 per cent do so. In other words, one-fourth of the whole population (or about 50 million persons) has shifted from farms to cities—most commonly to metropolitan areas—in the brief span of half a century. The basis of this migration is technology built upon research, leading to explosive growth in productivity.

Paradoxically, this triumph of technology has led to acute economic distress in rural America; the swift decline in farm population has had a catastrophic impact on thousands of rural trading and service communities. Almost every statistical indicator shows the rural population, both farm and non-farm, at a serious comparative disadvantage: poverty levels, personal incomes, mortality and morbidity rates, and educational attainments. There is a "rural crisis," now in its sixth decade, paralleling the "urban crisis" and closely intertwined with it.

The migration of tens of millions of dislocated and disadvantaged persons from rural to urban America is reflected in the congested slums and ghettos of the large central cities, and the effects reach out increasingly to their suburbs. Most inner cities are plagued by poverty, high unemployment and underemployment, family disorganization, high crime rates, racial tensions, environmental hazards, substandard housing, high death and disease rates, and weak educational and transportation systems. In large metropolitan areas the contrasts between concentrations of disadvantaged minority groups in central cities and concentrations of privileged whites in suburban enclaves aggravate these conditions.

The public looks to Congress for solutions to the nation's ills, whether urban, rural, or suburban. The states, and the local governments which are their creatures, are theoretically responsible for corrective actions. But too often the states are operationally impotent to use their legal powers, and local governments are so handicapped by structural and fiscal weaknesses that very few

communities are able to deal effectively with issues of such range and scope. The resulting vacuum has stimulated federal activity on many new fronts.

This activity has been fragmented among many agencies in the Executive Branch. In January 1969, President Nixon pointed out that:

"The American National Government has responded to urban concerns in a haphazard, fragmented, and often woefully short-sighted manner . . . What we have never had is a policy: coherent, consistent positions as to what the National Government would hope to see happen; what it will encourage, what it will discourage."

The Executive Branch is not alone in its need to reconcile and coordinate divergent policy interests. The Congressional committee structure subdivides responsibility for urban affairs to an extreme degree. This is visible in the functions of the 268 Congressional subcommittees, over half of which claim some share in urban policy issues. (See Appendix.) There is no central focal point in either chamber where consideration may be given to urban problems in their entirety, nor where a suitable allocation of available resources may be made.

The Congressional approach to the issues involved in rural decline has also been narrowly focused, in this case on agriculture as such. The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and the House Agriculture Committee are mainly concerned with those farms that continue to operate. Together with the Department of Agriculture, they form a powerful triangular decision-making complex, with large-scale agriculture the chief beneficiary of some \$4.5 billion in annual "farm income stabilization" payments. Meanwhile, scores of thousands of small "family farms" are abandoned each year. The collateral effects of farm out-migration are largely disregarded by this powerful farm triangle.

Other committees are concerned with various aspects of the agricultural transformation: the Appropriations Committees; the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees; the Public Works Committees; the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees; the Banking and Currency Committees; the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate; and the Education and Labor Committee of the House. This partial enumeration goes far to explain the continuing lack of a comprehensive national policy for the improvement and advancement of life in rural America. Congressional committee patterns are no more designed to deal with the "rural crisis" than with the problems of the cities.

As matters stand, Congress cannot hope to formulate any overall program for the rehabilitation of either urban or rural America. Congress should make the structural and procedural changes necessary to devise policies designed to relieve the urban crisis and to foster and utilize the human and material resources of rural America more effectively. All Members, whether from metropolitan or rural districts, should share in development of these policies. Congress should not limit itself to piecemeal response to Executive initiatives in these crucial fields.

International security and worldwide economic interdependence confront Congress with a complex of problems new to the decades since World War II. The enormous peace-keeping operations of the United States, the swift growth of private investments abroad, the vast expansion in world trade, the growth of an international monetary system, the provision of development aid through national and international institutions, and much wider contacts through travel and communications have all brought home to Americans the vital importance of a constructive foreign policy.

Continuous tensions have led this country over the past quarter-century to incur severe casualties, to spend over \$1 trillion on defense, to assign to the Department of Defense title of land acreage larger than the combined areas of eight of the 50 states, to maintain 25 times as many men in uniform as in 1900, and to absorb in military procurement up to one-seventh of all value added by manufacturing. The implications of nuclear power place this nation's foreign relations and the quality of its diplomacy in a totally new context. The public interest ought never to be subordinated to special or parochial interests in fields of such importance.

The initiative here is in the Executive Branch, but the ultimate authority over foreign relations and military operations resides in Congress. Primary jurisdiction in these matters is divided among six separate Congressional committees; nine more play important secondary roles; and still others have marginal jurisdiction. These arrangements make it extremely difficult for Congress to fix coherent and consistent policies governing the nation's role in world affairs. The history of foreign aid legislation—both civil and military—presents one dramatic case in point. Continuing disagreements over various weapons systems provide others.

Any parliamentary body making decisions on such complex and critical matters is handicapped by a relative lack of expertise. Few, if any, Members can claim thorough personal mastery of the highly sophisticated subject areas upon which modern diplomacy and defense depend. Qualified and unbiased advisory sources in these fields are not readily available. Congressional limitations are magnified by comparable deficiencies at key leadership levels in the Executive Branch.

The President has access to few sources of expert advice outside the Department of Defense. The Bureau of the Budget has never been suitably staffed to subject Defense requests to the kind of intensive review applied to other expenditures. Congress has had to cope with Defense budget recommendations based almost entirely on personal negotiations between the Secretary of Defense and the President—without adequate staff or research aids to estimate the nation's needs independently. The public interest calls for judicious use of the \$75 billion entrusted annually to the defense establishment. It is the joint responsibility of the President and Congress to make sure that security objectives are attained at the least possible cost.

The realities of American politics put pressures on Members to obtain economic benefits for their constituents from the flow of defense dollars. These pressures frequently operate against the interests of the nation at large. Public confidence is weakened by the selection process for membership on key committees. Members whose states or districts contain major defense installations or plants are often appointed to the Armed Services Committees or to Appropriations subcommittees concerned with defense. Hence, these committees tend to be dominated by Members whose constituencies are directly affected by the size and distribution of the armed forces, by the extent and nature of defense procurement, or by both. The fact that their constituencies have so great an economic interest in their decisions arouses great skepticism about the objectivity of these committees.

There is a primary need for Congress to consider diplomatic and military aspects of foreign policy in a unitary context, not as separate subjects. Furthermore, the public interest urgently requires structural and procedural changes that will check tendencies to foster local interests at the county's expense. At stake is, quite literally, the nation's survival.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Facing issues of unprecedented magnitude and scope, Congress—like most other human institutions—is reluctant to modify its long-established, habitual ways of doing business. Continuing delay in modernization of Congressional structures and procedures, however, will surely be injurious to the national interest and can lead only to further erosion in influence and effectiveness of the Legislative Branch.

Recognizing the complexities and obstacles standing in the way of change, we have limited the recommendations in this statement to proposals designed to overcome weaknesses without undertaking a complete remodeling of the present system. No further reference is made, for example, to the possible substitution of multi-member for single-member districts in the House of Representatives, or to changes that would require amendment of the Constitution.

In the following chapters we advocate significant modifications that are both pragmatic and immediately practicable, dealing with three separate though interrelated fields of action. *First*, we urge fundamental improvements in the Congressional handling of fiscal-economic decisions. *Second*, we propose readjustment of the entire committee structure and of the procedures associated with it. *Third*, we strongly support divestment by Congress of inessential and unsuitable administrative burdens, together with other measures that would strengthen public confidence in its objectivity.

The present Congressional approach to fiscal affairs is indefensible. When budget decisions are extended long past the beginning of the fiscal year for which they are intended, when there is no Congressional mechanism to tie revenues and appropriations into a coherent pattern, when no legislative procedure exists to initiate actions based on a comprehensive view of the economy, then national stability is endangered. When Congress permits its evaluation and oversight of programs to be carried out in ways that allow the continuance of obsolete programs and the wasteful management of potentially useful ones, then both the credibility and the effectiveness of the entire national government are seriously harmed. To correct these conditions we recommend that:

Means for comprehensive review of the annual budget be established and used, relating total revenues and expenditures to the state of the economy.

Annual authorizations be discontinued; instead, authorizations should be made along program and project lines, fully funded, for minimum terms of four years.

Evaluation of program performance, in terms of objectives as well as dollars, be heavily stressed.

The federal fiscal year be changed to coincide with the calendar year, so that appropriations may always precede expenditures.

Congress establish and observe deadline dates for both authorizations and appropriations.

The committee system has the crucial role in Congressional decisionmaking. As it now operates, however, decisions are fragmented; problems demanding a broad policy approach are handled in piecemeal fashion and hence poorly by the many autonomous committees and their innumerable subcommittees. These committees carry out much of their work in obscurity or secrecy which can be and often is maintained—even against the inquiries of other Members—in defiance of the elementary tenets of democracy.

Through the assignment system that determines their makeup, and by means of restrictive procedures, committees can be dominated by small groups of Members with

special interests held in common—or even by the desires of a powerful and autocratic chairman. These conditions prevent Congress from making open and effective response to urgent national needs. Therefore, we recommend:

Fewer standing committees, with broader jurisdiction for each.

Better use of joint and select committees. More flexible subcommittee arrangements, with rotating chairmanships.

Abandonment of seniority as the sole criterion in selecting committee chairmen.

Democratized procedures, with many more open hearings.

Better informational and analytical resources for committees.

There is no doubt that there has been an erosion of popular respect for Congress. This is injurious to the nation as well as to Congress as an institution. Citizens are now insisting that every level and branch of government become more responsive, more open to the demands of all the people, more attuned to current priorities, and less bound by traditional approaches or endless red tape. In the face of these trends Congress has appeared to fold in upon itself. Its endless involvement with minor details of administrative management and its open and attentive solicitude for special interest groups contrast with its negative reaction to many concerns of the general public. Prompt action on several fronts is needed to restore public trust. Hence, we propose:

Relinquishment of detailed direction of all administrative functions unsuited to management by a legislative body or by any committee of such a body.

Stronger "Codes of Ethics."

Assurance of majority rule on major issues in both chambers.

Installation of modern voting procedures which would eliminate the secrecy surrounding teller, standing, and voice votes in the House of Representatives.

Thorough reform of campaign finance, with full disclosure and tax incentives for contributions.

Prohibition of committee meetings while sessions of the chamber are in progress.

Acceptance of these recommendations would do much to improve Congressional operations and to enhance the Congressional image. Fortunately, there are no legal barriers to their adoption; changes in House and Senate rules, modification of outmoded customs, or statutory enactments in some few cases, would suffice. The Members can make the necessary changes whenever the majority chooses. Congress has considered and debated many of them in recent years, so far to little or no avail. It is now time to correct obvious weaknesses. The defects of Congress are not congenital; its wounds are self-inflicted.

VICE PRESIDENT KY ENTITLED TO FREE SPEECH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, certainly no thinking American can find anything wrong with victory. That is why many concerned and informed Americans are wondering why all the frantic efforts to prevent and discourage Vice President Ky from attending the March for Victory in Washington on October 3.

Mr. Ky is the elected representative of a war ally for whose people's free-

dom and independence, over 50,000 American men have thus far given their lives. For certain, our men who so died would be repulsed to think that a leader of such an ally would not be enthusiastically welcomed and entitled to free speech in our country.

What can it be that the vocal few so fear from the message of Mr. Ky? Our people have been exposed repeatedly to the views, the ambitions, and the line of the Communist enemy at Hanoi through her dear American friends and experts. Why should our people not hear from an ally?

Some would suggest that this is the wrong time for Mr. Ky's appearance. Pray tell, with mounting American casualties each week, when is the right time to talk about ending the war in Vietnam? After all, ending a war by victory is also an alternative—in fact, it is one of the few alternatives that our leadership has never tried nor has set to pursue.

We of the United States have a Vice President who has been highly vocal and for his forthright speeches is admired by a great number of Americans. Why should not the Vice President of Vietnam be entitled to speak his piece as best he feels represents the feelings, fears, and frustrations of his people?

I agree with Mr. Ky's right to come to our country and be received with the respect due any sovereign friend or representative. In fact I dispatched a letter to him encouraging his visit and participation. Recently, I joined with 136 fellow Democratic Congressmen in an appeal to reason in condemning efforts to disrupt campaign speeches by President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW.

I am confident that if all sides of a question can be heard, the American people will decide wisely. Without a free exchange of ideas, there can be no free society. In such exchange lies the ultimate worth of our democratic system.

NEW ENGLAND AND THE FUEL OIL MERRY-GO-ROUND: PAY HIGHER PRICES OR FACE SEVERE WINTER SHORTAGES

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper report this week indicates it is the aim of the American oil producers' lobby to hold New Englanders as hostages to force unreasonable fuel oil price increases during the coming winter, or allow shortages to develop which might result in cold homes, power shortages, closed schools, and disrupted industries with resulting job losses.

This cruel ploy was revealed by Columnist Jack Anderson in "The Washington Merry-Go-Round" printed in the Washington Post Tuesday, September 22, under the subheadline "Fuel Shortage." Columnist Anderson wrote of the latest oil merry-go-round that New Englanders can expect this winter as follows:

FUEL SHORTAGE

Industry officials have told Paul McCracken, the President's chief economic adviser, that coal, gas and oil prices should be permitted to rise sharply. Otherwise, they warned that producers would not have enough incentive to prevent fuel shortages across the country this winter.

McCracken heads an interagency task force which is investigating the threat of fuel shortages. This threat has been aggravated by the Middle East crisis and the antipollution campaign.

There's pressure upon building owners, for example, to burn low-sulfur fuel oil. The main source is the Middle East where Arab-Israeli tensions have disrupted shipments. Utility companies have also held back construction of fuel plants because of the clamor over pollution.

Meanwhile, our natural gas reserves are dropping low. Gas producers are petitioning the Federal Power Commission for huge price increases, which they claim are necessary to encourage them to explore for more reserves.

A major strike or transportation tieup or severe winter could leave a lot of homes and buildings short of heat during the cold months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the artificial and arbitrary oil import quota system has been studied to death over the years, and the only result has been price increases and annual threats of fuel oil shortages in the Northeast.

The time has come for the administration to take positive action to alleviate these twin threats which constitutes an unjust and inequitable discrimination against millions of New Englanders.

We do not need one more study while fuel oil prices escalate and our region struggles and suffers through another frigid winter. Past studies have produced nothing more than delay until the warm air of spring returns to evaporate the crisis, and then a decision is made not to tamper with the mandatory oil import quota program in the wholly unjustified and greatly exaggerated name of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge this administration to take action, as I did in a telegram to the President on September 9, by liberalizing the oil import quota for the Northeast region this winter in an effort to alleviate the twin threats of fuel oil price increases and shortages.

I ask permission to have my telegram included at this point with my remarks, and the September 10 White House response, signed by William E. Timmons, assistant to the President, together with editorials dealing with the fuel oil crisis facing New England, taken from the Springfield Sunday Republican of September 6 and the Boston Globe today, September 24:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1970.

President RICHARD M. NIXON
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Respectfully urge you order Interior Secretary Hickel and Defense Secretary Laird take immediate steps that would assure homeowners and industries in Massachusetts and New England of adequate fuel supplies at reasonable prices during the coming frigid winter season. I suggest this can be accomplished by further liberalizing the mandatory import quotas on No. 2 fuel oil and the emergency release of Defense Department oil quota reserves. Shortages of residual oil and coal supplies has forced industries, institutions, and utilities to seek No. 2 home heat-

ing fuel, also in short supply because of Middle East crisis and shortage of jumbo tankers to make long voyage around Cape of Good Hope to East Coast ports due to Suez Canal closure. The Federal Government has the power to relieve the people of Massachusetts and New England of this unjust burden on their comfort and their pocketbooks. The mandatory import controls on home heating oil are artificial and arbitrary. Existing lack of flexibility in their administration serves no legitimate national purpose, but merely constitutes an unjust and inequitable discrimination against millions of Americans in the Northeast. If these proposals are not implemented to alleviate the fuel oil crisis, the alternative will be oil rationing and price controls for New England this winter.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 10, 1970.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: I would like to thank you for your September 9 telegram to the President regarding the national energy situation and the possible fuel shortage in the New England area.

A committee, under the chairmanship of Chairman McCracken of the Council of Economic Advisers, is now engaged in a study of all aspects of the fuel situation. We believe that the studies conducted by this committee will result in specific recommendations for administrative and, to the extent necessary, legislative action. You may be assured that a high priority has been assigned to this problem.

With cordial regard,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican,
Sept. 6, 1970]

FUEL-SHORT REGION

What may have been regarded in the past as a political agitation for lower fuel oil prices in the Northeast has emerged as something quite different. It is, obviously, not political and not a matter of cheaper fuel. The objective is fair treatment for consumers in the New England region, who face a shortage of heating oil at any price.

In the first of three regional hearings by the Governor's Emergency Commission at Springfield's city hall Thursday, public officials from the western counties colored the fuel picture black. Prices are rising sharply as supplies become scarce, it was reported. Industrial heating oil, on which much of the area's electric power supply depends, is in particularly short supply. Natural gas shortages are a problem for some industries.

But the pressure is also on home heating oil, the price of which has gone up—and which reportedly is being used by some suppliers to thin the heavier industrial oil. The prospect of fuel rationing in the coming winter, to say nothing of power brownouts, is disturbingly real.

Basically, the problem is a conflict between the interests of the domestic oil producers, who have been supported generally by both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, and the New England states, which have no oil refineries or gas supplies of their own and are remote from the production areas. The cost, and sometimes the inadequacy, of transportation has long been reflected in the high prices New Englanders have had to pay for fuel—and, indirectly, for steam-generated electric power.

Hopes of remedying the price inequity rose a couple of years ago when Occidental Petroleum Corp. announced plans to build a refinery at Machiasport, Me., which would process imported crude oil. But it was neces-

sary for the state of Maine to apply for federal authority to establish a free trade zone in that state to free the imports of customs limitations. Also, the company needed permission, under the federal oil import quota program, to receive shipment of foreign crude oil. Neither application has succeeded.

The entire proposal was fought strenuously by the domestic oil industry, which cited "national security" as one reason to protect the home market against competition from abroad. Another reason was that the development of yet-untapped oil reserves in this country should be encouraged.

While the administration has given lip service to abandonment of the 11-year-old oil import quota system—and indeed seemed ready to replace it with a stepped-up tariff program—the picture changed abruptly in mid-August. The key was the position of the President's oil policy committee, which first recommended replacement of the quota system, then reversed itself—apparently on the strength of "national security" in the light of the Middle East situation.

(The Department of Interior, reporting on a study done for it a year ago, said that with removal of the quotas the United States could store ample oil for emergency purposes at much less cost to the nation than accrues from enforcement of the quotas. The cost to Americans because of the quotas was estimated at \$7 billion to \$8 billion annually.)

For now, the only apparent hope of a fair deal for New England oil users is the pressure that can be brought on Congress and the administration by public groups, such as Gov. Sargent's Emergency Energy Commission and the Massachusetts Consumers' Council, by the region's own U.S. senators and representatives—and by private individuals and organizations throughout the region.

[From the Boston Globe, Sept. 24, 1970]

WE GET IT COMING—ON OIL

The quota-sheltered, tax advantaged oil industry is telling New England it may not be able to provide adequate supplies of fuel to keep power plants and industry running and schools and hospitals warm this winter.

The public is being asked to accept this state of affairs after paying artificially inflated fuel prices for 14 years under an import quota system whose purpose was said to be to protect the security of the United States' supply in the event of a national emergency.

New England's deepening energy crisis is credible evidence of the spuriousness of the national security argument and the bankruptcy of the system.

Hospitals, universities and municipalities are today without assurance of the availability, at any price, of enough residual oil to see them through the winter.

A shortage of low-sulfur fuel for the generation of electricity threatens the Oct. 1 deadline for imposition of power plant emission standards.

A 10 percent increase in the price of home heating oil is predicted for this winter, an increase above a price already too high because of import restrictions.

Of course, the situation is not entirely the government's fault. The petroleum industry apparently underestimated potential demand for its product, natural gas is in short supply, the Middle East war has produced a worldwide shortage of tanker capacity, nuclear power generation has not increased as fast as had been expected and the pollution issue has complicated the entire situation, both at sea and in the air.

Yet charges of misfeasance, malfeasance and nonfeasance seem fairly to lie against the government in this situation, and, in particular, against the Nixon Administration.

The misfeasance was in buying the phony oil industry argument on national defense

in the first place. The current crisis proves that the quota system failed to guarantee a domestic emergency supply. What it did was and is to protect the price of petroleum products against competition.

Malfeasance is an adequate description of the President's shelving of his cabinet task force report and the inclusion of a freeze-in of the oil quota system in the trade bill now before Congress. The report recommended phasing out the quotas.

And nonfeasance is about the kindest thing one can say about the unresponsiveness of the Federal authority in a situation which threatens inconvenience, hardship and even, perhaps, health hazard to this region of the country.

It is to be hoped that the White House will grant Gov. Sargent and the other New England governors a speedy and sympathetic hearing on their complaints. Such a hearing would help dispel the suspicion that the Administration has more concern for oil lobbyists than for New England homeowners and hospital patients.

But more than dialogue is needed. In a time of economic troubles, continued inflation and rising unemployment, jobs and financial stability are at stake.

The House, clearly, should knock out of the protectionist trade bill now before it, the oil import quota freeze.

The President has the power, unilaterally, to lift the quota on No. 2 home heating oil, which is now in demand not only for home heating but in industry as a low-pollutant additive and alternative to the cheaper residual oil. The prospect of industry and utilities competing with home owners for the available supply of No. 2 oil should make the home and apartment owners literally shiver.

The Administration should act to make available every possible tanker resource now, including Navy vessels in mothballs, if only to try to drive down the skyrocketing tanker charges which are blamed for a 100 percent increase in the price of residual oil here recently.

The President should use his influence to prevail upon domestic producers to switch over some refinery production from gasoline and other lighter distillates to heating oil.

With prudent respect for environmental factors, Federal policy should be to encourage construction of refinery capacity in New England, the region of the nation most dependent upon oil for warmth in winter, industrial production and power generation.

Finally, the suggestion of a legal attack in the Federal courts, not excluding a grand jury investigation of possible anti-trust aspects and a questioning of the constitutionality of the oil quota system, is recommended to the appropriate Federal and state authorities.

It is too much to expect all of these things will be done. The discouraging thing about this very worrisome situation is that, as of this morning, none of them is being done.

That this region, annually should have to go begging to its government in Washington for relief from the economic discrimination imposed upon it by national oil policy is a disgrace. Should New England encounter the crisis in energy and heating predicted by some keen observers, its citizens will know where to place the blame.

AMERICAN LEGION ASSESSMENT OF VA HOSPITAL CONDITIONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recent press reports by CBS and Life magazine,

among others, have focused public attention on conditions in our Veterans' Administration Hospitals. The Kingsbridge Veterans Hospital in the area of the Bronx, N.Y., which I have the honor to represent, was prominent in the controversy. I am pleased to see that one of the most prestigious and respected of the veterans' organizations, the American Legion, through R. B. Pitkin, the editor of the American Legion magazine, has undertaken to evaluate conditions in our Veterans' Administration Hospitals, including those at the Kingsbridge Hospital. I am impressed with the fairness of this evaluation, which closely corresponds in its conclusions to my own views. The American Legion magazine article, "The Truth About the VA Hospitals," follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE VA HOSPITALS (By R. B. Pitkin)

The American Legion has been getting distress signals from members asking if a story about the 166 U.S. Veterans Administration hospitals in the May 22, 1970, issue of Life magazine is accurate or misleading.

In a dozen pictures Life showed ten scenes in the spinal injury center of the Bronx VA hospital in New York and two in the Wadsworth VA hospital in Los Angeles. They are two of the oldest hospitals in the system, both rated inadequate by the VA and slated for eventual remodeling or replacement. Life's photos and much of its text portrayed callous neglect of paralyzed veterans, staff apathy, filth, rat infestation and disarray. VA patients were called "Our Forgotten Wounded," and Life said that to be put in a VA hospital was "An Assignment to Neglect." Paralyzed patients were shown lying exposed and mainly naked in open wards; stripped of privacy and dignity; left abandoned and undried in a shower; having to aid one another for lack of staff attention; lying with garbage pails beside what seemed to be their beds; or left helpless for "up to four hours" to be attended for enemas. This story overgeneralized and misshaped a real situation that is neither good nor typical of VA hospitals. As a generality, it better fitted the pre-WW2 VA hospitals, then run as a civil service bureaucracy that was scrapped in 1946. The Administrator of the VA, Donald E. Johnson, of Iowa, advised Life's editors that the photos were staged. Life denied it, and "staged" might suggest actors and false settings. The patients were real and the hospitals were real. But nurses, aides and patients in the spinal injury center of the old Bronx hospital have described some posing, arranging and miscaptioning, if not "staging."

Life's cover photo showed a forlorn patient sitting slumped forward and unattended in a wheelchair, hair hanging over his face, stripped to the waist in a dingy ward—the picture of despair. This view was shot once, says one nursing aid, when she was giving the paralyzed patient a bed bath. She was interrupted to have the patient posed alone before she could put on his jacket and comb his hair. But another employee says that the published photo was taken on another occasion when the patient was in the midst of being dressed, then pictured without his attendant. It appeared under the heading "Our Forgotten Wounded."

A two-page photo of the same patient, alone and apparently abandoned in a shower, was captioned "... waiting helplessly to be dried." He was waiting helplessly while a Life crew interrupted his shower, according to his attendant. The attendant said he was shampooing the patient when he was asked to step aside for a picture of just the patient. Two other attendants confirmed that description. Several patients said that being

left alone in the shower would be a rare thing.

Patients who were in the enema room of the Bronx hospital, where paralyzed patients who have lost the nerve responses of their colons must sometimes lie for hours on "Stryker frames" for an enema to work, described some other photos in the taking. An employee said that the picture-taking crew hauled a garbage pail away from a curtained corner and put it by one of the patients dozing on a Stryker frame, whose curtain was not pulled around it. The photo crew, said one patient, moved a garbage pail lid and added refuse to the pail. The patient on the near frame said he awoke to find a strange wheelchair patient offering him a cigarette, one garbage pail heaped and placed by his frame, and cameras snapping. As the photo appeared, the cigarette scene seemed to reinforce the idea that the patients could not get staff members to light cigarettes, while the garbage pails supported Life's phrase "a medical slum." Another patient said that he was awakened on his Stryker frame with an offer of a cigarette, but explained he didn't smoke. Life's caption said that these patients were "awaiting treatment" and "because of overcrowding, they must share a corner with garbage pails," and did not identify it is the enema room.

They were not awaiting treatment. The patients on frames were waiting for their enemas to work. The man offering the cigarette seemed to be truly crowding the scene and he was apparently invited in by the photo crew to offer the cigarette. The garbage pails were in the enema room because they have to be, to receive its unpleasant product which is then removed by the housekeeping department of the hospital. But some say they also collect general ward refuse.

Another Life photo heightened the idea that if the patients don't tend to one another, nobody will. It showed a wheelchair patient throwing a sheet over a bed patient, and Life explained to its readers that "... a totally crippled patient must depend on a buddy who still has the use of his arms to get a sheet thrown over him." When the picture appeared in Life the "totally crippled patient" was dismayed. He has been a paraplegic for 26 years, has full use of his arms, lives alone in an apartment, is able to take care of himself, and was then in the Bronx VA hospital temporarily for ulcer surgery. The sheet throwing, he said, was horseplay indulged in at the request of the photographer. He said he did not want a sheet and could have gotten one if he did.

Life said of quadriplegic patient Marke Dumpert, who was featured in many of its photos, that "Dumpert hopes to finish high school, and has a dream of becoming a lawyer, despite his disability. But his will to struggle has been seriously impaired by neglect and frustration."

From this it is not apparent that the Bronx VA hospital has a five-man educational therapy department or that about the time the Life story appeared Dumpert was completing six months of instruction in grammar, literature, math, social studies and science under blind staff instructor Anthony Alliverti. Dumpert sailed through with no grade under 90. He has received his New York State High School Equivalency Certificate and had admission applications in with several colleges last spring. He has learned to type and to turn pages while reading, using a mouth stick.

On these pages and on our cover are shown pictures of 41 of the VA hospitals, and there 125 more, with new ones going up. No view, either accurate or distorted, of just one section of one hospital can well serve readers as either a good or a bad portrait of the whole system. The spinal injury center in the Bronx is about 1/1250th of the whole.

The VA hospital system today is made up of (1) the dwindling remains of an old, pre-1946 system, and (2) a growing new system of some of the finest hospitals in the world.

Starting in 1946, the new system began to replace the old. In 25 years, 82 brand new hospitals have been added, either as additions or to replace older hospitals. These are, without exception, magnificent. During the same period, 31 of the older hospitals have undergone modern additions and renovations. A total of 106 of the new and the improved hospitals are rated "adequate" by the VA. It is a modest use of the word. Few if any community hospitals can match them in either their facilities or the quality of medical care they give. They are on a par with, or superior to, the hospitals of the great medical centers here and abroad. Sixty hospitals in the system are rated "inadequate" by the VA. Of them eight are rated as "obsolete" and are in line, with six more of the "inadequates," for the speediest replacement possible under the ponderous legislative and budgeting pace of the Congress. Replacing these 14 is a project that will stretch well into the 1980's at the present pace.

The Bronx hospital is among the 60 "inadequates" but not among the eight "obsoletes." It is well located for patients and to command the services of good doctors. It is poorly located to attract nurses, nursing aides, attendants, and others whose VA pay has not been up to the high living costs in New York City. The building's interior is a fright as a piece of hospital architecture. It was built as a huge Catholic orphanage between 1901 and 1903. It was taken over as a veterans hospital in 1922, and D Wing was added in 1940. Of nearly 1,000 patients on any one day, from 90 to 95 may be spinal injury cases. It is a general hospital, and includes psychiatric and tubercular patients. None of the staff there is "neglecting" the patients, but the interior design heaps inconveniences on the whole staff, which is seriously short-handed.

The devotion of this staff, from Director Dr. Abraham M. Kleinman, down, while working shorthanded... working shorthanded in an antiquated building never designed for hospital use, impresses everyone who comes to take a fair look. An aide to Senator Bob Dole, of Kansas, who went there to double check the Life story, put it in a nutshell in a brief report saying that the staff was absorbing the chief punishment of the hospital's handicaps and sparing the patients from most of it.

Many of the paraplegic patients (legs paralyzed but arms normal) speak well of their care there. Life would have rated undiluted applause had it stuck to a valid point it made about the need for more help, especially for quadriplegics, instead of charging neglect at the hospital and identifying exaggerated Bronx conditions with the whole VA system. A quadriplegic cannot move from his neck down, and there is no way that a staff can absorb the punishment that undermining inflicts upon quads. They must literally ask to have their noses scratched, to be rolled over in bed, to be attended for every least thing. They need attendants to do for them the little things that the un-paralyzed do for themselves without even thinking about it. Lacking constant attendance, they do not merely suffer physical discomfort, but mental torment. To be a beggar to have your nose scratched when it itches is not just itching. To have to wait even five minutes is humiliation at your helplessness.

On these pages we show a photo of John Pearo, in the Bronx hospital, a quad except for slight use of his right hand. He was provided with an electric wheelchair, with a control in his right hand. Nurse A. T. Campion, RN, who served five years on the famous international hospital training ship *SS Hope*,

asked him if he'd run his wheelchair for our camera. He toiled up and down the hall, zooming from within a fraction of an inch of one wall to a fraction of an inch of the other, wreathed in smiles. "What did the chair mean to you?" asked Miss Campion. "It gave me my liberty back," he told us. "Before then I had to scream for everything." Marke Dumpert, who cannot use either hand, now has a wheelchair run by a microswitch in his mouth.

There were not enough people in the Bronx VA hospital over the last two years to give the quads the full attendance they need, thanks jointly to a staff reduction harking back to the 1968 budget, and to recruiting problems in New York. Congressional committees got going in 1969 to raise the budget, and President Nixon pledged himself to an increase in budget and more staff last April 2.

The problem of more help is not an easy one to solve. The VA pay scale for various attendants is good for many areas of the country, but low for New York and other metropolitan areas where living costs are high. Most of the Bronx employees stay on more out of dedication and the satisfaction of the kind of service they are rendering than for the financial rewards. The place is seriously undermanned for the evening and night shifts, partly because of the difficulty of recruiting at all, partly because of unattractive hours, and partly because of insufficient budgeting by Congress.

The American Legion, other veterans organizations, and many members of Congress have loudly insisted on more adequate operating budgets, particularly for personnel and the putting into use of new medical equipment. In the May issue of this magazine, National Commander J. Milton Patrick asked every Legionnaire and Legion Post to write their Congressmen to ask them to support "sufficient VA funds to keep the high quality of care that has been famous for 20 years." He advised Legionnaires that "the start of decay" was showing "due to repeated cutbacks in staff..."

There is no way of knowing how many Legionnaires and Posts actually wrote to their legislators. Congressmen badly need evidence of grass roots support in order to front for an adequate VA budget.

Over the years, the American press has been largely apathetic or hostile to VA appropriations, and has either supported cutbacks or failed to oppose them. Some of the roots of the present difficulties within the system hark back to 1965, when President Johnson ordered a large-scale slash in the VA hospital system. The veterans organizations and many members of Congress bitterly opposed the order, and within six months President Johnson rescinded half of the slash, while putting the other half into effect. Thereafter, he supported many veterans programs, and initiated beneficial legislation, though he presided over a 1968 staff cutback that is the main cause of the present problems.

An examination of Life's issues during the six months battle in 1965 shows that it was editorially silent on the whole issue. This could be called a form of "neglect" by the press, but at least it wasn't hostility. The New York Times and some other major newspapers supported the cutbacks and characterized the opposition to them offered by the veterans organizations with the usual clichés about greedy veterans. With year-in-year-out apathy and hostility in the more influential press, it is not surprising that it is extremely difficult for Congressmen to do right by disabled veterans in the annual tugging and hauling over the federal budget. All who care should give them tangible support, which costs 6c postage.

Congress should, but seems unwilling to, take a step that would especially help situa-

tions like that in the Bronx. It should recognize differences in local living costs, and permit hospital pay scales that are pegged to a local cost-of-living index. Wherever living costs are high, VA hospitals are seriously handicapped in recruiting needed staff. With many categories of good hospital personnel in short supply everywhere, the inability to be competitive locally is a drawback to a hospital which is immediately reflected in what it can do for patients.

Much closer to the Time-Life Building in New York than the Bronx hospital is the magnificent Manhattan VA hospital, opened in 1954. It was not represented in Life's story, but it is one of the finest general hospitals on earth. Its competition for that ranking includes many of the other newer VA hospitals. But, as its Director, John Sheehan, told this writer, it is the very devil to recruit some of the needed people.

"Private hospitals simply raise the rates they charge to patients and pay what they have to for help. We are tied to a nationwide pay scale, which is pretty good in some places but not here in New York," Sheehan told us.

Nevertheless, the Manhattan hospital has to be seen to be believed. We accosted a patient in one of its sparkling halls who was just up and about after eye surgery. "Do you have any complaints about this place?" he was asked. He exploded, "Anyone who complains about this place ought to be kicked out!" We then identified ourselves as the editor of this magazine and gave him a chance to voice any gripe to 4½ million readers. He identified himself as Lawrence McShay, of Towaco, N.J., a 71st Infantry Regiment veteran of the WW2 European theater. "I mean it," he said. "Everything about this hospital is fantastic. It's my second time in. I was here three years ago, on my deathbed with pneumonia and complications, and these people saved my life." It says something when an infantryman of any war passes up a chance to gripe.

When Life accompanied its gloomy, special-effect photos with its message that assignment "to a VA hospital" is an "Assignment to Neglect," the copies circulated in Vietnam created in some of the servicemen there a dread of ever having to go to a VA hospital. Perhaps McShay's belligerent defense of the Manhattan hospital may reassure them. Certainly any veteran or serviceman who either must or may go to a VA hospital some day should not be given a bogie-man image of what awaits him there. Needless fear of the institution is not good for someone who is already sick or disabled. One's own spirits and outlook are an important part of restoration to good health, while dread and fear make sickness and disability worse.

Even the gloom of the old Bronx building and the burdens caused by its undermanning are pierced by the tenderness and devotion of the overtaxed staff, the good humor of many of the patients and their appreciation of the excellence of their medical care and training in the face of handicaps. One of the quadriplegics there who was featured in Life is back at his own request after having been transferred to another hospital in a better building.

Richard Carter is shown here in completely candid and undirected photos on pages 8 and 9 as he helps paraplegic Matt Raible break his standing-up record after two years off his feet. Carter has been a corrective therapist in the spinal injury center at the Bronx hospital for eight years. "The pay isn't too much," he says, "but helping these fellows gives you satisfactions that are hard to find in other work." Carter looks as if he might have passed up the world heavyweight championship, he is so burly and powerful. But the tenderness with which he helps Raible shines through in our candid photos of

their regular exercise session of 11 a.m., June 24.

Equally attentive to the patients is Carter's corrective therapy teammate, James Ford. On page 10 we show a posed picture of Ford exercising paraplegic Thomas Gary. The photo is posed because Gary insisted that we pose it, so proud was he of the care that Ford gives him. Beside it, we show an unposed picture of Ford putting another paraplegic through his arm-exercise paces. Ford holds up the patient's useless legs while the patient builds up his arm and abdominal strength with pushups.

Vietnam servicemen may believe a statement in Life, attributed to Marke Dumpert, that even the GI humor that men can indulge in under fire is impossible in the Bronx hospital. In Life's photos of Dumpert he appears as a tired, dispirited man. In his shower room photo he seems to be at least 40 years old. In its cover photo where his dressing was interrupted he seems forlorn and forsaken. On page 11 we show an unposed photo of Dumpert who has just cracked a joke about the Marine Corps that set the corrective therapy patients and staff roaring with laughter. That's what Carter and Raible are laughing at in the first photo of them on page 8. Dumpert is actually bright, alert, 21, good-looking, well groomed, and, when not depressed by his terrible injury or the shorthandedness of the hospital, has a sharp sense of humor. He participates in many of the regularly scheduled parties and special events that the Bronx hospital puts on for its spinal injury patients. Thus on May 22 he was one of a party of six who were taken to Aqueeduct for a day at the horseraces in a special bus with a hydraulic lift which is regularly used to take the spinal injury cases on outings in the New York area.

None of this is said to make the life of the spinal injury cases or the old Bronx hospital a bed of roses, but simply to tell it as it is, in balance. It is nothing short of a shame that these patients, especially those who cannot use their arms, do not have more attendants—but it is preposterous to pretend that they are "assigned to neglect" or that life is better under fire in Vietnam than in a VA hospital. What is better is to be whole rather than disabled, a fact without bearing on the VA hospitals.

Two other statements in Life that could dismay a prospective VA patient need attention. One was that a totally paralyzed veteran had lain on one side in bed without anyone coming to turn him over from 6 a.m. to 4 p.m. In that period there is a mandatory full day's schedule to be carried out. The statement could only have referred to the refusal of an emotionally upset patient to let anyone touch him (which has happened) and not to a refusal of the staff to offer help. The daily routine at the Bronx, as in all hospitals, gets under way at what often seems an ungodly hour of the morning for many patients. Nobody lies in bed unattended all day except at his own insistence. And when that happens it is a staff emergency than can go all the way up to the director if the head nurse cannot persuade the patient to accept care.

And again, Life said of the enema room for spinal injury cases that "patients wait up to four hours to be attended by a single aide." Things are not that bad. The whole enema process for patients with nerveless colons is a tedious, unpleasant bore for patients and attendants alike, due to the nature of the injury. Four hours is maximum for the whole process, from being wheeled to the enema room to being returned to bed after a shower. Most of this exasperating time is spent lying on the Stryker frame waiting for the enema to work, a process that not Life, Congress or the VA can speed up. Nobody waits four hours, or three hours or two

hours, or one hour "to be attended" for an enema. Two to 3½ hours is more common for the entire process. The quads learn to doze off or fall fast asleep while on the frame, as two of them have stated they were doing when awakened by the Life crew for the garbage pail, cigarette-offer scene. According to several Bronx patients, the worst delay while awaiting an enema is not traceable to staff neglect, but to the slowness of the enemas of those ahead of them to work. A nerveless colon does not react normally.

Just as the revolutionary successful treatment of tuberculosis with drugs was a VA development, so the Veterans Administration is largely responsible for the enormous advances of the last quarter-century in the care and training of paraplegics, quadriplegics, and amputees. Most WW1 quadriplegics were dead within five years of the war. Many WW2 quadriplegics are going strong today after 25 years. Nobody has ever found a way to restore the severed nerves of a broken spine. The VA cares not only for war-disabled paraplegics and quadriplegics, but for war veterans who suffer such paralysis in civilian accidents, or from polio or other causes, if they cannot afford their own care (which is astronomical in cost). It returns all of them it can to private life outside of the hospitals, and trains them for a way of life if possible. The war-disabled spinal cases receive a current \$400 a month for 100% disability, plus several hundred extra dollars in awards allowed by law because of the special severity of their injuries. Their physical retraining, special equipment, medical care, and further education are free, and special housing and automobiles are provided where applicable. There are other forms of four-way paralysis, such as that caused by multiple sclerosis. If a totally paralyzed service-connected multiple sclerosis case has a family who will keep him at home, the Manhattan VA hospital, for instance, will provide special equipment and send therapists up to 60 miles to their homes to train the family in the ways of care and to keep an eye on the condition of the patient. It will pay a non-VA therapist to do the job if the veteran lives off the beaten track of its own therapists.

Though the VA is doing things like this, and more, and is still in the forefront of world medicine, it is nevertheless hurting.

There has been a steady attrition of staff in the VA hospitals for several years. Without a murmur of protest in the press, the VA medical appropriation as passed by Congress in 1968 required a cutback to the 1966 levels. It was achieved by failing to replace thousands of employees who quit, were discharged or retired.

That made a belt-tightening inevitable, since the influx of new patients from Vietnam service guaranteed an increase of new patients over the 1966 levels.

We wish we could report that Life or any other medium of national influence had spoken up on behalf of a better medical appropriation in 1968 when the damage was done.

An attempt to increase the present VA medical budget failed in Congress last November, and again we can find no word of protest at the time in the media. There was plenty of protest from the veterans organizations and some of the key leaders in veterans affairs in the Congress, including committee chairman Olin E. Teague in the House and subcommittee chairman Alan Cranston in the Senate, as well as from some of the VA medical and administrative staffs.

Last April 2, more than a month before Life's story appeared, President Nixon told the press that he had approved an increase of \$50 million in his VA medical care budget for fiscal year 1971—which would make it \$210 million more than for 1970—and that he had authorized VA Administrator Johnson to ask Congress for an extra \$15 million for

the remainder of the 1970 fiscal year. Mr. Nixon gave the background to the press in some detail on April 2. He cited the 1968 cutback and said bluntly that it "deprived the VA's medical care program of several thousand workers in all categories of the health service professions at a time when the VA requirements for such personnel were growing steadily."

VA chief Donald Johnson was the Legion's National Commander in 1965, and led the Legion's fight against the cutback of the VA hospitals of that year. Mr. Nixon named him to head the VA in June 1969. Nixon told the press on April 2 that, after 10 months in office, Johnson had reported to him that "additional funds are required immediately if the VA is to meet its obligations to veterans requiring medical attention."

The President told the press specifically that the VA has not had the funds to open and operate enough treatment centers for the amputee and spinal injury cases coming from Vietnam, where helicopter airlift and rapid evacuation is saving many who would have died on the battlefield in earlier wars. He told them that in two separate actions he had authorized a total increase of 3,500 employees for VA medical operations, perhaps most of whom were only paper additions, due to lack of funds, until June 30.

The VA hospitals have many of the most advanced treatment centers—coronary intensive care units; cobalt cancer radiation units and even three linear accelerator high voltage radiation units that are a step beyond the older cobalt units; organ transplant centers; pulmonary emphysema units and artificial kidney (hemodialysis) units which keep patients with failed kidneys alive by "cleaning" their entire blood supply twice a week.

Many of these units have long been in operation. Some fine equipment is new but unused for lack of current operating funds. John Andreola, of the staff of this magazine, visited the Bronx hospital last winter where Director Kleinman showed him new equipment stored in crates. Congressional committees in both houses have reported more such unused equipment around the country. President Nixon told the press on April 2 that he wanted to put this equipment into use and open up more special care centers, and what was needed was funds. He pointed out that the VA has to get moving faster in these areas not only for veterans but for all Americans. Acting in partnership with many medical schools and medical centers, it has a leading role in the development of new techniques and new equipment that benefit all medical practice.

The austerity caused by the 1968 cutback to 1966 operating levels has slowed the progress of the VA's celebrated medical research programs, according to conversations that American Legion National Commander Patrick has had with the professionals of many of the hospitals. This adds weight to the President's comments about getting medical advances cracking again as well as more help for overworked patient-care staffs.

Life was silent on the President's press conference, was silent on Johnson's report to the President, was silent on Nixon's projection of VA needs and the need for funds for them. It did not mention that the Administration was seeking new funds for 1970 or 1971. It mentioned a possible increase of \$122 million by Congress for next year and was silent on Nixon's proposal to make it \$210 million while \$15 million more should augment the VA budget for the dying year.

Congress granted the extra \$15 million for the old year, and by June 30 the first 1,000-odd of the new staff members that the President sought were being hired. Rep. Teague in the House and Sen. Cranston in the Senate, with their respective committees, had, along with the veterans organiza-

tions, been working hard on an appropriations increase for more than a year.

When President Nixon's April request for an extra \$210 million for 1971 over the original 1970 VA medical budget reached the House, the House passed it with an additional \$25 million tacked on by Teague. In the Senate, Cranston's committee added another \$80 million, and the Senate approved it. At this writing the House and Senate are scheduled to come together to agree on a final figure. If the whole package goes through it would be \$315 million over 1970. The VA says that would allow it to add more than 5,000 to its hospital staffs. This should help upgrade the operating performance of the hospitals tremendously.

Perhaps the climate created by Life's article may rate some of the credit if the whole \$315 million increase survives the usual tendency to compromise House-Senate-Administration differences at a lower figure. We live in an age when exaggeration seems to get more results than a balanced view of things.

The renovation or replacement of the 60 "inadequate" hospitals is another matter. It moves slowly, so much is involved. There are hospitals in the system whose need of replacement is both more urgent and simpler than that of the Bronx, and new construction is going on all the time. The San Juan, P.R., and Long Beach, Calif., hospitals are brand new. The old Hines hospital, just outside of Chicago, became completely outmoded. A brand new Hines hospital will probably open up when you read this, or shortly thereafter. The Hines hospital on our cover is the new one, and it should take in its first patient by October at the latest, to be a sister to the magnificent Chicago VA hospital. A new hospital is going up in Tampa, Fla. It ought to, and may, absorb the patients of the old Bay Pines hospital in St. Petersburg, a few miles away.

In many respects, the St. Petersburg hospital is worse off than the Bronx. It is not air conditioned—which makes it beastly in the Florida summer—and it is better located to attract retired doctors than those in active practice, while the Tampa hospital will be tied as a partner to an existing medical institution. St. Petersburg could more easily be renovated to become a VA nursing home, and it may.

Two hospitals new to the system should open in Columbia, Mo., and San Diego, Calif., next year. The Northport, N.Y. and the Lexington, Ky., hospitals will also probably be replaced before 1971 ends. A 250 bed addition to the Seattle hospital is due soon, as is a major addition to the San Francisco hospital. General hospitals at Martinsburg, W. Va., Richmond, Va., Temple, Tex. (its old section), and Vancouver, Wash., are rated obsolete, as are psychiatric hospitals at Augusta, Ga., Gulfport, Miss. (badly damaged by hurricane Camille), Marion, Ind., and Sheridan, Wyo. Plans to replace all of these by 1980 or before, are in various stages. The Richmond replacement has the needed financial OK. Site selection—no simple matter—is being worked out for Richmond. Bids are out for a new hospital at San Antonio.

Vancouver is an example of an "inadequate" hospital with a higher priority than the Bronx. It too is old. It is also poorly located for the best medical practice and not centrally located for the potential patient population. The VA has insisted since 1946 that it wed all of the hospitals it can to a medical school or center, though this is not possible in some areas. It is these partnerships, more than anything else, that raised VA care quality from perhaps the worst in the country to world leadership over the last 25 years. The Army more often places its hospitals for its convenience. Since it commands its own personnel it can take the staff wherever it wishes. The Vancouver hospital was inherited by the VA from the Army. Its

replacement, though only in the talk stage today, will probably be located more centrally in the Vancouver-Portland population area.

The Bronx hospital benefits by affiliation with Mr. Sinal Hospital medical school and the Columbia U. dental school. The Manhattan VA hospital is tied to the NYU medical school and the city-owned Bellevue hospital, which is operated by NYU under contract. These three institutions, all physically together, attract a concentration of skilled doctors in all specialties and jointly formulate teamwork in practice and medical policy-making.

The huge Bronx building is a puzzler. VA engineers say that the outer shell is perfectly good, and the insides could be torn apart and restructured to make a fine modern hospital. There are few other land sites in New York, if any, that are as conveniently located except at huge cost. So far nobody has any answer to the question: What would you do with 1,000 Bronx patients during the time the insides were ripped out and rebuilt? In the New York area the Brooklyn hospital (another splendid one), the Manhattan hospital, and the fine East Orange, N.J., hospital could hardly take on the Bronx patients for a couple of years even if they shared the load.

There is reluctance to find some less perfect site for a new hospital and close out the Bronx, though in VA gabfests some say that seems the only choice. New York's Castle Point hospital, not far away, is another old one that is due for renovation or replacement, though plans are vague.

Of 31 older VA hospitals that were modernized rather than replaced in the rebuilding that started in 1946, all but seven are rated "adequate" today. Of the seven that are not, perhaps the Wadsworth hospital in Los Angeles is most critical. In spite of a modern addition since WW2 the whole thing is now rated "inadequate," and its older section hardly belongs in such a fine system.

It's clear that before the last 60 hospitals of this huge system are made completely modern a big pile of money must be spent, and each and every one of them will have to fight its way through the annual federal budget debate.

The future construction on which the VA is actively working or specifically planning today has a present estimated price tag of \$250 million, spread out from now into the 1980s. It's anybody's guess that with the way costs are going that could double before the work is finished.

During 1969 alone, seven new hospitals were under construction and six, not yet started, were authorized.

Referring to the entire VA hospital system, Life said that its "standards are far below those of an average community hospital" and rated its facilities for long-term treatment and rehabilitation of paralytic injuries as "generally inferior." The VA's hospitals in general are vastly superior to the average community hospital, while the VA is excellent in its long-term treatment and rehabilitation of paralytic injuries by perhaps one or two highly specialized institutions with limited capacity.

There is not a specialty in medicine practiced in the VA in which it is not accredited by the corresponding professional medical group. Nor is this surprising, in view of the partnership established by the VA with leading medical schools and medical centers starting in 1946.

It was not always so. In 1922 the American Legion National Convention asked that the veterans hospitals be wedded to the great medical schools. It was an idea whose time had not come, and the VA hospitals developed between 1922 and 1946 as a closed system of bureaucratic medicine, with doctors on civil service. It was totally unsatisfactory, locking veterans care in the backwash of American medicine.

In 1945, Earl V. Cliff (who died early this summer) revived the idea of tying the VA hospitals in with leading professional institutions in a conversation with Dr. J. A. Pringle, head of the St. Cloud VA hospital in Minnesota.

Cliff, a practicing lawyer of Ortonville, Minn., was an American Legion volunteer rehabilitation leader in Minnesota and nationally. The idea of a medical wedding took fire in Minnesota in 1945-46, and soon Cliff (as the chief catalyst) and Dr. Pringle enlisted the support of the late Dr. Charles Mayo, of the Mayo Clinic; Dr. Harold Diehl, Dean of the University of Minnesota medical school, Dr. Paul Magnuson and others in Minnesota.

Dr. Diehl got his university's consent to team up his medical school with the Fort Snelling VA hospital if Congress and the President would revise the VA system to permit it.

Dr. Paul R. Hawley was then VA medical chief. He was later a director of the American College of Surgeons and head of Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Using his Legion contacts, Cliff asked Dr. Winfred Rountree, head of St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, to propose the idea to President Truman. Dr. Rountree had been the Selective Service medical chief in WW2. Gen. Omar Bradley, then briefly the head of the VA, called in Dr. Paul R. Hawley to hash the idea over. When Hawley endorsed it, Truman named a special medical committee to make final recommendations, including Dr. Mayo and many of the others named here. Mayo, Rountree and others also served concurrently on the Legion's medical advisory committee. The new system went into effect swiftly. In August 1954 Dr. Mayo, writing in this magazine, described the great transformation in these words:

"Nine years ago the Veterans Administration voluntarily abandoned the bureaucratic idea of medicine, which had failed to achieve medical leadership and could not have cared for the large number of disabled veterans of WW2. . . .

"The remarkable change in VA medicine since then has come about because it has been running away from 'bureaucratic' medicine as fast as it could. For the care of its veteran patients, for the conduct of its new education and research programs, and for the formulation of its medical policy, the VA asked Congress to write a new law to let private medicine assume a huge role in the VA.

"Today, 92 of the VA's hospitals are affiliated with 72 of our leading medical schools and clinics. The schools appoint Deans Committees from their staffs to help guide and formulate VA medical policy.

"To create national VA medical policy, the VA depends largely on two committees of independent physicians, totaling fifty leaders in medical specialties.

"Thousands of nongovernment doctors take residencies in VA hospitals to qualify for specialties, and VA has already contributed to the education of more doctors than are on its full-time medical staff.

"Thousands of independent doctors work on a consulting basis in VA hospitals, caring for patients and guiding medical policy.

"Most of the 4,407 full-time VA doctors are now members of the American Medical Association, while more than 11,000 nongovernment doctors participate in the program of the VA hospitals. . . .

"The whole inspiring story of VA medicine since 1946 is a brilliant example of the American way to solve enormous problems—a story of the voluntary teamwork of all concerned to accomplish what neither government nor private monopoly could ever accomplish alone. . . .

"I am proud of the care we are now giving our veterans. Some of my pride is personal,

because I played a small part as one of the outside physicians who were invited to aid the medical program for veterans.

"More of my pride is professional. Our hospitals for veterans have helped raise the standards of my profession.

"Part of my pride is patriotic. I am proud that my country and the men of my profession have not forgotten, in peace and security, the awful obligation that we placed on millions of boys and young men in the prime of their lives, when they stood between ourselves and national ruin—and stood well. It is fitting, in time of peace, that if they now stand on the brink of ruin through failing health, we as a nation do not entirely forget them."

That was said by Dr. Mayo in 1954. The essential problems of VA medicine in 1970 are two in number.

The first is to finish modernizing a system in which 106 hospitals are superlative while eight are obsolete and 52 are not fully up to the VA's exacting standards. To this end, construction is continually under way—which is not to say that good medicine cannot be and is not practiced in old buildings. In fact, when the American Medical Association's Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation surveyed the antique Bronx hospital last December, it commended it on the "high quality" of the care given, old building or no. The Joint Commission could be called the high court of hospital evaluation in the land.

The second basic current problem is to maintain an operating budget to fit the same exacting standards.

Whether the House and Senate will approve the full \$315 million increase for 1971 is not known at this writing. If they do, it will not be evident until some time next year if this is enough, in view of spiralling hospital administration costs, and new federal pay raises which any appropriations increase must absorb.

The painful cutbacks in staff in recent years have not been due to a dollar reduction in budget, but to a failure of the budgeting to keep abreast of needs. Each year, VA medicine has received more operating money from Congress, but not enough more to meet the higher costs of just exceeding 1966 levels. Specific help from the opinion-forming news media at appropriation time each year has been lacking. The Congressional veterans committees and the veterans organizations have pretty much gone it alone to rally support at that key time each year when the money was being handed out.

A PRIMER FOR VOTERS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when citizen participation in elections is more important than ever before, I would call attention to the importance of voting as stated by Luis Munoz Marin, former Governor of Puerto Rico, in Harper's magazine, September 1964:

A PRIMER FOR VOTERS

Let no one stop you from voting! If it rains, remember the hunger of your entire future is worse than one day's rain—if you have no clean clothing, vote in your work clothes—there is your future! It is not a holiday; it is the most serious day of your life. Better to come in clothing dirty from work than—with your soul filthy for having sold your own right to justice, your future and the future of your children.

Come to vote, seriously, without foolishness. You don't win justice with fooling. Above all, have faith in yourselves. Have faith in your own honor—Be the men and women that God wanted you to be.

CONGRESSMAN JACK McDONALD'S CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a Representative must wear many hats in carrying out the responsibilities of his office. One of the most important of those is the ability to listen to and communicate with the people who have elected him to that office.

A vital tool in that listening and communications partnership is the questionnaire. Through this device, Members of Congress reach into the homes of their constituents and learn firsthand the opinions and desires of the people.

My colleague from Michigan (Mr. McDONALD) recently completed tabulations on his fourth annual questionnaire, and made public his findings, through his congressional report. These findings warrant, Mr. Speaker, that this document be made available to all Members. My colleague and I come from different States, and represent different people; however, it is important to me as a legislator to know how others feel about the issues of this decade.

I submit, therefore, for printing in the RECORD, a copy of Mr. McDONALD's congressional report:

THE JACK McDONALD CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO MICHIGAN'S 19TH DISTRICT

THE ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE: A VITAL LINK

My annual questionnaire is a vital communications link which makes it possible for this office to assess the needs and desires of the people of the 19th District. This year the returns were higher than ever before, reflecting continued interest in the opportunity to participate in government.

This Congressional Report contains the results of the questionnaire as well as reports on legislative items which are of deep concern to the 19th District.

There are no simple solutions to the problems and priorities that face this nation today. I feel that the response from the people of the 19th District indicates an active interest in government, and a deep understanding of the problems with which we must deal.

Of those responding, 15 per cent were in the 18-21 age group, which for the first time was offered the opportunity to take part in the questionnaire. Their approach to today's problems was, in my view, responsible, and gives me confidence that our future would be secure in their hands.

Details on the questionnaire results are on page two and three of this report.

On page 1 is a picture of Congressman McDONALD and 11-year-old Clayton Edmonds of Walled Lake, with the following caption: "Aid for pollution: Congressman Jack McDONALD, primary sponsor of a 7-point pollution abatement program, received some unexpected help from Clayton Edmonds, a Walled Lake youth who sent the Congressman 48 cents to be used to fight pollution."

THE 91ST CONGRESS AIMS AT IMPROVING QUALITY OF LIFE

The major aim of the 91st Congress has been to improve the quality of life for more than 200 million Americans living under our flag.

As we near adjournment, sometime toward the end of October, more legislation will come before Congress pertinent to accomplishing its stated aims.

I anticipate Senate approval of the House-passed Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, plus House action on the Emergency Community Facilities Act and on the remainder of the 7-point pollution abatement program which I introduced earlier this year.

The Emergency Community Facilities Act provides basic safeguards for the health and well-being of Americans and checks widespread water pollution by providing funds for locally directed water and sewer projects.

The environment bills face a series of hearings before the House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member. I feel confident that this Congress will accomplish more in the field of environment control than any other previous Congress, and pledge my personal effort to get this vital legislation passed.

Items which have been passed in the House since the last Congressional Report include: reinstatement of the Golden Eagle Passport Program; the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Bill; additional funds for the home mortgage market; three years funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities; proposed amendments to the Constitution which insures equal rights for men and women; and a bill which prohibits the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, to transport unsolicited obscene advertisements.

There have been other significant steps taken in this Congress toward making a better life for all; and much yet to be done. This report focuses on some of our achievements and some of our hopes.

THE 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS—CRIME, POLLUTION, EDUCATION: THE MAJOR CONCERNS IN THE 19TH DISTRICT

The results of my annual questionnaire indicate 19th District residents are concerned about crime, pollution, education, and that they support withdrawal of troops from Vietnam.

In a series of McDonald in Washington columns, mailed weekly to the local press media, I covered each question as reflected in the questionnaire and gave my views on the issues.

This portion of the Congressional Report is devoted to listing the views of the 19th District as reflected in the questionnaire returns, and my views on the issues and priorities.

The first question was: Do you support President Nixon's strategy to withdraw U.S. troops from Southeast Asia?

Your view: 75 per cent of the men responding approved it. Of the women who responded, 70 per cent approved it, and of the 18-21 age group, 65 per cent approved it.

My view: I support the President's strategy to remove troops from Southeast Asia with the proviso that all troops be out on an agreed upon date. I would oppose any efforts to remove from the President his Constitutional power to use any military maneuver necessary in bringing our men home. However, I have most serious qualms about the possibility of over 200,000 troops remaining in South Vietnam by May, 1971.

Question two: Do you favor abolition of the draft as now constituted and creation of an all-volunteer Army?

Your views: 68 per cent of the men responding support this concept. Of the women, 80 per cent approved it, and of the 18-21 age group 83 per cent approved it.

My views: I feel this reorganization is long overdue and have urged Congressman Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, to go forward with true draft reform and not mere tokenism.

Question three: Do you favor my bill (H.R. 15283) prohibiting federal agencies from selling mailing lists to the public?

Your views: 93 per cent of the men responding favored it.

Of the women responding, 90 per cent favored it, and of the 18-21 age group, 71 per cent favored it.

My views: Several federal agencies gather private information through required forms, and sell the names and other pertinent data to commercial firms for use in direct mail advertising. I do not support this, and therefore introduced a bill preventing such a practice.

Question four: Do you approve the use of federal funds for busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance?

Your views: The tally against this practice was men, 91 per cent; women, 92 per cent, 18-21 age group, 85 per cent.

My views: I introduced a Resolution to the Office of Education appropriation bill preventing the use of such funds for busing for the express purpose of achieving racial balance. That language is now law, having been included in the bill passed by the Congress, vetoed by the President, and overridden by the House and Senate.

Question five: American flag ships carry approximately 6.4 per cent of the total tonnage of U.S. trade. Would you favor increased federal shipbuilding subsidies to expand and modernize our merchant marine fleet?

Your views: The tally in favor of the subsidies was men, 75 per cent; women, 69 per cent, and 18-21 age group, 65 per cent.

My views: I consider it important that American produced goods be transported on American built ships manned by American crews. I voted in favor of the \$10 billion, 10-year program to strengthen and expand our merchant marine fleet. As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee it has been my pleasure and duty to study closely the effects that such a program offers to the economy of this nation.

Question six: Which direction would you like taken with regard to an ABM system? (Check one) a. Gradual installation of a limited network b. An eventual full-scale network c. No funding at all.

Your views: The men voted 38 per cent in favor of a gradual, limited ABM system, 45 per cent in favor of an eventual full-scale network, and 16 per cent in favor of no ABM at all. The women voted 44 per cent gradual, 48 per cent full scale, and 8 per cent no ABM at all. The 18-21 age group supported the gradual, limited network by 57 per cent, a full-scale by 22 per cent and 21 per cent favored no ABM at all.

My views: An effective defense network is an absolute necessity for this nation. But the Safeguard ABM as proposed is simply not an effective way to strengthen our defense posture. It is technically vulnerable, of questionable effectiveness, and also expensive. The Defense Department must be as careful in its expenditures as any other government agency. If we are to maintain our peace and freedom at home, we must stop playing politics with our national defenses and develop a workable deterrent to possible nuclear attack.

Question seven: In addition to reducing federal spending, which policy would you favor to curb inflation? (Check one) a. Increased taxes. b. Wage and Price Controls c. Tighter credit.

Your views: The men voted 8 per cent in favor of increased taxes, 69 per cent in favor of wage and price control, and 23 per cent in favor of tighter credit. The women voted 2 per cent in favor of increased taxes, 76 per

cent in favor of wage and price controls, and 22 per cent in favor of tighter credit. The 18-21 age group voted 9 per cent in favor of increased taxes, 84 per cent on wage and price controls and 7 per cent on tighter credit.

My views: If inflation continues its sharp increase after every possible effort has been made to control it, or in the event Congress fails to honor the budgetary restraint sought by the Administration, I would support wage and price controls. We are now paying the price for years of fiscal neglect. In my votes on budgetary legislation this session, I opposed NASA's space budget, Foreign Aid, the SST, and certain Defense Department appropriations. Fiscal responsibility by the Federal government is by no means a cure-all for our economic ills; but it's a step in the right direction.

Question eight: There is much talk these days about "reordering our national priorities." In which order would you place these programs? 1. Crime Control 2. Defense 3. Education 4. Pollution Control 5. Space 6. Urban Problems.

Your views: Men—1. Crime. 2. Pollution. 3. Education. 4. Urban Problems. 5. Defense. 6. Space. Women—1. Crime. 2. Education. 3. Pollution. 4. Urban Problems. 5. Defense. 6. Space. The 18-21 age group—1. Pollution. 2. Crime. 3. Education. 4. Defense. 5. Urban Problems. 6. Space.

My views: The pressing problems of crime control, pollution abatement, and educational aid require urgent and immediate action by Congress and every other form of government. However, attention to our domestic problems will be in vain unless we achieve peace and stabilize the economy. Peace first, for without it any effort to improve our quality of life will be meaningless. And stabilization of the economy must follow in order to restore purchasing power to tax dollars.

My votes reflect my concern for the priorities as listed above: I voted for the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act; I was a prime sponsor of a 7-point pollution abatement program; and voted in favor of the Office of Education appropriation bill.

It is time that we began to invest in ourselves. We are working toward peace in Vietnam, and turning around the runaway inflation which has swelled costs of government this past decade. We must now put the tax dollar to work for the benefit of the American taxpayer.

On page four is a picture of Congressman McDonald and Federal Water Quality Commissioner David Dominick with the following caption: "Environmental strategy—Congressman Jack McDonald plans next move in his battle against pollution during informal conference with Federal Water Quality Commissioner David Dominick."

LOCAL BOY'S 48 CENTS INITIATES POLLUTION FUND

My efforts to obtain a cleaner environment through a 7-point pollution abatement program which I introduced early in this session received an unexpected boost when Clayton Edmonds, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Edmonds of Walled Lake sent me 48 cents to be used to fight pollution.

I forwarded the 48 cents to Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy, who in turn put the money in a special fund established by the Environmental Quality Administration to combat pollution.

From Secretary Kennedy's reply, I gathered that Clayton's money was the first to enter the fund. The pollution abatement program which I introduced will add substantially to the monies which will be made available to clean up our environment.

More significant than the money, however, is that Clayton took the initiative in dealing with pollution. Until every American takes it upon himself to do everything possible to combat this problem, the problem will go unsolved.

No amount of Federal funds, of Federal legislation will prevent an individual from littering or otherwise polluting. Only an individual commitment, such as Clayton's, can prevent pollution of our air and water.

EDUCATION FUNDS GAIN SIGNIFICANT PROVISIONS

The \$4.5 billion Office of Education appropriation bill for fiscal 1971, passed by the House and Senate, vetoed by the President and overridden by the House and Senate, contains several provisions significant to the 19th District.

Elementary and Secondary education funds were increased \$232 million to \$1.8 billion. Most of the funds in this category were for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Basic vocational educational grants were increased by an additional \$54 million, and nearly \$1 billion was included for higher education. Many students unable to afford college may use the funds to participate in the student loan program under the Higher Education Act.

A key amendment to the appropriation bill contains language which I introduced prohibiting the use of Federal funds for the busing of students beyond normal geographic boundaries for the sole purpose of achieving racial balance.

The majority of parents and students would rather go to the schools closest to their homes. There is no justification in using Federal funds as blackmail to influence local school district policies.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE AL DEL GRECO

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, a man who had established himself as a community institution in Bergen County, N.J., because of his devotion to his work and to people, his integrity and his wit has departed from this earth.

He was Mr. Al Del Greco, for 40 years sports columnist of the Record of Hackensack, N.J., who died last week of a heart ailment at the age of 64. He was widely respected, and will be truly missed by people in all walks of life.

As one who knew Al Greco from my school days as Mr. Sports Writer, I could go on endlessly reporting on all of the good things Al did for so many and particularly young athletes, but I believe the best descriptions of Al Del Greco the man, his career and his accomplishments are best set forth in the following series of articles written by his colleagues on the RECORD.

AL DEL GRECO DIES—RECORD SPORTS COLUMNIST

Al Del Greco, sports columnist of The Record for more than 40 years and dean of New Jersey sports writing, died yesterday in Hackensack Hospital of a heart ailment. He was 64.

Del Greco joined the sports staff March 18, 1928. He was with the paper nine months when he brashly told James Sutphen, then sports editor, "I can write a better column than you."

Sutphen, now senior managing editor, told him to go ahead. Ten days later Sutphen told Del Greco: "You're pretty good. The column's yours as long as you live."

That was Dec. 19, 1929. Del Greco rarely

missed a day, writing what first was called At Random In Sports and later For The Record, until he was taken ill last May 17.

Del Greco had a special gift for limning the world of sports. His ability to cut down the pompous with a biting phrase was matched by a compassion equally quick to offer credit lavishly where it was due.

He often made fun of his own athletic prowess, but in truth had been a fair football halfback. He tried boxing.

"I quit," he used to quip, "when I found out the idea was to hit the other guy, not let him hit you. Brave, I was. Stupid, I wasn't."

Del Greco's personal favorites in the sports world were football, boxing, horse racing, and bowling, in which he carried a 180-plus average until giving up the sport four years ago. He claimed to have attended every New York Giant home football game since 1927.

Closest to his heart was the annual Boat-jumper's dinner, a gathering of the descendants of Italian immigrants which became legendary throughout the state. In 1968, when there were nine candidates for New Jersey's gubernatorial nomination, all nine showed up. They didn't dare refuse a Del Greco command performance.

The dinner, invariably presided over by Del Greco as toastmaster, has been imitated in other counties but never equaled. It was pure Del Greco from start to finish. He arranged the catering, doled out the invitations, wrote the script.

A 1925 graduate of Garfield High School, Del Greco attended the Savage School of Physical Education, intending to become a gym teacher. He left school to join the Record.

It was as sports editor beginning in 1931 that Del Greco hit his stride.

Donald G. Borg, Editor and Publisher of The Record recalled yesterday:

"Al Del Greco was my boss in sports when I became a newspaperman. I got \$25 a week in 1929, and he made me earn every dollar."

"I enjoyed working with Al then, and I enjoyed working with him since. He was one of a kind, writing his column to the end. And not the least of his virtues was that he used his magnificent sense of humor not just on others but on himself. We'll all miss him deeply and long."

One of Del Greco's last communications was to The Record's executive editor, Don Carter.

"I feel pretty bad about my therapy fondering," Del Greco wrote. "Doc had the idea no work was involved. But I took a bad turn."

"I broke down May 17 and have been off since."

"... I'm out for a long while."

The Board of Freeholders, at its meeting last night, observed a moment of silence in Memory of Del Greco.

Del Greco was a lifelong resident of Lodi. His survivors include his widow, Mrs. Marie Senft Del Greco; a daughter, Mrs. Arthur C. Sweet of Arlington, Mass.; a son, Albert J., 24, at home; two grandchildren; and three sisters: Mrs. Mary Luggiero of Maywood, Mrs. Josephine Guidetti of Lodi, and Mrs. Anita Gallo of Atlanta.

There will be a solemn high requiem mass at 9:30 a.m. Saturday in St. Joseph's R. C. Church, Lodi. Burial will be in St. Nicholas Cemetery, Lodi.

Visiting hours at Santangelo Funeral Home, 300 Main St., Lodi, will be today and tomorrow from 2 to 5 and 7 to 10 p.m.

FORTY YEARS "FOR THE RECORD"

(By Lew Azaroff and Ron Drogo)

Al Del Greco wrote his column, For The Record, and its predecessor, At Random In Sports, for 40 years. He wrote roughly 20,000 columns and to pick the best is next to impossible—there were thousands of bests.

Here are some examples of Del Greco's best: On basketball: "Those guys look silly running around in their underwear."

On freeloading sports writers: "There's enough invitations on my desk to eat free for a year. I might go to a couple."

On hunters: "They should give the animals guns so they can shoot back."

On fishing: "It's a bore. It gives you a chance to catch up on sleep."

On last year's New York Mets: "What a pity it will be if a bunch of stiff like the Mets win the National League pennant."

On the New York Football Giants' No. 1 draft pick in 1965: "Who the hell is Tucker Frederickson?"

On golf: "Of all the arrogant guys in sports, my nomination would be the golf professionals because of their refusal to wear an identifying number or name on their shirt. Take away Jack Nicklaus, Arnie Palmer, a fire plug like Gene Sarazen, and the rest of the group is a horde of anonymous slashers."

On Willis Reed: "Willis Reed gets a car for being the most valuable player in the NBA and he graciously says the car belongs to the team, so-o-o how about Cazzie Russell using it for a week or so?"

On politics: "Methinks President Nixon would be sent to St. Joe, Mo., if he were a ballplayer and measured by his achievement thus far."

On cats: "There are qualities about a cat that I admire. They are sneaky and disloyal. Rub the cat's skull or make it walk along rubbing its stomach against your leg and you have a life job—or as long as it's your leg the cat wishes to rub its stomach against."

On dogs: "The dog people gave up picking dogs that look like dogs as champions quite a few years ago. Right now, the closer a dog resembles a goat, the better chance it has to win a prize. A few years ago, if the little mutts resembled black-widow spiders and you could carry them in your wristwatch case, you had a winner."

DEL GRECO AT RANDOM

First column, subbing for Jim Sutphen, Dec. 9, 1929: "It's a tossup as to who is going to have the tougher time this week: Sutphen at the Hackensack Hospital, or me with this very, very long column."

"Never came close to winning a raffle, lottery, or what-have-you. Won a pigeon once and was abused for eating it; the owner claimed it was a champion flier."

New Jersey Racing Commission: "The governor says quit dragging your feet, approve the new harness tracks. Does a gent by the name of Kenny have to give the okay, too?"

"As you grow old on the sports beat, you don't see as many of the old faces because they take to sensible things like rocking chairs and racehorse charts, and, when they're feeling sprightly, play a vigorous game of tick-tack-toe."

"Chicago Cub manager Leo Durocher and former umpire Jocko Conlon have one thing in common: they despise each other. And quite a few people think both of them have good reason."

"If a horse's coat shines, it indicates he's in good condition to run—or pull an ice wagon."

On Allie Sherman: "Personally, I'm one of his greatest admirers. He makes a good impression wherever he goes, is a gifted speaker, coins more expressions than a college professor, and can explain away loss after loss after loss."

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

"I wouldn't want to be a horse. What horses eat isn't fit to even look at. If they served oats or sour mash or the rest of that sort of junk to human beings, they'd throw it in the garbage pail."

"Every time I think of good hitters, my mind goes back to the eighth grade when a

little teacher by the name of Miss Shea used to whack us across the face without telegraphing the slap."

"A dark gloomy day at the race track means that you bet less, you eat and drink less, you feel low down, and even a winner can't make you shake the mood."

"It's considered a gag in the East to talk about eating a horse if he can't run fast. In the West, they reach out for the utensils."

"I think I'll go up to Main Street, Hackensack, and break a few windows and steal some TV sets and sports jackets. The guy overcharged me on the price of a tie."

"Get your tickets for the Jersey Americans!"

"Oh, it gives you a headache but abstainers will never understand the fun guys can get out of sitting around, drinking, and telling lies."

"Hackensack's Ed Waldo has a collection of remarks made by Yankee broadcasters which prove, he says, they are school drop-outs. He has Phil Rizzuto and Joe Garagiola dead to rights."

"It was a great weekend for golf. One guy caught a fish."

"Every one has a question. So Old Cockeye is going to answer them:

Q—You frequently mention your Italian ancestry. Isn't it true you're a Greek?

A—Not so at all. No one in the family ever owned a restaurant or a boat.

Q—What is your favorite drink?

A—Water—but I have an allergy to it so I go to champagne as a substitute.

"LIVED LIFE TO FULLEST:" A COLLEAGUE'S TRIBUTE

(By Don Sherlock)

Al Del Greco took a lot of the world with him. He lived life to its fullest.

People loved what Al Del Greco wrote, or they didn't understand him. There was little middle ground.

He had a way with words. It just came naturally; he didn't have to try.

My first memories of him were as a Teaneck High School student in the 1950s. It seemed as if all he wrote about in those days was how good Hackensack was and how badly the Comets were going to beat Teaneck on Thanksgiving Day. It burned us. But Hackensack beat us bad, just as Al said.

We were of the do-nothing '50s, but Al told of a group of irate Hackensack students and athletes who didn't appreciate a column of his in which he predicted that Englewood would rout Hackensack in football. They stormed the old Record building on Main Street, splattering the walls with tomatoes and ransacking the office.

"I was never so scared in all my life," Al said. He must have told that story a thousand times. If Al ever knew fear, that was it.

There was the time The Record entertained a South Korean newspaperman in an exchange program. Al really got to like the man, but, sneaking around to the different offices where the guest was chatting with various editors, Al would get down on his hands and knees, stick his head around the corner into the office, and say, "Don't worry, I'm keeping an eye on this spy."

That was Al Del Greco as the people of The Record knew him. Always good for a barrel of laughs.

Al was from the old school of newspapermen. He was known to hoist a few every once and a while, wasn't averse to putting down a bob or two on a nag or a football game, and was always around when the tab came.

Al ran an annual show called the Boatjumpers. If you were anybody in Bergen County—in sports, business, or politics—you got an invitation.

He referred to the Boatjumpers as descendants of those guys on Christopher Colum-

bus's ships who jumped off without passing through customs. Al was the leader.

"My first memories of Al Del Greco are that he worked me 16 to 18 hours a day for \$25 a week," said Donald G. Borg, Editor and Publisher of The Record. "Oh yes, that's when we worked a six-day week, too."

"There was a time in 1932 when we were having a bit of trouble with the ITU," Borg said. "Some of our employees were members of Company G [National Guard] and they went down to the armory and came back with a bunch of .45s."

"One of them mounted guard and Ernest Zimmerman went inside. Al was sitting there writing his column and Zimmerman came up behind him and laid the muzzle to Al's neck."

"It kind of shook up Al. He left a note for the day staff saying, 'If I'm shot, Zimmerman did it!'"

In 1960, when I first joined the sports department, Al was in charge of the whole works. He wrote his column and put the paper to bed in the morning. Those were the days of the six-day work week.

I was working the late shift one Thursday night during November and there was little to do in the office except wait for the bowling league results to be delivered. So, I decided to take a ride over to Feibel's Recreation in Teaneck, hoping to meet my sports editor. I did.

The first thing he said was, "What's your name, kid?" The second was, "Want a drink?" That was Al Del Greco.

The next time I met Al was when I started working the morning shift with him about a year later. I walked into the office bright and early at 5:30 and there was Al, feet up on the desk, sound asleep.

I didn't know what to do, so I went out into the old wire room to get all the sports copy. It was gone. When I came back into the sports department, Al said: "Hi, kid, not much left to do. Start reading proofs."

About a half-hour later, after taking another short snooze, Al awoke and started typing (he was of the old three-finger, hunt-and-peck school). In a little while, he tossed over a couple of sheets of copy and said, "Read this over, will ya, kid?" It was the day's For the Record column.

Next, he headed for the composing room and started tossing around the type. He'd grab a handful and 'pie' it—that's the same as Gene Michael booting a ground ball—and say to makeup man John Amico:

"What'd you do that for, John. Can't ya do anything right? Hey, Ray, look what John did over here."

Back to the office to go through the mail. Again, there was Al with his feet up on the desk, chair tilted back. The New York Times in his lap, and his eyes shut tight.

After the paper was out and we checked it for mistakes, Al would take off for Monmouth, a Yankee game, Guido's, Petrullo's, or for lunch with his friends at the real estate office.

A crossword puzzle nut, I'd pick up The Times only to find that Al had finished the whole darned thing. That was Al Del Greco, too.

Back in early spring, Al had this hacking cough. He just couldn't shake it. Went to the doctor but there was no diagnosis. Then there was a call from Al's wife, Marie, saying Al had had an apparent heart attack. It hit like a sledgehammer.

He had rarely missed a day of work in more than 42 years at The Record.

During his stay in the hospital, Al wrote a note to Lew Azaroff, our sports copy editor who edited Al's column for the last 10 years or so.

"I lived one helluva great life and anything I get to do now is repetition—and pretty poor at that."

He signed it, "Your old buddy who always appreciated help. Al."

LOOKED AHEAD TO REUNION WITH LOMBARDI

(By Augie Borgi)

The Record reader never really knew Al Del Greco. Sure, he read what Al Del Greco had to say ever since March 18, 1928, until 10 days ago when his last column appeared.

"I guess he knew he was going to die," Father Tim Moore said yesterday, "when he talked to me in the emergency room as they put him in intensive care. Al told me that the country had lost a great man when Vince Lombardi died."

"He held my hand and said: 'I'll see him tomorrow, I guess, and I'll say hello for you.'"

Jack Armstrong never really knew Del Greco until a few years ago.

"When I was coaching," said the former Tenafly High School football coach, "I didn't know what kind of guy he was. I had read him since I was a kid, but really didn't know him until I got into the brokerage business, and then I found out he was one of the kindest men I ever knew."

"Sure he tried to keep the raucous image and I got a kick out of the impression other people got," he said. "Ever since Al took sick, my four little girls have said a prayer for him every night."

Del Greco loved sports.

"I remember him when he became sports editor," said Lud Shabazian of Ridgefield, sports editor of the Hudson Dispatch. "He was a helluva writer; such a good touch and quite a guy. The first time I met him was at Jimmy Braddock's training camp. After that we went everywhere together."

"I can still remember how he won the King and Queen (bowling tournament which is still the biggest amateur mixed doubles event in the country) in 1954," he said. "He rolled 216, 202, and 201 for a 619 that went with 18 handicap pins. He and Clara Archibald of River Vale won the championship. But Al was a real competitor in that he entered every year."

Frank Esposito, owner of Paramus Bowling, said:

"Bowlers attribute to Al Del Greco everything that bowling is in Bergen County. Bergen is recognized throughout the country for its bowling activity. Al pioneered it. During the years when bowling was getting very little publicity, Al helped it grow tremendously."

"We in the bowling sport are saddened to have lost such a good friend—and a fellow bowler."

Del Greco also helped found the New Jersey Boxing Writers Association. Until Jimmy Colatto of Englewood began his promotions in North Bergen a couple of years ago, the boxing writers had more meetings than there were matches. But Del Greco never lost his enthusiasm for the fight game.

"He really liked boxing," said Charley Hoffman of Fort Lee, a close friend. "But he also liked just about everything else. I can still remember the column he wrote about me 28 years ago. He said I was the best amateur handicapper in Jersey. He really loved the races."

"We'd be at the track," he said, "and a guy would come up to him and ask him who Al had bet. Al would say: 'No. 1,' and then another guy would come and Al would say: 'No. 2,' and another would come and before you knew it Al told somebody every horse in the race. Then he'd say: 'I gave somebody a winner.'"

"He wrote crazy columns, but he was a wonderful guy in my book," said Jackie Farrell of Hasbrouck Heights, director of the Yankees' speakers bureau. "He had quite a reputation in Hudson and Bergen, and the writers there respected him. He wrote as he talked—a crazy guy and I loved him."

"He offered me a job in 1941," said Record copy editor Joe Lovas, former sports editor of the Passaic Herald-News. "It was for more

money than I was making in Passaic but I didn't have a car and during the war it was hard to travel at night. I lived in Garfield then."

"He was the kind of guy who grew on you," he said. "I remember one year in New Brunswick at a basketball game when he was throwing coats out of the windows of the ninth floor of the hotel."

"He's been a friend of mine for years," said Col. John Roosma, a member of the Passaic Wonder teams that won 159 straight basketball games (1919-25). "He was one of the outstanding sportswriters in New Jersey. And it wasn't just writing. He had an interest in the players and the teams. He could tell me more about my days at West Point than even I remember."

Del Greco never was a basketball expert. He called it round ball. But Wally Green of Demarest, the youngest player ever to win a varsity H at Hackensack High and current president of the Hackensack Alumni Association, helped Del Greco when it came to basketball.

"Ever since the first week when he came to The Record, I remember what a wonderful guy he was," Green said. "And I remember about seven years ago he took me to Gracie Mansion as his guest. I met every big name in sports. Guys like Stan Musial down to the Giants' third-string quarterback. I can never thank him enough."

The man on the street knew Del Greco, too, if he happened to be in the vicinity of Hudson Street in Hackensack the last few years or at Guido's Restaurant, or Petruccio's, or just about any establishment in Bergen.

"He was in our office practically every day," said Phil Mancini of Myd Realty. "The last year he used our typewriter to do his column."

"Four or five days a week he'd cook for us," he said. "He'd come in and move the long tables around and cook for about 25 people. His hobby was cooking. He was great when it came to Italian stuff like pastafagioli and he was the center of attraction. Some of the guys here broke down when they found out Al died today."

The sports world lost a man who loved fun and games.

One day The Record's hunting and fishing columnist went on vacation, so Del Greco wrote Rod and Gun. Of course the name on the story was: By J. Hunter Fish. The first sentence said: "All hunters and fishermen are murderers."

The hunters and fishermen telephoned that day and asked for J. Hunter Fish and Al told them all the same thing: "J. Hunter Fish? He got fired. Did you see the stupid column he wrote today?"

Art Argauer, former Garfield High School coach, perhaps summed it up best.

"I just can't believe it," he said. "Al Del Greco was a classmate of mine at Savage School for Physical Education in New York City in 1924-25. Instead of going into education, he chose the newspaper field in which he became one of the outstanding writers. He was always fair and impartial and was respected by all who knew him and read his humorous columns."

"He was a credit to his profession, his Italian heritage, and to his family. His humorous columns will be missed. All of us have lost a fine friend."

AL DEL GRECO

(NOTE.—"Al and I started on The Record more than 40 years ago. We have shared a great many laughs, a lot of excitement, and a few tears. I have in all those years never known a man with a more devastating contempt for the phonies in the many worlds in which he moved, or a man with greater appreciation of the good and decent things in sports, his associates, and his profession.")

—JIM SUTPHEN, Senior Managing Editor

Al Del Greco was a public institution, es-

tablished and famous. He knew it, and took pains to say or do nothing that would be inconsistent with his reputation. He was, then, tough, sardonic, cynical and worldly both, candid to the edge of cruelty in his judgments on his fellowmen whether they were the athletic heroes of the season or United States Senators or bookmakers. This was his reputation, and he was faithful to it and to the countless tens of thousands who knew him and expected of him the kind of integrity they never required of their legislators and archbishops. Al was himself. Let that first be said.

And then let it be said, as it could not be said as long as he might wander into the newsroom with that hobgoblin grin and repudiate the libel in a gravelly baritone that could be heard in the next block—let it be said that Del Greco was an incurable idealist, a hopeless romantic, was the starry-eyed small boy who never grew up and didn't want to.

He was a sports writer—when the subject interested him one of the best in that mysterious field of literature. He admired that which was admirable in the athletes he knew through four decades and more: their strength, skill, intelligence, courage. He had no use for the man he suspected of doing less than his best; and for the muscular egotist who gave himself pompous airs off the field or outside the ring, Al had nothing but curt contempt. His ethical standards were high, and he tested every man he knew in politics and public life against them, and the hilarious acidity of his comment on the world around him was not a sneer but a cry of despair. Let it be said, then, that he was an idealist. Perhaps the only man who never disillusioned him was the late Vince Lombardi. They were much like each other. They had things in common and still do.

He loved the contact sports, played them, was trained to teach them. He loved the look and crash and smell of the physical games, and although he played the gentlemanly sports and wrote about them competently they did not engage him and he declined to accept an excitement over golf or tennis or track and field, not to say yachting, which he did not feel. But when the game had been honest and the men were brave, when it mattered to him who won and how, then when the shadows slanted down the field, he would hurry back to his desk and, hunched over his typewriter, take up the tale of arms and the man in a transport of joy not much unlike old Vergil's.

Al would never have stood for this, but he was a poet, a young and ageless poet, and it is heartbreaking to know that we shall not see him again. To his wife and family is extended the deepest sympathy of us who were privileged to be his friends and companions.

"MEDDLING"

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record a sermon given this past Labor Day by Rev. Hillsamer of Michigan City and sent to me by Mr. Stanley A. Lauer of Michigan City, Ind.

Rev. Hillsamer's sermon pointed up a subject long overdue for recognition and comment, and as Mr. Lauer said in his letter to me.

It should not be sentenced to oblivion.

I urge every Member's attention to its message and contents which follows:

MEDDLING

Labor Day is a time of tribute to men and women whose efforts contribute to the greatness of our land. Work in this era of mechanism and automation and through factories, no longer include the same processes as in the time when the Biblical writers described "the work of our hands."

Today, Labor encompasses an array of different activities, almost defying description. But the same motivations and relationships still exist.

This is why we turn to the Word of God for our instruction. Listen as we read from Ephesians 6:5-9: "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ; Not with eyeservice as menpleasers; but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; With good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not men; Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening; knowing that your Master also is in heaven, neither is there respect of persons with him."

This may seem a little strange in its context, but remember, labor and management was not the focus as it is today. Paul has described the family relationships, now he extends the application of Christianity to the next removed, Masters and Slaves.

Let us look at this passage: Not ideally, but practically. Not at things as they are, but as they ought to be.

In order for a person to be happy with their work, there certainly must be loyalty toward their employer. This loyalty would be manifested in our appreciation for the product manufactured or for the service rendered. To have a little regard for our work, and, or product, would be less than Christian.

This loyalty is twofold: The employee must be obedient to the employer. Our Scripture says that slaves should obey their masters. Every place I've ever worked, including my present job as minister of the First United Methodist Church in Michigan City, my employer has had ideas about how I should spend my time. Whether I agree or not, was of no importance. If I signed up for the job, then it was mine to do. The second factor about this loyalty to employer, is what might be called, singleness of purpose. The only effective way I can serve this church is as though it were mine for the rest of my life. I have a feeling that if we worked at our jobs with this attitude rather than just a living, or until I get something better, we would be living under more pleasant circumstances than we do.

If a person is to be really contributing of himself, there must be sincerity. Wherever you work, you must feel that you are contributing of yourself for the sake of living with yourself and you must also feel you contribute some small part to the whole product. The Christian ought to work harder than anyone else. Not to make more money, but because he or she represents Jesus Christ. "Working for God not as unto Men." This translation says, "Remember that the Lord will repay every man, whether slave or free, for the good work that he does."

What about compensation? How much does a person work only to be paid? Do we work just for the sake of work?

Ever since the fall of man, God has so designated work as an integral part in the livelihood of man. To live we must work, so says God. It is not God's intention that man receives something for nothing, even though this philosophy seems to be running rampant in our society today, with almost every place of business offering chances on prizes for the lucky.

It could also be said then, that God expects man to be compensated for his efforts in proportion to his accomplishments. The

hard working farmer for the most part, is the successful farmer.

Humankind does not always compensate as God does. Hence, man has devised means for recognition and compensation. Such organizing has placed the emphasis on compensation, and less upon the dignity of work incumbent upon every human being.

Many employers are less than Christian, according to this principle, so therefore, let us look at the other side of our text.

The greatest thing that management can do for labor is to respect them. The lowly private in the line infantry company is the last in the chain of command. Orders may be given from the General of the Army on down the line until they come to the Private. That is as far down as you can be. In other words, in the last analysis, it is the Private that really does the work in Uncle Sam's Army. And the Private should be respected. If work is to be done, if labor is to be exercised, it will be the buck privates of industry, the laboring man that will do it. And the laboring man needs to be respected for what he does.

Our text says, "Masters forbear threatening." What would our society be like without threatenings? Can you imagine people respecting the wishes of others without threats? For example, the speed limit sign is posted and nobody violates the limit, not because of threats of arrest and fine, but because respect is held for it. Can you imagine raising a family according to respect? No discipline necessary because the children just wouldn't think of violating their parents' wishes. Because they have too much respect for them.

Management needs to recognize that every man has worth in God's sight, and if a man is hired for a job, let him work.

Management needs always to be reminded as our text says that the Master of Labor is their Master too. Like I told a friend of mine who had just finished Officer's Candidate School, "we all put our pants on the same way, one leg at a time." Among the priesthood of believers, is where all men meet to worship the one true God.

Management needs further to realize that while some men may be more productive than others, yet every man has the same value to God. The best men get the best jobs, but every man gets some job.

These truths we have talked about today have eternal significance, yet their manifestations have had a shorter history. The factory system here in these United States is only a little more than 150 years old. The labor-management conflict is even younger yet. And to make it even worse, only a small minority compose the Christian element.

Jesus Christ is always the answer to man's problems, regardless of dimension. It is time for Christians to witness.

Christian labor ought to be showing a loyalty to management. Christian labor ought to be convincing management of its sincerity. Christian Labor ought to be allowing God to be the paymaster.

While on the other hand, Christian Management ought to show respect to its laborers. Christian Management should also be subservient to God. Christian Management needs to be recognizing the dignity of every man. Amen.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of my financial assets and liabilities:

ASSETS		Shares
SECURITIES		
Booz-Allen Hamilton	-----	25
Mass. Investment Trust	-----	190
Advance Ross Corp	-----	50
Ashland Oil Inc	-----	60
General Motors	-----	25
Pneumo Dynamics Corp	-----	100
Ramada Inns Inc	-----	55
Union Carbide Corp	-----	50
Xerox Corp	-----	50
A.T. & T. 8¾ % bonds	-----	6
Cash on account	-----	\$172
		<hr/>
Total value of securities as of Sept.		
24, 1970	-----	\$20,819
<hr/>		
INSURANCE		
Prudential, cash surrender value	---	\$2,310
GI life insurance, no cash value.		
Checking account at Sergeant At Arms, U.S. House of Representatives (Sept. 1, 1970, balance)	----	\$2,974
<hr/>		
SAVINGS ACCOUNTS		
South Bend Teacher's Credit Union	---	\$90
<hr/>		
RETIREMENT		
Equity in Federal retirement fund	---	\$24,410
		<hr/>
Total assets	-----	\$50,603
I have no interest in real estate or in any commercial enterprise not listed here.		
Liabilities: None.		

NEWSLETTER OF HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ALBERT W. JOHNSON has just issued a newsletter, which I have found very interesting and informative, and I am submitting it for the RECORD as a part of the official proceedings of the House. The newsletter contains the usual heading of previous newsletters, as follows: "Newsletter From Your Open Door in Washington, Congressman ALBERT W. JOHNSON, 23d District of Pennsylvania, Newsletter 18, September 1970." The newsletter also contains a picture of Congressman JOHNSON holding the door open at his office, room 1424 Longworth House Office Building. The newsletter is as follows:

DEAR FOLKS IN THE 23d CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: Following my usual custom at this time of the year and before the close of the Congressional session, I am sending you this Newsletter, in which I will point out some of the highlights of the accomplishments of the 91st Congress as well as some of the legislative proposals remaining to be acted upon.

SOME OF THE BILLS THAT HAVE PASSED

This 91st Congress convened on January 3, 1969. The House membership now stands at 243 Democrats, 187 Republicans, and 5 vacancies. All of the 435 House seats are up for re-election now on November 3rd. The U.S. Senate is also controlled by the Democrats with the result that when President Nixon took office, it was the first time in 120 years that an incoming President of one Party faced a Congress dominated by another. However, despite this unusual situation, Congress has enacted a number of new legislative proposals which have been signed

by the President. The most important being the bill turning the Post Office Department over to a government-controlled corporation, the tax reform bill, and the extension of the poverty program. Congress also increased social security benefits by 15% last year, and the House has passed a bill this year providing for an additional increase of 5% to cost \$1.7 billion a year and to be financed by an increase from \$7,800 to \$9,000 in the social security tax base. This measure also ties future increases in benefits to the cost-of-living index. The President supports this bill. The Senate Finance Committee is now holding hearings on this proposal. Some other bills passed I will discuss elsewhere in this Newsletter. Only 4 appropriations bills out of 14 have passed to this date. Congress has a real job to do before it can adjourn.

STATUS OF BILLS REQUESTED BY THE PRESIDENT
Not yet acted upon, but urged by the President are the following:

Welfare Reform: Called the Family Assistance Act, which abolishes the discredited welfare system of the past, by providing for basic income supplements, work incentives, job training, and provision for jobs. This has passed the House and is being re-written in the Senate.

Draft Reform: A bill improving the random-selection system by direct national call of selectees, as well as a plan for a volunteer army replacing draftees.

Electoral Reform: Provides for direct popular vote election of the President. This Constitutional amendment passed the House, is now being debated in the Senate.

Crime Control: Only two bills have passed in this category, the one, the Washington, D.C. crime bill, the other, the Youth Correction Act. Awaiting action are bills to: control the drug traffic, deal with organized crime, terrorist bombings and obscene mail. This omnibus crime bill, with ten titles passed the Senate, but the House has not acted. This is a must.

Some other bills not acted upon: Vietnam Veterans Assistance Act; Amendments to the Food Stamp Act; Revenue Sharing, wherein Pennsylvania will receive \$252 million, Manpower Training Act, and a host of bills in the field of education, consumer protection, mass transportation, urban affairs and pollution control.

THE PRESIDENT VETOES FOUR BILLS

This Congress will be remembered by the almost precedent shattering vetoes by the President of four appropriations bills to date, with more vetoes likely. The President is determined to hold down Federal spending in order to achieve a balanced budget and thus reduce inflationary pressures. When Nixon became President, one of the first matters placed on his desk was the fact that he would have to ask Congress to raise the National Debt by \$12 billion in order to pay the bills during the first half of 1969. Congress complied as there was no other alternative. The proposed LEJ budget he inherited estimated income at \$198.7 billion and expenditures at \$195.3 billion. The actual spending was \$196.8 billion, but revenue fell to \$193.8 billion, making a deficit 6/30/70 of \$2.9 billion. We are now in the fiscal year to end June 30, 1971, and revenues are estimated to be \$199.1 billion, and unless huge savings are made, spending is estimated at \$208.5 billion, or a possible deficit of \$9.4 billion.

CONGRESS INCREASES APPROPRIATIONS AND LOWERS TAXES

And the so-called tax reform bill, it is said, will result in a reduction of taxes of about \$8 billion. Against these disturbing figures, the appropriations bills as they emerge from Committee exceed the President's budget by from \$350 million to \$1 billion each. For instance, the 1970 Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Bill exceeded the budget by \$1.1 billion; the 1971 Hospital Construction Bill by

\$350 million; the 1971 Aid to Education Bill by \$450 million; and, the 1971 bill for Housing, Urban Renewal, Space, Veterans, etc., by \$500 million. And, while Congress was increasing spending, they put a spending ceiling on Nixon of \$205.6 billion. A recent bill by Representative Ford would extend this ceiling to Congress as well. Against this backdrop of inflation, deficits and spending control, Nixon vetoed all four bills. Two were re-passed over his veto.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE TO 18

An interesting legal development has resulted from one of the bills of nation-wide interest—the lowering of the voting age to 18. In doing so, the Congress unveiled a new method of amending the Pennsylvania State Constitution. We all thought that the only way to amend it was to call a convention, or have two separate sessions of the legislature to pass a resolution of amendment to be then voted on by the people. The U.S. Supreme Court has assumed the power to declare a Pennsylvania Constitutional provision unconstitutional, but Congress also assumed the power by declaring a provision of the Pennsylvania Constitution void. Here is the way it was done:

Article VII, Sec. 1 of our State Constitution provides: "Every citizen twenty-one years of age . . . shall be entitled to vote . . ." But Congress added a clause to the Civil Rights Act of 1970 by providing that this provision is void, (as well as similar ones in other states), as it violates the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution as denying 18 year olds equal protection of the laws, that is, the right to vote. Proceeding according to the Pennsylvania State Constitution, as required, Pennsylvania is already in the process of lowering the voting age to 19. This resolution has already passed the present legislature, and

will be submitted to the new one in 1971, and the people will be asked to vote on it in the Fall of 1971.

This invasion of a State Constitution is a new venture for the Congress. If this newly-used method is allowed to stand, then Congress could declare that 6 year olds are being denied equal protection of the laws by being forced to go to school, thus violating the 13th Federal Amendment, the privilege against involuntary servitude.

Inasmuch as the new voting law goes into effect on January 1, 1971, the U.S. Supreme Court has been asked to pass on this Congressional invasion of states' rights before this date. 18 year olds will be registered to vote in Pennsylvania commencing December 1, 1970.

POPULATION AND CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Many of us were disappointed when the population of Pennsylvania was reported to be 11,663,301 persons, up only 3% from 1960, as compared to the National Average of 13.6%. And, as a result of this small increase, Pennsylvania will lose two Congressmen, reducing the number from 27 to 25. There is, of course, great speculation among Congressmen as to where this loss of two will be absorbed. One target area is the City of Philadelphia, where the population is 1,926,529, a drop of 3.8% from 1960. Under the new census, a Congressional District must equal 475,000 people. Philadelphia now has five Congressmen, and if you divide 1,926,529 by 475,000, you come up with four Congressional Districts.

CENSUS REPORT ON THE 23RD DISTRICT

The population of the 23rd Congressional District has increased slightly. In 1960, the population was 429,009, and in 1970, 432,367, or an increase of 3,358 or .8%. The breakdown is as follows:

Counties	1960	1970	Increase	Decrease	Net increase	Percentage
Cameron	7,586	7,008		578		7.6
Centre	78,580	98,578	20,178			25.7
Clearfield	81,534	73,178		8,356		12.5
Clinton	37,619	37,981	362			1.0
Elk	37,328	37,039		289		.8
Forest	4,435	4,247		238		5.3
McKean	54,517	50,895		3,622		6.6
Potter	16,483	15,730		753		4.5
Seneca	65,295	60,514		4,781		7.3
Warren	45,582	47,017	1,435			3.1
Total	429,009	432,367	21,975	18,617	3,358	.8

It is apparent from this chart that the population of the District is 42,633 less than that necessary for a Congressional District, which means that the District will require the addition of another County—from 10 counties to 11.

REAPPORTIONMENT AND REDISTRICTING UNDER PRESENT LAW

The law requires that the Pennsylvania House and Senate be reapportioned in 1971 and the Congress redistricted. Who will prepare the reapportionment plan for the Pennsylvania Legislature? The new Pennsylvania Constitution, Article II, Section 17, answers this query. It provides that a five man reapportionment Commission shall file such a plan within 90 days after they are organized. The Commission consists of the Minority Leader and the Majority Leader of the House, and the same two officers in the Senate, plus a 5th person selected by these four, who shall act as Chairman.

Some say that it was intended that this Commission should also redistrict the Congress. However, a careful reading of this Constitutional provision indicates otherwise, according to the former Attorney General of Pennsylvania. This means that the Pennsylvania House and Senate will be doing Congressional redistricting by a bill duly enacted and signed by the Governor. Both political parties, as they are now campaigning, are eyeing this plan.

THE UNSOLVED QUESTION: WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

Shall this nation impose wage and price controls in order to stop inflation. In my recent Newsletter, I reported that 69% of the people in my District favored such controls. Since that time, Congress has passed legislation making controls possible. In the hearings on the bill before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which Committee I am a member, on the subject of wage and price controls, it was pointed out that such controls would require 250,000 employees and would cost \$2 billion a year. Many of us saw in the bill that was passed some pre-election politics. To enable the President to put on controls would require at least a two-year authorization and a \$2 billion appropriation, and wide discretion as to wage and price levels. The bill that passed and which the President reluctantly signed only gave the President discretionary power to control prices and wages until February 1, 1971, and provided no money to set up the organization, and only gave him the power to fix prices and wages at levels no lower than those prevailing May 25, 1970. In other words, the President could raise prices, not lower them.

The Republicans in the House wanting to find out the sense of Congress on the issue offered an amendment mandating an immediate freeze, and the House voted 270 to 11 against this amendment. However, perhaps the country is ahead of Congress and

the President and really wants wages and prices frozen (the U.A.W. wages now being negotiated?) even though it would cost \$2 billion a year. This is a serious question facing the nation.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM OTHER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Some Congressmen have recently sent out questionnaires to their districts, and the results have been reported in the Congressional Record. Here are some interesting replies:

(a) Should the Constitution be amended to guarantee equal rights for women? No: 66% (Corbett, 18th District, Pennsylvania).

(b) Did you approve of President Nixon's use of ground troops in Cambodia? Yes: 77% (Corbett, 18th District, Pennsylvania); Yes: 56.9% (Rogers, 1st District, Colorado); Yes: 77.9% (Jones, 9th District, North Carolina); Yes: 89.6% (Duncan, 2nd District, Tennessee); Yes: 61% (Nation-wide Harris Poll).

(c) Do you favor abolishing the present military draft system for an all-volunteer army? No: 61.5% (Duncan, 2nd District, Tennessee); Yes: 55% (Steiger, 6th District, Wisconsin).

(d) Should the House approve the Cooper-Church amendment to restrict the use of funds and prohibit future military operations in Cambodia? No: 63% (Corbett 18th District, Pennsylvania).

(e) Do you favor continuation of draft deferments for college students? No: 58% (Bray, 6th District, Indiana); No: 69% (Steiger, 6th District, Wisconsin).

WHAT IS THE "ESTABLISHMENT" WHICH SOME SEEK TO DESTROY?

In the last few years, lawless elements in the United States have been on the increase, pursuing mob violence, drug addiction, destruction of our colleges, assassination and subversion. They want to destroy the so-called "establishment."

What is this "establishment" they seek to eliminate?

First of all, it is that venerable U.S. Constitution that guarantees to us all the freedoms we now enjoy. It provides for an elected government chosen by the people, and answerable to the people. It contains the Bill of Rights which we so readily take for granted, which guarantees:

(a) Freedom of religion, of speech, or assembly, of the press.

(b) The privilege against self-incrimination.

(c) That one is innocent until he is proven guilty.

(d) The right to be confronted by the witnesses against you.

(e) Trial by jury.

(f) Freedom from cruel and unusual punishment and excessive bail.

(g) Freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures.

(h) The right to keep and bear arms.

They also would destroy our free enterprise system which has made this nation the most prosperous in the world, with a standard of living unmatched in all history.

Gone would be our provision for free elections, coupled with freedom of thought resulting in the finest educational institutions in the world. Those who would close our schools do not realize that this would mean we would become a backward nation and all creative wonders would cease to be developed.

And, these disgruntled persons who seek to destroy our way of life as they travel up and down our highways, do they stop to think and appreciate the vast network of roads, freeways and turnpikes that our free nation has built for us and for them? How about our railroads and airways, now graced by the 747 plane? One of the guarantees of our way of life is the privilege to travel freely, from place to place, with no barriers, harassments, or inconvenience. All we ask is that you observe the rules of the road. Those liberty-destroyers would change all this, I suppose. Or do they know what they want?

The point I am making is that they, and we, should all stop and count our many blessings, as the song says: "Name them one by one."

BULLETINS, PAMPHLETS AND OTHER ITEMS AVAILABLE

As usual, I have available for distribution some interesting items, which I would be pleased to distribute as long as they last:

A bulletin listing over 300 Federal publications available.

1970 Official Pennsylvania Road Map.

Department of Agriculture new volume: "Food For Us All."

Large Map of Vietnam.

I hope you have found this Newsletter both interesting and informative.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

FUEL OIL CRISIS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for several months now, I have been doing everything that I can in attempting to ward off the pending fuel oil crisis which so seriously threatens my city of Chicago.

Today, I had the pleasure to appear before Senator McIntyre's Small Business Subcommittee which has been looking into the national fuel oil emergency. In connection with this, I include in the RECORD my introductory remarks along with the excellent statement of Mr. Byron Weil, president of Oils, Inc., of Chicago:

INTRODUCTORY

Mr. Chairman: It is a pleasure for me to be here this morning to introduce to you, Mr. Byron Weil, the President of Oils, Incorporated, of Chicago. For several months now, I have been working very closely with Byron and with other representatives of the Chicago fuel oil industry in attempting to head off the grave fuel crisis which so seriously threatens our city. With the winter months fast approaching, the supply of residual fuel oil, so necessary to the operation of the city, remains at an extremely low level.

Mr. Chairman, Chicago has become an island with an insufficient energy supply source and I am afraid that there is a strong possibility that on several occasions this year, many of our citizens will have to face Chicago's famous winter without heat.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried everything. (I am sure that Byron will go into this in greater detail.) I have taken a Special Order on the House floor. I have written several letters to the President as well as to other government officials from the Secretary of the Interior, on down. I have had several meetings with representatives of both the Administration and the domestic oil industry. We have offered what we thought were reasonable alternatives that would at least provide short-term relief to an otherwise untenable situation—unfortunately our success has been limited. During all this time, which now seems like a year, Byron Weil has been a tremendous help to me and to the other members of the Chicago delegation in the Congress. He is a concerned and knowledgeable citizen who has spent much of his time and money in attempting to alert the people of Chicago to the danger of this situation. But, Byron doesn't just talk—he acts. I can think of no one who is better qualified to

explain to your Committee the seriousness of the fuel oil crisis as it pertains to the city of Chicago.

STATEMENT OF BYRON S. WEIL

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much for the privilege of appearing before you. My name is Byron S. Weil; I am President of Oils, Inc. of Chicago, Illinois. Our company is in the business of selling heating oils in the Chicago Metropolitan area, and the bulk of our business involves the sale of residual fuel oil (No. 6 oil). I have been in the fuel business for the past 25 years. Currently, I am a member of the American Petroleum Institute, the Illinois Petroleum Marketers Association, The Chicago Oilmen's Club, the Oil Heat Marketers Association and the American Society of Lubrication Engineers.

As a marketer of heavy fuel oil, I have been concerned for nearly a year about the adequacy of supply. Last January, it became increasingly evident to many that the country was headed towards a serious residual fuel oil shortage. Many refineries which had formerly supplied residual fuel oil to customers in the Middle West either had converted or were in the process of converting to the manufacture of coke, in place of residual fuel. Economically, this was a wise decision for the refiners, as petroleum coke has a long-range market potential at a far greater return than residual fuel oil.

The useable supply of residual fuel oil was reduced even further in many areas that had enacted pollution laws regarding the sulfur content of fossil fuels. We, along with all marketers in the Chicago area, have, of course, strongly supported the effort to clean up our environment, and agree that the use of high sulfur fuels has been a contributing factor to air pollution. As the Committee may know, the City of Chicago passed a new ordinance in the Spring of 1970 reducing the permissible sulfur content of fuels used in the City and the surrounding area. As a result of the new anti-pollution laws, consumers using coal have been forced to hunt for low sulfur coals which are not readily available, or convert their burners to either gas or oil. However, gas supply has also been short; for example, Peoples Gas Company in Chicago announced last June that there was a shortage of natural gas and that they would have to curtail new installations as well as cut back supplies to existing industrial customers.

As these problems developed, Oils, Inc., along with other fuel oil marketers in the Chicago area, were also giving notice to their customers and Governmental agencies, that there would be a residual fuel oil shortage during the Winter of 1970-71.

As the dimensions of the fuel oil shortage became clear over the summer, Oils, Inc. and others in the Middle West, applied to the United States Department of the Interior, Oil Import Appeals Board, for permission to import residual fuel oil into District II. We stressed the need to act quickly, as we were aware of the East Coast's problem, as well as that of Europe, in obtaining residual fuel.

On June 12th, Oils, Inc. led a group of concerned citizens and suppliers to a meeting with Congressman Dan Rostenkowski in order to familiarize him with the problems of the Mid West regarding residual fuel oil. Congressman Rostenkowski, on June 23, wrote President Nixon informing him of our problems and requesting action on the import quotas. On July 15th, Oils, Inc. headed a group of suppliers and consumers to Washington to meet with Senators Smith and Percy, Congressman Rostenkowski, and other Members of the House, again outlining our problems. On July 24th, the Oil Import Appeals Board granted quotas to seven of sixteen Midwestern suppliers based on a percentage of their appeal. In granting these

awards, the Oil Import Appeals Board made the following findings:

"1. Residual fuel oil demand in areas served by the petitioners has increased significantly due to curtailment of natural gas sales to industrial, commercial and governmental purchasers of gas. This applies to new as well as historic users.

"2. New regulations to curb air pollution in many parts of the area served by these petitioners have necessitated the use of low sulfur fuels in facilities that had formerly used high sulfur coal. To meet fuel needs in the immediate future, oil must be imported because there is a general shortage of suitable domestic fuels, such as coal, natural gas, and residual fuel oils.

"3. Neither the consumers, nor the suppliers of domestic fuels anticipated shortages of suitable fuels as evidenced by depressed market conditions during the immediately preceding several years. In turn, the depressed market conditions contributed to the severe shortages by further reducing incentive to produce these fuels.

"4. The relaxation of East Coast residual fuel oil import control, announced in mid-1967, resulted in Gulf Coast residual prices being decreased to be competitive with foreign supplies. The economics then dictated that refiners develop more profitable markets for this material. This was accomplished by building refinery units such as cokers, desasphalting units and hydrocrackers, that would utilize most of these new facilities as inputs. Construction of most of these new facilities was completed in 1969 and early 1970 coinciding in time with the sudden demand outlined above.

"The Board concludes that the foregoing combination has created shortage of residual fuel oils of the desired quality in District II and has considered the requests of each petitioner to reach determination as to whether or not an exceptional hardship is suffered attributable to the limiting factors of the Mandatory Import Program. The Board has considered the physical capacity of the petitioner, its experience, and its record of sales."

After receiving our quota of 480,000 barrels, Oils, Inc. contacted some sixty sources of supply around the world, and offered to purchase low sulfur residual fuel oil. Oils, Inc. and the other Mid-Western suppliers were unable to obtain any product as a result of our strenuous efforts.

I can assure this Committee that we will continue these efforts to secure supplies from overseas sources, but, if we are unsuccessful, I would hope provision could be made for extension of these import allocations beyond March, 1971.

We have been in contact with most of the refiners in the country on many occasions in the past several months to determine whether supplies of residual fuel oil could be offered to us for the coming Winter. Our efforts met with little success. With the thought in mind that it might be useful to the Committee's record, I request permission to insert a series of letters which I have written to oil refineries in my own search for product.

As a marketer of significant quantities of fuel oils in the Chicago area, I can assure this Committee that the crisis of No. 6 is as serious in the Mid West as it is on the East Coast. Our hospitals, schools, factories and office buildings are threatened by a lack of heat in the months ahead. This must be considered as a serious threat to the health and welfare of the community. In the Chicago area many of the large consumers of fuel, such as the Chicago Housing Authority, University of Illinois and University of Chicago, as well as various city schools and hospitals, have in recent months requested but received no bids on their residual fuel oil requirements. Some have made requests for bids

as many as three or four times with no response. In my statement before the Oil Import Appeals Board, I outlined the problems faced by some consumers in the Chicago area and ask that this statement be included in this Committee's record.

We have received innumerable requests not only from consumers but from other marketers, such as ourselves, for supplies of residual fuel oil; and I ask that some letters from these marketers also be included in your record.

We estimate that the City of Chicago will have less than 75% of the residual fuel oil required to meet this winter needs. The shortage of No. 6 oil in Chicago is expected to be a minimum of 50,000 barrels per day.

I might also add a comment regarding No. 2 fuel oil, home heating oil. While we are not major marketers of this product, we, and many of the people in the Chicago area who do sell it, feel that No. 2 fuel will also be in very short supply within the next few months. I would, therefore, urge that this Committee and the Government agencies examining the fuel oil situation in the Middle West also consider the needs of that area for No. 2 fuel oil.

There are, I believe, several steps which the Federal Government could take to bring significant relief to our area. I hope that the Oil Policy Committee and the White House Emergency Committee headed by Dr. McCracken would give serious consideration to the following:

1. Immediate adoption of a residual fuel oil incentive program for refiners in Districts I-IV. Under such a plan, domestic refineries would be encouraged to produce residual fuel oil by awarding them an import license for 1 barrel of crude oil for every barrel of low sulfur fuel oil they produce.

There are a number of small refineries in Districts I-IV with excess capacity that could produce additional amounts of residual fuel oil, if sufficient incentive were created by the Federal Government. Existence of this capacity offers a real opportunity for the Federal Government to take steps now to a recurrence of a residual fuel oil crisis in subsequent winters.

Adoption of an incentive plan would, I believe, strengthen our nation's security by increasing residual refining capacity in the U.S., which, in case of a national emergency, could operate exclusively on domestic crude oil. I ask that a partial list of such refineries be included at this point in the Committee's record.

2. Increase imports of crude oil into the Middle West from Canada, so that refineries in the area can turn out more heating fuels. I would also urge clarification of the Oil Import Regulations to assure quota-free importation of crude oil which can be burned as residual fuel oil.

3. If we and other Mid West marketers are unable to utilize fully the residual fuel oil import allocation granted by the Oil Import Appeals Board, we request that these import rights be extended beyond March 31, 1971, if supply conditions warrant.

4. I would also urge immediate study of the possibility, as a long-range solution to the problems of the Mid West, of giving that area access to overseas supplies of residual fuel oil on the same basis as District I.

Before concluding, I should like to present for your record, chronology of the residual fuel oil crisis that may be useful to the Committee.

We have been very busy trying to forestall this crisis and our efforts and the efforts of other marketers in the Chicago area have been exhausting and expensive and to date, unsuccessful. However, we will continue to do everything in our power to prevent a disaster in our area in the coming Winter. We hope that Federal officials here in Washington who establish U.S. oil policy

will assist us in this effort and will consider adopting the proposals I have recommended—before it is too late.

Thank you very much.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND— INDIANA NEEDS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Indiana highway needs and the importance of the highway trust fund in meeting those needs were clearly stated by Mr. R. H. Harrell, executive director, Indiana State Highway Commission, in a speech delivered last Thursday morning to Indiana highway constructors meeting here in Washington:

SPEECH OF R. H. HARRELL

Our planned highway programs for fiscal 1971 and 1972 were prepared on the assumption that funds from the Highway Trust Fund would be available, on an annual basis, for the construction of the Interstate and the A. B. C. Systems, in about the same amount as was provided for in fiscal year ending July 1, 1970.

Plans have little meaning unless funds are available to do the proposed work.

Federal cut-backs (16 million dollars on July 9 of this year, the fourth time since the Trust Fund law was established), the more serious proposed legislation to divert Trust Fund money for other than highway purposes, and the new apportionment factor for distribution of funds for construction of the Interstate for fiscal years 1972, 1973 and 1974, as summarized in House Document #91-317, dated April 21, 1970, all are, or will, determine to what extent we can complete the planned programs and provide for our many highway needs. I suppose we were too optimistic when we prepared this wish list.

We were proud of our progress on the completion of the Interstate. At mid year Federal Highway Administration reports showed that Indiana was 6th in the Nation in obligating 1971 Interstate Funds. Purchase of right-of-way for the Interstate has advanced to the point where uncompleted sections can be let as fast as construction funds from the Trust Fund can be made available.

All network systems are important to the citizens of our State, but at this hour, the completion of the 972 miles of the Interstate System of Freeways, exclusive of the 157 miles of the Northern Indiana Toll Road, is, in my estimation, the most critical.

Indiana has 719 miles of Interstate open to traffic, exclusive of the Toll Road, 151 miles under construction, and 107 miles yet to be placed under construction.

The total cost of Indiana's 972 miles of Interstate, when completed, will be over 1.3 billion dollars.

The remaining 107 miles are estimated to cost over 300 million dollars.

Mr. Frank Turner, Federal Highway Administrator, in a reply to a writer for the Washington Post, stated that the new Interstate System of Freeways, is preventing both deaths and injuries. He estimated that since the Interstate program was launched in 1956, these modern, safe, highways have saved more than 35,000 lives that otherwise would have been lost on older, more dangerous roads, and has prevented more than a million injuries. Further, when the entire 42,500 miles of the System are complete, late in this decade, an estimated 8,500 lives will be saved annually.

Indiana's complete Interstate network cannot all be placed under contract before mid year 1976, if funds continue at the present rate, or at the rate that no doubt will prevail under the new distribution factor that will be applied starting with the 1972 fiscal year's obligation.

The final opening date, for the Nation-wide Interstate System, will be more than two decades after the enactment of the law and at least six years later than originally estimated.

This delay has been caused by extensions authorized, added safety features, changes in geometrics, environmental considerations, cut-backs and many other related factors.

In addition to the need to complete the Interstate, the Indiana State Highway Department has 4,367 miles of primary and urban highways and 5,986 miles of secondary roads that have not had, since the end of World War II, the many critical improvements needed to make these highways safe for the traffic load they are forced to carry today.

Traffic fatalities alone, on all of Indiana's highways, are over 1,600 persons per year, and a major portion of these are occurring on the primary, urban and secondary systems of highways.

Over 1500 miles of our total primary and urban system is in immediate need of major new construction and reconstruction. Also, an equal or larger mileage of the secondary system needs similar type construction.

Studies show that over 500 major bridges need replacement either because of their age, condition or inability to safely serve today's traffic volumes.

Railroad grade separations have been another of the forgotten programs which have not moved because of the lack of sufficient funds.

I have only attempted to list our major immediate needs, and by immediate I have arbitrarily set this time span at one decade since in today's society a six year or more time span is required from the time a project is first set in motion until a project can be open to traffic.

At today's price tags these programs are estimated to cost as follows:

\$300 million required in the next 6 years to complete the Interstate.

\$1.5 billion required in the next 10 years to improve the Primary and Urban Federal Systems.

\$1.0 billion in the next 10 years for improvements to the farm to market or Secondary System.

\$100 million for major stream and river bridge replacements.

\$100 million for railroad grade separation structures.

or a total price tag of 3 billion dollars in this short span of 10 years.

Now to give you an idea of the magnitude of the apparent available funds to finance these needs, should the present methods of financing continue at about the present level, and without diversion of vehicle taxes to other modes of transportation or programs:

About \$85 million per year estimated to be available from the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

\$60 million of this for the Interstate on a 90-10 percent matching basis. \$25 million for the A.B.C. program which is matched on a 50-50 basis. This A.B.C. money is allocated to the States on the basis of one-third on State area, one-third on State population and one-third on each State's mileage of rural delivery and star routes.

\$30 million per year available from Indiana's six cents motor fuel tax, which is needed to match Federal money and to take bids on miscellaneous State projects not eligible for Federal participation.

\$30 million per year from Indiana's recently enacted 2 cents increase in gas tax,

restricted to the construction of Primary Roads, generally known as "killer highways". These sources of road building funds total \$145 million per year, or a little less than \$1.5 billion over a ten year period.

With the ten year needs price tag set at over \$3 billion, you can see Indiana will continue to drop seriously further behind in meeting our highway needs in this decade.

It has been my good fortune to have worked for the Indiana State Highway Commission for over 40 years or just a few years short of the total time we have had a State Road System in our State.

The estimates I have given you today are not altogether based on detailed studies, but are estimates that combine prior factual information with personal knowledge gained by close association with the State Highway Road System.

You, I am sure, are well acquainted with the sources of the tax levies that are collected for the Highway Trust Fund.

But you may not realize that Indiana does not get what could be considered a fair return from amounts collected from our taxpayers.

To give you an example, available records show that Indiana taxpayers contribute 173.4 million dollars of auto excise taxes to the Federal General Fund in 1968, 127.5 million dollars went into the Federal Trust Fund for highway construction. In fiscal year 1970 Indiana received authority to obligate 98 million dollars from this source.

So you can see that Indiana taxpayers are, even now under present distribution formulas, making substantial contributions to the road programs in other States—why permit other diversions.

In the opinion of Governor Whitcomb, the majority of our State Legislators and the public in general, who have not voiced that first complaint on the recent 2¢ increase in motor fuel tax, Indiana needs the continuation of the Federal Trust Fund, at least at the present level, and without periodic cut-backs or diversions of any of these funds to other than what it was intended when the law was enacted—that is for road construction.

I personally want to thank each of you for giving our Highway Department this opportunity to present this paper to you. Also, to seriously solicit your support or see that taxes collected to build highways are retained for that purpose and without cut-backs.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARNATION FARMS

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 60th anniversary of Carnation Milk Farms located in north-central King County in my district. The achievements of the farms in animal husbandry have been highly successful and have contributed greatly to our agricultural prosperity. Pet lovers can take satisfaction in Carnation's continuing research and development of feline and canine nutrition.

Recently, Gov. Daniel Evans, of Washington, issued a statement commending Carnation Farms. I would also like to extend my best wishes for Carnation's future and would like to incorporate the Governor's statement in the RECORD at this point:

A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR

Relative to commendations to Carnation Farms on its 60th anniversary.

Carnation Farms was purchased by Elbridge Amos Stuart in 1910 and is now celebrating its 60th anniversary. It has grown from 360 acres which were stump-ridden and often flooded, and is now 1,150 acres given over to animal research and nutrition.

The Holstein-Friesian breed and dairy industry breed has prospered over the years because of the Farms superior breeding developments. The first direct mail campaign to sell Registered Holstein Bulls to American dairy farms was begun here.

The first statue of a cow in the United States Segis Pietertje Prospect ("Possum Sweetheart") was erected in 1928 to honor this champion's milk and butter fat production. A herd of Purebred Polled Herefords are maintained whereby research and beef breeding management and nutrition have been extended.

The recent artificial insemination industry has grown from its national and international activities.

A sizeable cattery facility was recently erected to serve as a center for major feline nutrition and food acceptance research.

Friskies Research Kennels have studied the nutritional needs of dogs for nearly 40 years. Present facilities include research operations for livestock, poultry, pets, calves, rabbits and other small animals.

Now, therefore, I, Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington convey greetings and congratulations on the milestone on its 60th anniversary, and wish the Farms continued growth and vigor in its service to animal breeding and nutrition the world over.

DANIEL J. EVANS,
Governor.

CURL NAMED AFA "MAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, "Every Day in Middle Georgia Is Air Force Appreciation Day" is the motto of Dr. Dan Callahan of Warner Robins, Ga., president of the Middle Georgia Chapter of the Air Force Association. This attitude is reflected in the excellent civilian-military community relations at Robins Air Force Base, Ga.

That relationship is a splendid credit to Maj. Gen. A. J. Beck, commanding general at Robins Air Force Base, and to the Air Force Association.

In the AFA Profile issue of Monday, September 21, 1970, there appears the following news article which merits special attention and a well done to the individuals and units selected as superlatives:

CURL NAMED AFA "MAN OF THE YEAR"— GEORGIA WINS "TOP UNIT" TROPHY

The men, women and organizations whose efforts helped advance the goals of the U.S. Air Force during the past year will be honored today during opening ceremonies of the Air Force Association's annual meeting.

The ceremonies, keynoted by Daniel Z. Henkin, assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, will be in the Park Ballroom of the Sheraton Park Hotel. Awards will be

presented by George D. Hardy, president of AFA.

Individuals and organizations and the awards they will receive are:

"AFA Man of the Year": Lester C. Curl, Southeast Regional vice president.

"AFA Unit of the Year": The Georgia State Organization (William Kelly, president).

Special Citations (Unit): Billy Mitchell Chapter, Wisconsin; Tucson Chapter, Arizona; Santa Monica Chapter, California; Richmond Chapter, Virginia.

Special Citations (Individual): Maj. Melvin Bailey, Washington, D.C.; Jack T. Gilstrap, Alabama; Maj. Gen. A. J. Beck, Georgia; Joe Higgins, California; Foreign Liaison Division, Office of the Vice Chief of Staff, USAF.

Exceptional Service Plaques (Unit): Middle Georgia Chapter, Ga., community relations; San Bernardino Area Chapter, California, unit programming; Tennessee Valley Chapter, Alabama, aerospace education; and Utah State Organization, best single program.

Exceptional Service Plaques (Individual): Will H. Bergstrom, California; Cecil Brendle, Alabama; B. L. Cockrell, Texas; A. Paul Fonda, Washington, D.C.; James Grazioso, New Jersey; William Kelly, Georgia; Robert Lawson, California; Nolan W. Manfull, Utah; Sam E. Keith, Jr., Texas; Edward Nedder, Massachusetts; Jack Price, Utah; Margaret A. Reed, Washington; Clyde Stricker, Washington, and Herbert West, Florida.

Medals of Merit: Peter Augustus III, Massachusetts; S. Samuel Boghosian, California; Noel A. Bullock, Colorado; Dr. Dan Callahan, Georgia; Jerry Cleveland, Utah; Margaret M. Foster, California; Gerald Frewer, Florida; Paul Gallard, Nebraska; Darlene Galbraith, Utah; John Haire, Alabama; Alexander Harris, Little Rock, Ark.; Robert Hunter, Ohio; Glen Jensen, Utah; Robert Maltby, Ohio; A. D. McCall, Texas; Maj.-Gen. Frederic Miller, Florida; J. Gilbert Nettleton, Jr., New York; Dick Palen, Minnesota; Gilbert E. Petrina, Pennsylvania; William C. Rapp, New York; V. M. Rexroad, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Robert H. Saber, Florida; Robert J. Schissel, Washington, D.C.; Norman L. Scott, Michigan; Thomas W. Shoop, Colorado; Edward A. Stearn, California; Hugh W. Stewart, Arizona; Lynn S. Summers, Utah; John F. White, Massachusetts, and Clair G. Whitney, Washington.

Top Membership Winners: Middle Georgia, top chapter; Georgia, top state organization, and Southeast, top region.

TRIBUTE TO OUR FLAG

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Leota D. Martin, of Edgewood, Md., wrote a tribute to our flag on the occasion of Flag Day. I should like to share her well-expressed sentiments with my colleagues by including the poem in the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO OUR FLAG

Only some stripes of Red and White
And, some stars on a ground of Blue
Only a little cotton Flag
Is it anything more to you?

Oh, yes indeed—for beneath its folds
We are safe on land and sea
It stands for America strong and brave
No matter where'er it be.

As we pay tribute to our flag today
Of Red and White and Blue
And to our great democracy
To which our hearts are true

May God be always with us
And our Flag forever wave
Above our land of Freedom
And, the homes of all our brave.

RHODESIA DESERVES RECOGNITION NOW

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, November 11, 1970, marks a particularly significant day. Notwithstanding the annual observation of Veterans' Day here in the United States, halfway around the world the people of Rhodesia will mark their fifth anniversary as an independent nation. Some in certain circles will attempt to pooh-pooh this occasion or to dismiss it as unfortunate. However, the time has come to face the simple fact that in spite of overwhelmingly hostile odds and anegative world public opinion, the Rhodesians do in fact exist as a completely autonomous people, and their 5 years of independence have been marked by significant economic progress, domestic peace and harmony, and a determination to work for a better tomorrow.

We who have known a traditionally warm friendship with the Rhodesian people, we who have benefited from a decisively favorable commercial relationship with that nation, and we who have set ourselves as an example to others by our self-proclaimed Declaration of Independence, have now for the past 5 years been led down a path of fruitless fantasy. We have been kidded into believing that somehow Rhodesia constitutes a "threat to world peace" and that the Rhodesians have instituted a form of government one step removed from the barbaric Dark Ages. These things are simply not true, and those who believe in such manner are sadly deluded.

However, I am not going to plead Rhodesia's moral case—that has been done many times before and simply leaves Rhodesia's critics without answer. Instead, I am merely going to state some plain, hard, unemotional facts—facts so obvious that no one should miss them. Fact No. 1—Rhodesia is moving toward her fifth anniversary as a completely autonomous state. Fact No. 2—all feeble cries notwithstanding, Great Britain exerts absolutely no sovereignty over Rhodesia and after 5 years of inconclusive activity has in reality abandoned any substantive claim to suzerainty over that former African possession. Fact No. 3—the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, only recently admitted publicly that the U.N. program of economic sanctions against Rhodesia has been an utter and complete failure. And fact No. 4—both the United States and Great Britain have already gone on record in the U.N. Security Council as vetoing any stronger measures, partic-

ularly the use of armed intervention, against the people of Rhodesia.

Therefore, on the simple basis of commonsense, it is time for the United States to pull its head out of the sand and to view Rhodesia in the sunshine of reality. Accordingly, at this time I am introducing a House concurrent resolution which proposes that the United States immediately take steps to grant full diplomatic recognition and to restore full economic and social contact with Rhodesia. I call upon each Member of both the Senate and the House to join with me in introducing this legislation before his respective body, and for the prompt enactment of this resolution to aid the President in making this reasonable, necessary, and proper change in American foreign policy. For the information of my colleagues, my resolution reads as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO SANCTIONS AGAINST RHODESIA

Whereas the constitutionally elected Government of Rhodesia, with the full support of the Council of Chiefs, declared Rhodesia's independence on November 11, 1965; and

Whereas on November 11, 1969, the Government of Rhodesia observed its fourth anniversary of continuous, effective, and peaceful control over its legal territory and population; and

Whereas Rhodesia has shown continuous economic growth and stability during almost five years while being subjected to unprecedented economic sanctions; and

Whereas the Government of Rhodesia has clearly established itself as the de jure sovereign over the legal territory and population of Rhodesia; and

Whereas Rhodesia is not hostile to the United States nor an enemy of the United States either under international law or under the laws of the United States, but rather has established a tradition of warm friendship between the people of Rhodesia and the people of the United States as evidenced by the fact that Rhodesia has fought beside the United States through two wars and the fact that there have been no wanton acts of violence against American lives or property; and

Whereas United States citizens continue to be warmly welcomed in Rhodesia as would our Government representatives; and

Whereas Rhodesia is one of the very few countries in Africa which pays her own way and receives no United States aid and that trade between our two countries before sanctions had been running two to one in our favor, all on a commercial basis with no subsidies, thereby assisting our balance of payments; and

Whereas, according to the Constitution (article I, section 8, paragraph 3), only the Congress has power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and the Executive has no legal authority to block trade except under laws which control trading with the enemy; and

Whereas the United States Government, without any authority from the Congress or the American people, has adopted and encouraged a stringent policy of economic sanctions and has broken all diplomatic and consular contacts with Rhodesia; and

Whereas these sanctions have caused the United States to lose a major source of high grade metallurgical chromite ore which is militarily and industrially vital to the security of the United States; and

Whereas the United States has become almost wholly dependent on the Soviet Union for its supply of this high grade metallurgical chromite ore; and

Whereas the United States and firms doing business therein are forced to purchase high grade metallurgical chromite ore from the Soviet Union at prices ranging as high as 100 per centum greater than that at which high grade metallurgical chromite ore produced in Rhodesia can be purchased; and

Whereas United States citizens have extensive commercial interests in Rhodesia which have been severely damaged by the arbitrary application of economic sanctions; and

Whereas such United States citizens have even been prevented from performance of valid contracts and other legal and moral obligations, to their present and future great loss; and

Whereas the economic sanctions have deprived Africans in Rhodesia and from neighboring countries of employment in occupations directly affected by the sanctions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government immediately cease its inhumane, imprudent, and economically and militarily disastrous policy of economic sanctions against Rhodesia; take necessary steps to restore normal trading relations; and accord full recognition and all diplomatic and consular rights attached thereto to the legal Government of Rhodesia.

CARNEGIE-MELLON PROFESSOR CITES COMPUTER TO AID CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee, on which I serve, has had 2 days of hearings designed to focus on the most effective allocation of Federal resources to reduce the incidence of serious crime.

Witnesses have discussed ways to improve the court system, youth programs, new measures to deal with the impact of crime on small business, the need for Federal policies to deal with the alarming acts of terrorism such as bombing in our cities and on the campuses, and the functioning of the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Agency and companion State agencies set up under the Safe Streets Act of 1968.

I am very pleased that Dr. Alfred Blumstein, director of the Urban Systems Institute at Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, who served as Director of the Task Force on Science and Technology on President Johnson's Crime Commission agreed to testify this morning.

His testimony emphasizes the need for better collection and relation of social data to aid in finding new or alternative approaches in our criminal system. Under a \$50,000 research grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Carnegie-Mellon recently ran a training course in systems analysis for 30 planners from the Mid-Atlantic States. Dr. Blumstein cites the need for more funds for this type of effort in other areas of the country as well as a greater link between those who do the research and carry out the plans on the local level. His excellent

testimony is included for the benefit of my colleagues herewith in the RECORD:

Senator Proxmire and members of the committee, I am particularly pleased and honored at the opportunity to appear before this distinguished Committee and to contribute to your deliberations on the problems of crime and particularly the operation of the criminal justice system in the United States.

The members of this Committee know very well the frequently repeated statistics regarding the annual increases of about 10 to 15% in crime rate statistics. There may be some question about how much of this increase is due to reporting rate increases and how much is due to more crimes. There may be some question about how much is due to people becoming more criminal, and how much is due to having more people with higher criminal propensities in the population. But very few people will deny that the crime rate has seriously increased over the last decade.

In response to these trends in the crime rate—or to focus more directly on the issue of concern, the victimization rate—President Johnson's Crime Commission paid particular attention to the need to deal in an integrated way with the component parts of the criminal justice system. It is necessary to recognize that what police do has an impact on the courts, that defendants pleading guilty or convicted in the courts must be dealt with by corrections, and that the failures of corrections are subsequently visited upon the police and the society at large as offenders back on the streets committing more crimes.

This emphasis on the "systemness" of the criminal justice system was reflected in the 1968 Omnibus and Safe Streets Crime Control Act, which created state criminal justice planning agencies in each of the states, established the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and within it the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to undertake a significant research program.

The state planning agencies were to develop plans and programs to deal with the crime problem, to foster innovation within the time-encrusted criminal justice system, and to allocate Federal resources across the total criminal justice system.

These state planning agencies are the closest approximation to "system managers" within the criminal justice system. They are the channel through which Federal block grants are routed to the states. They can thus exercise a significant influence through the \$480 million Federal program, a sizeable increment of almost 10 per cent over the current six billion dollar state and local expenditures on the criminal justice system.

Unfortunately, far too few states have engaged in meaningful planning. In most cases, the state planning agencies react rather than initiate—they approve or reject grant applications generated by the existing agencies much more than they "plan" in the sense of making projections into the future and testing alternative programs against such projections. While there have been some important ideas generated at these levels, it is understandable that the inertia of the system has not been overly creative in generating change or in fostering closer interaction between the police, courts, and corrections.

In large part, these state planning agencies have been limited by the very inadequate methodology that has been available to them. We know very little in a quantitative sense about what causes crime, and about the consequences in terms of crime of the many things we try to do to control it. We try an innovative community treatment program in one jurisdiction and it proves to be a remarkable success; when it is picked up in

another jurisdiction with less innovative drive than the first, the success is less than remarkable. When a new director of a police planning bureau allocates his forces efficiently and someone else tries to apply those methods in another jurisdiction, statutes or police rules and regulations prevent him from adopting those procedures. We still cannot definitively determine how much good we accomplish with better street lighting, more intensive police patrol, stiffer maximum sentencing or smaller caseloads for probation officers.

This great gap in our knowledge makes it extremely difficult to project about crime and to plan rationally the operation of the criminal justice system. These conditions should cause deep concern and should bring about a concerted effort to remedy this situation. Nevertheless, the Congress has seen fit to appropriate only \$7.5 million for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the research arm of LEAA. Thus, it is not very surprising that the state planning agencies do more grant management than planning.

Part of our efforts at Carnegie-Mellon University this past year have been devoted to developing a computer model to aid state criminal justice planners in planning for their state criminal justice systems. This computer model treats the criminal justice system as a sequence of processing stages through which crime reports, suspects, defendants, cases, charges, and offenders flow. At each of the stages in the system, the flow of offenders is characterized by "branching ratios" which depict the proportion of units processed at that stage that flow to each of the possible output stages. Using data on the costs and resources (such as judges or prison cells or patrolmen) used at each of the stages, it becomes possible to examine the resource implications of any contemplated changes within the criminal justice system. This computer model has been developed so that it is available to any state planner and is usable at a teletype terminal at his desk from some central time-shared computer facility.

Just last week, we ran a general training course in systems analysis for key personnel of each of the states in the mid-Atlantic region of LEAA. We were all very impressed with how quickly these planners—most of whom had no technical education and most of whom had never used a computer terminal—learned to use this planning tool. Within just a few hours of operation, these people were exploring the effects on the downstream parts of the criminal justice system of a wide variety of changes. What happens if we introduce public defenders into the lower court? An important argument limiting the expansion of the use of public defenders is the cost involved. It was found, however, that greater use of public defenders reduced the workload on the superior court and reduced the number of offenders sent to corrections. These cost savings would more than compensate for the cost of the additional lawyers. This, of course, is an advantage beyond the enhancement of the quality of justice dispensed.

Similarly, if we were to speed up the processing of cases at trial by such means as introducing more judges, then we might expect to reduce the time defendants have to spend in pre-trial detention. This cost saving may well be large enough to more than pay for the additional judges assigned to the courts. Again, cost advantage is in addition to the many other social values of a speedy trial—avoiding excessive detention of the innocent and swifter punishment to the guilty.

The comments by the participants in this course reflected the considerable value of even this very preliminary system planning model. Police officials were intrigued by being

forced to face the consequences of what happens eventually to the people they arrest.

All the planners were forced to consider what happens in the system when they introduce a new program like expanded use of public defenders. Are more cases nolledd because of an effective defense presented? Are more cases brought to trial? Are more cases pleaded guilty in order to receive lighter sentences? In the process of making such assumptions, the system planner has a tool by which he can test the implication of a variety of assumptions regarding the system he is planning. If he finds the consequences of his assumptions unacceptable—e.g., more demand for trials will call for too many judges—either he made the wrong assumptions, or he had better revise his intended plan for the criminal justice system. Thus, a model like this provides the planner with a tool which he can use to explore a wide variety of revisions within the criminal justice system.

One of the fundamental shortcomings of our model is that it does not yet incorporate the "feedback" effects, that is, it does not tell him the reduction of crime—both due to recidivism and due to the failure of deterrents that result from his various possible actions. He must still guess at those effects, largely because the appropriate data have not been collected and organized. We hope in our future work to be able to bring in data on recidivism probabilities in order to reflect the effect of the programs on crime rates.

The saddest part of the exercise involving our criminal justice planners was their universal feeling that, while the model was exciting and the availability of the tool was particularly important, their own states did not yet have the data necessary to use it immediately. They acknowledged that the model was a particularly valuable device for identifying how to collect the data in a consistent form relevant to the planning decisions to be made, but they were most skeptical that their states would soon commit the effort to collect the data.

This is an unfortunate reflection of the status of our social data. Think of where the science of economics and the practice of business management would be today without the enormous commitments made by the United States over the past three decades for the collection of a wide variety of economic data. Think of where the physical sciences would have been were it not for the major commitments by institutions such as the National Bureau of Standards, to collect basic physical measurements. In the social sciences and particularly in dealing with crime, we are little beyond the Middle Ages in terms of our understanding. In most states, particularly those that have a "minor judiciary" or local lower courts, all the criminal action that passes through them goes virtually unnoticed by anyone other than the individual magistrate. In the United States last year, we had about 7.5 million people arrested for non-traffic offenses, a rate that has increased about 25% since 1960 and has about doubled for persons under 18 years. These arrests are reasonably well reported by the FBI.

As soon as we try to follow these arrestees through the courts and into corrections, however, we find that we lose well over 90% of these, since an average daily prison population in the U.S. is about 200,000 persons. We don't know where in the courts they drop out and for what reasons, and we have a very poor idea of how many are languishing in what form of jail. The institutionalized population in state prisons is thus only a very small portion of those who run afoul of the law.

This high dropout rate suggests that the threat of imprisonment may not be the effective deterrent force many would wish it to be. One might, for instance, run a very simple

calculation to try to measure the "expected risks and benefits" to a burglar contemplating a burglary. The average value of property stolen in a burglary is about \$300. An individual who commits a burglary, on the average, has about a 1% chance of ending up in prison for that burglary. If he does go to prison, his sentence may be about three years or 1,000 days. Thus, his "expected sentence" is one per cent of 1000, or about 10 days. Thus, if he were to value his time at any less than \$30 per day, then he might be quite "economically rational" to undertake the contemplated burglary. This very superficial review, of course, does not take into account the complexities of the "irrationalities" in the decision-making behavior by a potential burglar, the details of his own case (an individual with a prior prison record is much more vulnerable than one without), nor does it try to account for the wide variety of factors that he individually takes into account. It does serve to highlight, however, the fact that most offenses do not result in a direct punishment for that offense and that the deterrent threat of the criminal sanction is inherently limited.

These data also emphasize that in our determined concern to use the criminal sanction for deterrence, we see many arrests, but a very small amount of imprisonment. It may just be, for instance, that we are extending our arrest far too broadly. Our studies for the Crime Commission some years ago indicated a projection that a 10 year old boy would have about a 50% chance of being arrested some time in his life for a non-traffic offense. That was based on 1965 arrest rates, and those rates have been going up since, so that that estimate is likely to be conservative today. It may well be that making all these arrests may well reduce rather than enhance deterrence. To the extent that people are deterred by concern over the stigma of an arrest record, we reduce that concern once we give a man an arrest record. He may have less to lose the next time, and so may be less deterred. It may just be that in this respect, as well as in others, the criminal justice system operates in a counter-productive way. Furthermore, the job discrimination suffered by those who have an arrest record, particularly if his employer thinks arrest is a rare phenomenon, can be a serious hindrance to avoiding the conditions that led to his arrest in the first place. We should consider purging minor arrest records after a reasonable time so that we can renew this stigma aspect of deterrence as well as enhancing the habilitation of half of our males.

It may well be that we are blunting the criminal sanction by using it for such private behavior as gambling, prostitution, homosexuality, drunkenness, and marijuana smoking. We thereby clog the courts, the jails, and thereby weaken our ability to use these weapons against the crimes of robbery, murder and burglary, which concern us all so much more.

Consider, if you will, a theory which suggests that a society strives to keep a constant proportion of its population imprisoned. If that proportion gets too large, then the society would have to build more jails, and it may not be willing to pay that expense. Or it may not want to see so large a segment of the population identified as ultimate deviants. On the other hand, if the proportion in prison gets too small, then the society would not want to appear excessively permissive, and sends more people to prison. If that theory is correct, then with all the increase in arrests, the courts and corrections must find means of dropping people out of the system through legal technicalities, through nolle, through acquittals and dismissals, through probation or other community treatment, and through shorter sentences or earlier parole.

The evidence, in fact, does seem to indicate that the United States does have such a stable imprisonment rate (about 100-120 per 100,000 population). And we are finding more and more means to avoid imprisoning the greatly expanded number of arrested individuals. Perhaps this lies at the heart of much of the conflict between the police and the rest of the system. Perhaps people have been getting worse, or perhaps the police are merely resorting more often to the formal mechanism of arrest rather than the informal lecture many of us received as boys. Perhaps we must finally clear up our criminal laws to focus them on those issues that concern us most, and not to mock them by appearing to apply them where they are ineffective and where they may well do more harm than good.

I recognize that changing such concepts is a long, slow, difficult process. How many legislators are willing to come out "for" adultery or gambling or prostitution? And changing the relationships within the criminal justice system is similarly difficult. Our perceptions to crime and criminals seem impervious to the knowledge that most people commit crimes and most males will get arrested. The component agencies of the system still seem to be working more in conflict than in concert. The institutions within the criminal justice system have been specific targets of the entire LEAA program. Nevertheless, one would have great difficulty identifying where there have been significant positive improvements as a result of the LEAA program. We can only hope that, as the program significantly expands this year with the infusion of a half billion new dollars, that significant forces for innovation and change will be gathered. I must confess that I am not overly optimistic. How much can we expect with an investment of 0.1 per cent of criminal justice budget in research, 1/30th that which any responsible corporate executive would spend in improving his operations.

MAKING CONGRESS MORE EFFECTIVE

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to you a report by the Committee for Economic Development, entitled "Making Congress More Effective," which was released to the public today.

This report by a most prestigious organization is the result of a long study into the role and operations of the Congress. Many of its conclusions and recommendations are good, many are thought-provoking, and a few I might disagree with—but all of them are so vital to the operations of this body that I believe everyone should read this document.

At this time, I am inserting in the RECORD a summary of the conclusions and recommendations by the CED. I think you will agree that a study of the entire document is very worthwhile:

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Facing issues of unprecedented magnitude and scope, Congress—like most other human institutions—is reluctant to modify its long-established, habitual ways of doing business. Continuing delay in modernization of Con-

gressional structures and procedures, however, will surely be injurious to the national interest and can lead only to further erosion in influence and effectiveness of the Legislative Branch.

Recognizing the complexities and obstacles standing in the way of change, we have limited the recommendations in this statement to proposals designed to overcome weaknesses without undertaking a complete remodeling of the present system. No further reference is made, for example, to the possible substitution of multi-member for single-member districts in the House of Representatives, or to changes that would require amendment of the Constitution.

In the following chapters we advocate significant modifications that are both pragmatic and immediately practicable, dealing with three separate though interrelated fields of action. *First*, we urge fundamental improvements in the Congressional handling of fiscal-economic decisions. *Second*, we propose readjustment of the entire committee structure and of the procedures associated with it. *Third*, we strongly support divestment by Congress of inessential and unsuitable administrative burdens, together with other measures that would strengthen public confidence in its objectivity.

The present Congressional approach to fiscal affairs is indefensible. When budget decisions are extended long past the beginning of the fiscal year for which they are intended, when there is no Congressional mechanism to tie revenues and appropriations into a coherent pattern, when no legislative procedure exists to initiate actions based on a comprehensive view of the economy, then national stability is endangered. When Congress permits its evaluation and oversight of programs to be carried out in ways that allow the continuance of obsolete programs and the wasteful management of potentially useful ones, then both the credibility and the effectiveness of the entire national government are seriously harmed. To correct these conditions we recommend that:

Means for comprehensive review of the annual budget be established and used, relating to total revenues and expenditures to the state of the economy.

Annual authorizations be discontinued; instead, authorizations should be made along programs and project lines fully funded, for minimum terms of four years.

Evaluation of program performance, in terms of objectives as well as dollars, be heavily stressed.

The federal fiscal year be changed to coincide with the calendar year, so that appropriations may always precede expenditures.

Congress establish and observe deadline dates for both authorizations and appropriations.

The committee system has the crucial role in Congressional decision making. As it now operates, however, decisions are fragmented; problems demanding a broad policy approach are handled in piecemeal fashion and hence poorly by the many autonomous committees and their innumerable subcommittees. These committees carry out much of their work in obscurity or secrecy which can be and often is maintained—even against the inquiries of other Members—in defiance of the elementary tenets of democracy. Through the assignment system that determines their makeup, and by means of restrictive procedures, committees can be dominated by small groups of Members with special interests held in common—or even by the desires of a powerful and autocratic chairman. These conditions prevent Congress from making open and effective response to urgent national needs. Therefore, we recommend:

Fewer standing committees, with broader jurisdiction for each.

Better use of joint and select committees.

More flexible subcommittee arrangements, with rotating chairmanships.

Abandonment of seniority as the sole criterion in selecting committee chairmen.¹ Democratized procedures, with many more open hearings.²

Better informational and analytical resources for committees.

There is no doubt that there has been an erosion of popular respect for Congress. This is injurious to the nation as well as to Congress as an institution. Citizens are now insisting that every level and branch of government become more responsive, more open to the demands of all the people, more attuned to current priorities, and less bound by traditional approaches or endless red tape. In the face of these trends Congress has appeared to fold in upon itself. Its endless involvement with minor details of administrative management and its open and attentive solicitude for special interest groups contrast with its negative reaction to many concerns of the general public. Prompt action on several fronts is needed to restore public trust. Hence, we propose:

Relinquishment of detailed direction of all administrative functions unsuited to management by a legislative body or by any committee of such a body.

Stronger "Codes of Ethics."

Assurance of majority rule on major issues in both chambers.

Installation of modern voting procedures which would eliminate the secrecy surrounding teller, standing, and voice votes in the House of Representatives.

Thorough reform of campaign finance, with full disclosure and tax incentives for contributions.

Prohibition of committee meetings while sessions of the chamber are in progress.

Acceptance of these recommendations would do much to improve Congressional operations and to enhance the Congressional image.³ Fortunately, there are no legal barriers to their adoption; changes in House and Senate rules, modification of outmoded customs, or statutory enactments in some few cases, would suffice. The Members can make the necessary changes whenever the majority chooses. Congress has considered and debated many of them in recent years, so far to little or no avail.⁴ It is now time to correct obvious weaknesses. The defects of Congress are not congenital; its wounds are self-inflicted.

WHY THERE ARE SOME SAVINGS AND LOAN REGULATORY AMENDMENTS IN THE FORTHCOMING OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus housing bill on which we are to vote in the Banking and Currency Committee next week, H.R. 19436, now contains a number of amendments based on recommendations of an ad hoc Subcommittee on Home Financing Practices and Procedures which it was my privilege to head as chairman. This subcommittee

had investigated conditions in inner city residential real estate transfers, primarily in the District of Columbia, and found some serious abuses involving federally insured savings and loans.

The full text of the report of the ad hoc subcommittee was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 31 at pages 26880-26889.

The amendments agreed to in the Banking Committee to the omnibus housing bill last week, to carry out some of the unanimous recommendations of the ad hoc subcommittee, relate to the authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to regulate conflicts of interest by officials of savings and loans; making it a Federal crime to submit false statements or claims in applications for loans from federally insured savings and loans; bringing all federally insured savings and loans in the District of Columbia under the clear authority of the Home Loan Bank Board for regulatory purposes even if they are not federally chartered; and setting up a new office of Assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist nonprofit organizations to find their way through the maze of paperwork in participating in special programs of housing assistance for low-income families.

Another proposal from the ad hoc subcommittee prohibiting the use of straw parties in real estate transactions except under clearly defined circumstances has not yet been acted on in committee and may be offered on the floor instead because of the parliamentary situation in the committee on the omnibus bill, which is now ready for final action.

UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATIONS OF AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE

These five proposals were part of a series of suggestions for improvement of home financing practices made by the ad hoc subcommittee which also included Representatives HANLEY, BRASCO, and MIZE.

In our proposal for strengthening the powers of the Home Loan Bank Board in regulating conflicts of interest in insured savings and loans, we cited the importance of setting standards for appraising, as well as more effective limitations on the borrowings of any single individual from an insured savings and loan. We dealt also with the provision of goods or services to savings and loans by officers or directors of the association, or by close relatives or business associates. But the amendment does not itself try to write such standards.

Mr. Speaker, for a recent explanation as to why these reforms are needed, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the text of a talk I gave on September 11 to the Greater St. Louis Savings and Loan League, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ST. LOUIS, MO., MEMBER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AT GREATER ST. LOUIS SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE MEETING, CHESHIRE INN, ST. LOUIS, MO., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1970, AT 12:15 P.M.

Whenever I meet with officials of the savings and loan industry, which is often, the conversations seem to reflect what I believe

the psychologists refer to as the "love-hate" relationship—they "love" me for what I have done for the home-building industry and for the savings and loans through my work as a ranking Member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and they "hate" me for some things they feel I have done to them, or about to do to them.

As the Committee Member who successfully offered the amendment which increased the insurance of bank deposits and savings and loan share accounts from \$10,000 to \$15,000 some years ago, and as the sponsor of the provision in the 1969 Act which subsequently raised those limits to \$20,000, I have received many expressions of appreciation from your industry. And, as most people in the savings and loan field in Missouri know, it was a bill which I introduced about five years ago—after the problem was called to my attention by the Missouri League—which led to the enactment of the Savings and Loan Holding Company Act of 1966. And, for that, too, I have received many thanks. Also, as most of you know, I have helped to write many new provisions of the housing laws which have benefitted savings and loans, as well as home-buyers.

On the "hate" side, however, I have these possible demerits: I opposed, first in the National Commission to Study Mortgage Interest Rates, and then in the Banking Committee and in the House-Senate Conference Committee, the proposal to eliminate all ceilings on FHA-VA mortgage interest rates. I was also against the \$250 million subsidy to the savings and loans contained in the Emergency Housing bill, but because of other things in the final version of the bill, I did join in getting it out of Conference with that provision in it, and supported its passage on the House Floor—but I'm not in sympathy with that particular subsidy because I think there are better ways of getting mortgage money out to the moderate income family in a manner which would be less costly to the Treasury and which would have the desirable effect of pressuring interest rates down instead of up. Nevertheless, my position on this subsidy to the savings and loans probably made some of you unhappy.

SOME DEFICIENCIES IN AN IMPORTANT INDUSTRY

In addition, as chairman of a special subcommittee which investigated the practices of some savings and loans in the District of Columbia which were guilty of scandalous practices in financing the predatory activities of a number of speculators in slum real estate, I raised some questions about insider-deals, connivance on fictitious straw party deals and false appraisals and other abuses, which were by no means restricted to the District of Columbia. Our Ad Hoc Subcommittee report undoubtedly was a major factor in the issuance by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board recently of proposed regulations on conflict of interest that I know the industry feels are tough.

So there is some grumbling in my direction and some of the savings and loan people have been saying to each other "Look what that Congresswoman Sullivan has done to us."

In accepting your invitation to meet with you today, I have not come here to "love" you or to "hate" you, but to discuss candidly with you what you and I, and all others who believe deeply in the vital importance of the Federally-insured savings and loans to the home financing industry in this country, can do to improve the health and strength of this great financing mechanism so that you can do an even better job for the home-buying public in the future than has been done in the past. You have been instrumental in converting the American people from a nation of renters to one of home-owners; without your industry, there would today be no such progress toward giving the

¹See Memorandum by Mr. Herman L. Weiss, page 61.

²See Memorandum by Mr. Sydney Stein, Jr., page 61.

³See Memorandum by Mr. Richard C. Gerstenberg, page 62.

⁴See Memorandum by Mr. Joseph L. Block, page 63.

great majority of our families a financial stake—an equity—in their own housing; without your Associations the achievements of the last 25 years in the home-building field could never have been realized.

All of you here are already quite aware of the contributions of the savings and loans to these great achievements. In mentioning them now, I want to make sure you know that I also recognize those achievements and want to see them expanded.

But in taking such an interest in your work and in your worthwhile activities, I have also had occasion to learn about some of the glaring deficiencies in the savings and loan field, too. Assuming that all of you are running your own institutions with the highest degree of integrity and fairness and good practice, you must nevertheless be made aware, if you are not already, of the fact that not all of the associations are living up to their charter responsibilities and obligations.

And to the extent that some associations are bringing discredit, or even disgrace, upon the savings and loan concept, the well-run S&Ls can be the innocent victims of restrictions aimed not at them but at those who do wrong.

CONFIDENCE OF INVESTORS ESSENTIAL

I am reminded of the days long ago when bank deposit insurance was first proposed and many bankers bitterly opposed government interference with their activities. But after the financial bloodbath of the Depression which destroyed many good banks as well as some which were not so good, deposit insurance became the key to public confidence in the banking system, and no bank today would have much success in attracting deposits without the government guarantee of the safety of the funds.

The insured savings and loans have also prospered over the years because of the confidence of depositors in the integrity of the system, particularly after scandals in Maryland and elsewhere led to vast losses of depositors' funds in savings and loans which were not part of the Federal Home Loan Bank system or insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Thus, even with all of the disintermediation which occurred—with all of the shopping around which took place by some investors for the top quarter-percentage point of interest on time deposits, there are nevertheless millions of Americans who have never touched their S&L savings accounts and who, in fact, added to their savings in your institutions during all of this chaotic period, because they had complete confidence in the safety of their funds.

This is your major stock-in-trade—your integrity. And anything which disturbs or challenges the public's confidence in the integrity of your institution is bad for this industry.

Unfortunately, some officials of some savings and loans seem to believe that the savings and loan business does us all such a favor by reason of merely existing that no one should dare exercise the right to question anything done by the people who run any savings and loans.

NOT JUST ORDINARY BUSINESSES

Well, of course, any legitimate business has a right to exist in this country and to run its affairs generally as its owners see fit. But the insured Federal savings and loans which are part of the Home Loan Bank System are not just ordinary private businesses—they are endowed with certain rights and certain obligations which are not extended to most other businesses. They are supposed to be member-owned and member-operated. But in a great many instances, this idea of mutual ownership and control is something of a fiction—the shareowners may own the assets of the association, but the professional

managers of the association run the association as if it were their own private business. Now that the Home Loan Bank Board is proposing more membership democracy in the associations, we are told this will destroy the savings and loans—that the managers must continue to have a free hand to make all the decisions without interference from "outsiders," as in the case of a closely held family corporation.

Perhaps there are provisions of the proposed conflict-of-interest regulation issued by the Board which are unworkable or unnecessary, but I don't see how any one could object to the idea of actually notifying your members—your owners—of the annual meeting, or of any other membership meetings, instead of just having them sign a proxy card at the time of joining the association and never even knowing what it was.

When a mutually-owned association backed by the Federal Government becomes largely the extension of the business personality of one man, or of one small group of closely allied businessmen all doing business with each other and with the association and using the association primarily to further their own private business objectives, then I think the rest of us have to become deeply concerned over the legitimacy of that whole enterprise. We shouldn't have to wait for the association to get into serious financial hotwater before doing something to conserve the assets and protect the depositors and the public. With that seal on the door attesting to Federal insurance and supervision, the association is not anyone's private business preserve, to do with as he sees fit.

THE GAP IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGULATION

In Washington, there was a somewhat peculiar local situation in that most of the savings and loans, and particularly those which were in serious financial trouble, were Federally insured but not chartered. There is no local governmental regulatory agency. So, really, nobody was looking over their shoulders until the deals they were making with slum-area real estate speculators, in which large amounts of association funds were involved, suddenly went sour because of the consequences of tight money. And the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation found itself the embarrassed possessor of some properties you and I wouldn't in one hand and a mask to breathe through and filter out the smell. These squalid properties had been mortgaged for far more than their real value, and when tight money put the squeeze on the speculators who had used savings and loan funds to buy them up, the bottom dropped out of the whole scheme—the bubble burst—and the Federal Government was left holding the bag, or rather the bricks and mortar of some awful tenelements.

More serious was the victimization of many low-income families who had purchased single-family residences at greatly inflated prices from speculators who had the inside track to savings and loan financing and who, in some instances, had actually done the "appraising" for the savings and loan from which they had borrowed the excessive mortgages.

When we checked into some of these individual loans, and were horrified by the facts we uncovered, the responsible leaders of the savings and loans industry in the District of Columbia told us they had been aware of what was going on in some of the badly-run associations, had complained about it to the Home Loan Bank System, and had urged that steps be taken to stop this kind of practice. The solution utilized by the Board was to merge one of the insured non-Federal savings and loans which had been guilty of the worst practices into a Federal institution so that the insured depositors

could be protected, meanwhile having the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation take over the worst loans involved in this scandal so that the successor association would not be stuck or hurt by them. We were told that tight money had ended the schemes of the speculators, and that the cease-and-desist powers we gave the Board in 1966 could help provide leverage against future abuses of this nature by any Federally insured institutions. Perhaps so.

SOME OF THE THINGS WE FOUND IN AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE INQUIRY

But it was a revelation to us that there are no realistic standards for the qualification of appraisers who judge the value of property on which insured savings and loans extend mortgages; there were no efforts being made to stimulate share-owner participation in the work of the institutions they presumably own; there were no restrictions on fictitious straw party deals which inflate the alleged sales price of a property; there were no real guidelines on the legitimacy of transactions between the relatives or associates of directors and the associations on whose boards the directors serve; there were altogether unrealistic limits, which were practically no limits at all, on the percentage of a savings and loan association's assets which could be lent to one individual; and there was virtually no interest on the part of most of the savings and loans in the District in lending mortgage funds directly to home-buyers in the District itself, even FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed mortgages. In the inner city area, the avenue to a savings and loan mortgage was often through the slum property speculator—he was able to obtain a loan which the individual family could not obtain in many instances from the same association, and then he transferred the mortgage to the low-income family after skimming off his substantial profit.

These were actual cases we found and documented. We were particularly appalled because we had been instrumental in developing many new programs for extending home ownership opportunities to low income families and our fear was that without adequate supervision and investigation, these programs would become new avenues for speculative windfalls. And I think you all know that this has happened to an alarming extent in some of the Section 235 programs, not only in Washington, D.C., but all over the country.

TIGHTENING CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGULATORY AUTHORITY

It was in the light of these disclosures that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is moving now to tighten up on its own conflict of interest regulations and to ask for additional powers from Congress, including the power to make it a criminal offense to inflate fictitiously the value of a property, through fake sales or other devices, for the purpose of increasing the amount of a mortgage issued by a Federally-insured institution.

I understand that there is a great deal of unhappiness among the Federally chartered institutions over the proposed new regulations, not just the limitations placed on the directors and officers in their own business transactions with the association they run, but the requirement that members of the association be enabled in a practical manner to have some say about the policies of their associations. Either these are mutuals, as they are supposed to be, or are the private businesses of a few professional savings and loan managers. It seems to me that the stock corporations which operate in the savings and loan field have to tell their stockholders a good deal more about the structure of the company than the officials of some of the Federally chartered ones seem

to feel is necessary to tell their member-owners.

So I am curious as to what all the outcry is about. Instead of my coming here to give you a report on what some agency of government is planning to do—and you can get all of that information from the Board and your own trade association experts—I believe it might be more useful to you and more helpful to me if we could turn this into a discussion rather than a speech: you people tell me—because I am in a position to do something about it if you can convince me one way or another—you tell me what there is about this proposed conflict of interest regulation which is oppressive or destructive to the objectives of the savings and loan system.

As you may know, our Subcommittee proposed giving the Board substantially greater power in this field of issuing regulations, in order to prevent the kind of situations which developed in Washington and elsewhere, situations in which public confidence in the integrity of all savings and loans is inevitably jeopardized.

Your associations are too vital a part of our economy, and of the social objectives of our nation for decent housing for all families, to permit a few bad apples to contaminate public confidence in the whole system. What do we do about it?

MARYLAND SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. James M. Kozlowski, a courageous young man from Maryland, died recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

J. M. KOZLOWSKI, 21, DIES IN VIETNAM

An Army radioman from Overlea has died in Vietnam from wounds he received in the explosion of an enemy booby trap, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Spec. 4 James M. Kozlowski, 21, of 4100 Overlea avenue, died in a Saigon hospital on August 25 as the result of infection of a shrapnel wound in his stomach.

Specialist Kozlowski was on patrol in the Mekong Delta August 12 when he was struck by the booby trap explosion. Doctors amputated both legs and his left arm at the elbow in an attempt to save his life.

COMPLETED TRAINING

A member of Company B, 9th Infantry Division, he had been in Vietnam since April 27. He was drafted into the Army April 11, 1969.

He completed his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and his advanced training at Fort Dix, N.J.

Specialist Kozlowski was born in Rosedale. After his graduation from City College in 1967, he worked as an electrician with the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company. He had planned to return to his job after completing his service in the Army.

Specialist Kozlowski is survived by his wife, the former Mary Ellingsworth; his parents, Joseph and Agnes Kozlowski, of Baltimore; three sisters, Mrs. Frances Beaver, Mrs. Connie Luzadder, and Mary Kozlowski, all of Baltimore; four brothers, Raymond Kozlowski, Robert Kozlowski, Joseph Kozlowski, all of Baltimore, and Richard Kozlowski, of Virginia Beach, Va.

CXVI—2127—Part 25

TESTIMONIAL TO JUDGE ALFRED A. NOYES

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 12, Judge James C. Gulotta of the Orleans Parish Juvenile Court, New Orleans, La., was guest speaker on the occasion of a testimonial dinner in Rockville, Md., in recognition of Judge Alfred A. Noyes, for juvenile causes, of the People's Court in Montgomery County, Md.

Judge Gulotta's remarks on this occasion express the deep regard and affection which we in Montgomery County hold for Judge Noyes and, therefore, I insert Judge Gulotta's remarks in the RECORD.

TESTIMONIAL TO JUDGE ALFRED A. NOYES (Address by Judge James C. Gulotta)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, distinguished judges, ladies and gentlemen, may I express to you my sincerest thanks and appreciation in honoring me by inviting me to say a few words about a person for whom the highest esteem is felt by me personally and by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and the National Juvenile Court Foundation.

It is fitting that we in the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and National Juvenile Court Foundation are asked to participate in this testimonial dinner because we feel that Bud has been the pillar upon which the entire National Council has stood for many years and blossomed from a knife and fork association for judges to an outstanding judicial training organization dedicated to the improvement in the effectiveness and integrity of the judiciary, Bud Noyes organized, guided, and led this group from its inception to its present position.

Bud Noyes came to the Bench in the year 1946. He held the position of President of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges in 1960-61. He was Chairman of the National Juvenile Court Foundation in 1967-68. He is at present a Trustee and Treasurer of the Foundation. Bud was given the Distinguished Service Award in Atlanta, 1970, by the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges as the nation's most outstanding judge who has made the greatest contributions to the Juvenile Court System and juvenile justice. Bud has published many articles for the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

These accomplishments are not unusual for Bud because he makes every group, every organization, and every person feel that their cause and endeavor, their aims and their purposes, are the causes to which he also is enthusiastically dedicated. While we feel that Bud belongs to us, and while I personally feel that Bud is one of my closest friends, all with whom he has become associated jealously feel that he belongs to them. You feel this tonight. He is yours to honor. But let me say that Bud Noyes has reached the pinnacle in the judiciary not only on a national level, but also on an international one to such an extent that he is the recognized leader among judges of this nation and of the world. He epitomizes to them and to us one that possesses the highest attributes in every respect that a judge could have. Bud makes me and the national judges proud that we are judges.

I say these things not casually, nor cour-

teously, not without meaning. I say these things because I have had the opportunity as you have to work with this distinguished gentleman under stress and in delicate situations.

I came to the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges as a new judge, starry-eyed and awed by the association with elder, established, and highly regarded jurists. It took me little time to seek the wise counsel of Bud Noyes. It took me little time to observe the high regard that all judges and persons who occupy high positions have for this outstanding man. Bud is universally regarded as an outstanding astute and learned jurist.

Though a few years separated Bud from myself and though a few years of experience separated Bud from me, I immediately felt and continue to feel a close affinity to him. I felt that we are contemporaries and the most outstanding tribute that I can pay to Bud, and his are many, is that all persons, no matter what age group they find themselves, no matter what station in life fate has befallen them, Bud is their contemporary. Bud is their friend. Bud is their leader. This is true of the new judges of our organization. This is true of the older judges. All come to him to seek counsel and advice. None are turned away.

I have been the beneficiary of his wise judgment on several occasions, more than I can probably remember. I often wonder whether sometimes I should feel that I too often look to him for solutions to problems rather than solve them myself. This gentleman's ability, depth, and sound judgment comes to the forefront when the situation becomes most delicate. Just a few short weeks ago we were in Geneva, Switzerland, together at an international meeting of judges. Gathered there were representatives from just about every nation in the world. We were cognizant of our responsibility to our judges at the international meeting of judges and to our nation.

As you might expect, different concepts, different methods of doing things, as well as language barriers, led to misunderstandings and serious disagreements which, if not judiciously handled, could cause severe repercussions. Impressions of an unfavorable nature for the American jurists, for the American public official, and of America itself might have and could have resulted. The politics of the international groups was somewhat difficult for us to understand at a time when relationships between the American delegates and some of the other delegates were possibly becoming strained because we just did not understand each other's point of view. Bud, in a caucus of our judges, as usual, calmed the waters, offered solutions and courses of action, which, when adopted by us, appeared to be simple, yet were well thought out. This is his capacity to take the most complicated problem of a delicate nature and untangle it into a simplified solution. Needless to say, we, the American delegation, received more consideration from the foreign judicial delegates because of Bud's suggestion than we had ever hoped.

I could cite many examples of this gentleman's deep analytical ability and profound mind. Bud never ceases to amaze me. He never ceases to amaze others, and I am certain that he never ceases to amaze you.

I have had the opportunity and the honor to attend many testimonial dinners. None has given me more pleasure than the invitation extended to me to this one. Though Bud is highly regarded because of his forthright honesty and integrity possessed by few men and is considered a giant among judges, nevertheless he has a sense of humor and soundness and that reduces mountains of problems to avenues of progress.

More important than all of these is his

sincere desire to help persons less fortunate. His consideration for the children and people he serves is paramount. In every deliberation, Bud's primary concern is the effect that these deliberations will have upon the children who appear in his court or in any other court in our land. I have yet to feel that Bud has ever lost sight of his and our responsibility to the children who need our help and the help of all who serve the cause of juvenile justice.

In closing, may I say to you, Bud, and to your lovely wife that I hope and trust that you will enjoy your retirement and that you get to do all the things you thought and hoped you wanted to do but had little time to do. I hope and trust that we may enjoy the benefit of your continued counsel and advice.

All who know you love you, Bud, and I say with deepest affection, sincerity, and conviction that this world is a little better place because you walked by. God bless you and good night.

CIA IN CHILE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an interesting letter appeared in the New York Times today counseling against CIA plotting in Chile. For my colleagues who are not familiar with the background of the author of this letter, I include at this point a short sketch drawn from a staff study prepared for the Senate Internal Security Committee entitled "the Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," 89th Congress, first session,

Document No. 72, printed in 1965. Letter and sketch follow:

CHOICE IN CHILE

To the Editor:

A proposed Marxist, Dr. Salvador Allende, has received the plurality of votes in the recent presidential election in Chile.

It would be fitting for all adherents of free democratic elections to see to it that the C.I.A. does not repeat its past performances in Guatemala, Santo Domingo and Bolivia by endeavoring through underground intrigue—or *coup d'etat*—to nullify the democratically expressed wishes of the people of Chile.

ANTON REFREGIER.

WOODSTOCK, N.Y.

ANTON REFREGIER

Under date of May 9, 1965, the pamphlet "National Teach-In on the Vietnam War," May 15, 1965, lists Anton Refregier, artist, as a supporter. His record follows:

Anton Refregier is listed as a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization (official program of the American People's Meeting of the American Peace Mobilization, Apr. 5, 1941). The American Peace Mobilization has been cited as Communist by the Attorney General.

Anton Refregier is listed as a sponsor of the Artists' Front To Win the War and as a supporter of the American Artists' Congress (folder, Artists Front To Win the War, mass meeting Oct. 16, 1942, Carnegie Hall). The Artists' Front To Win the War has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The name of Anton Refregier appears on a list of persons affiliated with the John Reed Club who signed a protest against alleged anti-Communist propaganda (New York Times, May 19, 1930). The John Reed Club has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. John Reed was a founder of the American Communist Party.

The name of Anton Refregier appears in a list of artists calling for an American Artists' Congress (Art Front, November 1935, p. 6). The American Artists' Congress has been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

The name of Anton Refregier is listed as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. (undated leaflet). The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The name of Anton Refregier appears on a letter to the President protesting what was described as "the badgering of Communist leaders" (New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21). New Masses has been cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General.

Anton Refregier is listed as a contributor to a book of drawings under the title of "Winter Soldiers" in defense of certain Communist teachers then under charges of Communist activity ("Winter Soldiers," June 17, 1941).

Anton Refregier returned in May 1965 from a visit to the Soviet Union and Communist East Europe. The Worker of May 18, 1965, page 6, announced that he was to speak about his journey at the Philadelphia Social Science Forum, which is an adjunct of the Philadelphia School of Social Science and Art, which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

The signature of Anton Refregier, member of the United American Artists, appears on a letter to FDR urging help to U.S.S.R. (Daily Worker, Sept. 16, 1941, p. 7.)

The name of Anton Refregier, mural painter, appears on a list of persons requesting the President to exert his influence to end an attack on the freedom of the press with specific reference to the New Masses. (New Masses, Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21.) New Masses has been cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General.

SENATE—Friday, September 25, 1970

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, at this moment so turbulent without and tense within, we pause in this Chamber importuning Thy vivid presence to quiet our spirits, restore our souls, clarify our minds, and direct our energies toward the completion of our task.

O God, help us to stand here in the full stature of our manhood, men created in Thy image, vested with eternal value, and destined to serve Thee. In these strenuous, wearisome, and aggravating days deliver us from all pretense and posing, from all pettiness or littleness, from all rudeness or revenge—that we may quit ourselves as men of God—full of wisdom and faith—humble servants of that kingdom which is always coming but not yet here.

Receive us and use us this day and evermore.

Through Him whose love never ceases. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated

to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON RADIATION CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 360D of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-602), I am herewith transmitting to you the second annual report on the administration of this Act.

This report was prepared by the Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 25, 1970.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Daniel H. Huyett III, of Pennsylvania,

to be a U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 24, 1970, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works; the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare all be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, pursuant to the rather extensive discussion of my reasons on yesterday, I respectfully and with great reluctance nevertheless am required to object to the requests of the distinguished Senator from Montana.