

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FURTHER COMMENT FROM WYOMING ON STUDENT UNREST

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, I included in the RECORD a few remarks concerning the current problems which the campuses of our Nation face in terms of disorder and violence. I also had printed the thoughts and comments of some of the citizens of my State. I include the text of my newsletter together with some additional remarks made by the people of Wyoming:

JOHN WOLD: YOUR WYOMING CONGRESSMAN REPORTS ON CAMPUS UNREST

DEAR FRIEND: "On strike—shut it down!" was a chant that many students and faculty dissenters screamed this spring in hopes of closing their school. Seven-hundred-sixty colleges and universities across the country came to their knees under the pressure of such groups! It meant that nearly 1.5 million students had to temporarily abandon their plans for an education.

We cannot tolerate such actions in Wyoming. Wyoming young people have generally had able school administrators. Wyoming can be proud that our state leads the Nation in per capita investment for education. Last year the University of Wyoming faced student unrest to a degree it had never before experienced. Restraint prevailed and serious confrontations were avoided, but there was a potential for trouble. Our responsibility is to explore and solve campus problems ahead of time.

Change is vital to progress but we must be cautious that constructive protest doesn't erupt into destructive violence. The purpose of this report is to squarely face these problems and to come up with constructive solutions. I want you to know what I have done in this area as your Congressman. I also would appreciate your sentiments written on the enclosed form so that I can tell the U.S. Congress how Wyoming feels on this important problem.

Sincerely,

JOHN WOLD,
Your Congressman.

CAMPUS UNREST! ROAD TO REVOLUTION?

VIOLENCE IS NOT LEGITIMATE DISSENT

The rights of dissent and protest are fundamental to a democratic society. Our government should not interfere with the right of dissent as long as it is peacefully conducted and the rights of others are respected.

Violence in any form, in any measure, under any circumstance, is not a legitimate means of protest on or off a campus.

THOSE BEHIND CAMPUS VIOLENCE

The facts show that the bulk of campus violence is caused by the extreme new left led by the so-called Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

SDS leaders have been open in their statements of purpose. Greg Calvert, an SDS spokesman, has said: "We are trying to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment; we are actively organizing sedition."

The SDS publication, New Left Notes, says: "When we move with the people of the world to seize power from those who now rule, we can expect their pig lackeys to come down

on us . . . We've got to actively fight. We've got to bring the war home to the mother country of imperialism, 'Amerika'—the final front."

We cannot afford to ignore or underestimate the potential of SDS efforts directed at our colleges and high schools. Their dissent movement has shifted from peaceful protest to an outright declaration of war on the American system.

It is interesting that Lenin, before gaining control in Russia, used the college youth to promote anarchy and to destroy government in Russia—actions very similar to those being taken by the leaders of the new extreme left in the United States today.

THE PRICE OF STUDENT VIOLENCE

The cost of student violence has been high in lives and property damage. In the 15-month period between January 1969 and April 1970, this country suffered a total of 4,430 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings and 35,129 threatened bombings. This cruel form of terrorism accounted directly for the deaths of 40 people and \$21.8 million in property damage.

Campus disorders, according to the Treasury Department, accounted for 56 percent of these incidents of terrorism.

The price of these incidents decreases the amount of loans and scholarships available to deserving students.

REASONS FOR VIOLENCE

It is fashionable to attribute most student unrest to the Vietnam War. That is partially true.

Young people have always been in revolt against their parents. But what is unprecedented about today's outburst is the support they receive from so many people who should know better. In many cases we see professors, not only endorsing violent behavior, but out throwing rocks at the policemen.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told President Nixon's Commission on Campus Unrest that student dissent is threatening to plunge the nation's educational facilities to the brink of chaos. "The activities of student dissidents and violence-prone campus radicals have implanted the notion in our youth that the road to progress lies in threats, disruption and destruction," Hoover said. "Most of our youth are a credit to their parents and to this country, but a minority steeped in an attitude of indulgence and materialism, has terrorized whole academic communities, bringing the nation's educational facilities to the brink of chaos."

WHAT ABOUT THE MAJORITY OF YOUNG PEOPLE?

FBI estimates indicate that the SDS and their sympathizers number only about one percent of the students at our colleges and universities. While that rabble with filthy bodies and filthier mouths monopolize the headlines, there are millions of responsible young college students who are more concerned about getting an education than destroying the system that is providing their educational opportunities.

Even more thoroughly ignored are the millions upon millions of young Americans who decide to go to work instead of to college. These young people are experiencing the same daily hardships of other Americans. They pay bills, pay taxes, raise their families and keep a home together, usually with the added handicaps of less money, less experience and fewer possessions.

HOPEFUL SIGNS

Students who go to college to get an education should begin to challenge those who want to start a revolution. If they don't, they may find their precious heritage of freedom and opportunity gone down the drain.

In increasing numbers, however, young people seem to be turning from demonstrations and protest, and concentrating instead on change through the political process. The college student who works to elect a candidate who supports his point of view is doing far more for his cause than he could possibly achieve by participating in a protest demonstration.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

We are now approaching the fall and the return of a large number of young people to the campuses. We must place faith in these young people. This generation, perhaps more than any other, is sensitive to the shortcomings of our society and wishes to become meaningfully involved in their solution. We must encourage that interest and concern without losing sight of the need to deal firmly with violence and disorder.

There must be an assertion of leadership among the law-abiding students, professors, administrators, alumni, and public officials. At the same time an effort must be made to anticipate trouble, to remedy valid grievances, and to maintain clear channels for the effective handling of requests and complaints.

Young people must learn that while dissent is healthy, violence is not. Those who disagree with public policy have the right to dissent, but not to destroy property or interfere with the rights of others, including the right of other students to get an education.

REMARKS BY PEOPLE OF WYOMING

"I am a senior majoring in Education at the University of Wyoming. I am simply appalled by the radical actions taken by a large share of students involved in expressing campus unrest. I think police and college officials ought to have a strong arm in dealing with radicals. Withdrawing financial aid to radicals is an excellent idea. I am a member of ROTC."—Kenneth P. Marx, Laramie.

"Our young people do have some legitimate beefs such as the fact that they can pay taxes and be drafted to fight in wars which they feel are wrong, but they cannot legally drink, smoke or vote. Their peaceful protests and demonstrations often turn to violence because peaceful protests go unheeded or their significance is deliberately suppressed by the media—see the attached letter (which was not printed). I do not believe in letting campus militants disrupt or take over a college. I'm with Mr. Hayakawa on that, and have publicly stated this view."—Gil Stevenson, Laramie.

"I feel the colleges and high schools should have more rules that apply to each student and if not obeyed—have the students expelled. Our school system, I feel, has let down the students and parents that are really trying to get an education. Also, we need more trade schools and help for the students that aren't college material. We also need more communication between teachers and students. I think high school education or age 18 should be made a law."—Helen A. Cossitt, Sheridan.

"I feel that students have the right to peaceful dissent but violence has no place in our society and I feel that either students or faculty members engaging in violence should be immediately suspended from the university or college permanently."—C. W. Lyon, Cheyenne.

"We are suggesting legislation that would immediately expell or dismiss any of these people (students and faculty) from our colleges that in any way contribute to violence, property damage, etc. This would give the

greater percentage of our young people the right to an education. We further suggest that all of your views be extended to cover the high-school level."—Mr. & Mrs. Byron B. Rawlings, Sheridan.

"I am in complete harmony with the view that we are foolish, weak and apathetic to allow a small minority of rabble rousers to paralyze our educational system. They have no rights they are trying to preserve, but rather they deprive many Americans of basic rights we have had for generations. Laws which protect these rights should be enforced. I feel the right to peaceful protest is one thing, but interpreting this right to cover violence, and to champion the cause of an enemy government and to destroy our freedoms should be curtailed."—LaMont R. Merritt, Afton.

"The only way to achieve peace on the campus, in my opinion, is to: 1) Adopt strict, clearly-defined, rules against any and all interruptions, demonstrations or violence on our college campuses; 2) then, strictly enforce these rules without regard to who breaks them; 3) violators should be expelled immediately followed by prosecution in the courts; 4) and finally, all rules and enforcement should apply to the *College Professors* since they are much more responsible for the problem than the student."—Roy H. Guess, Casper.

"Part of the college's job is to turn out at graduation time, responsible, well-behaved adults. If they (the colleges) do not do this, they are failing in their duty to parents and society."—Mrs. J. G. Wannschaff, Casper.

"I believe that students not obeying the rules and regulations of the college which they are attending should be immediately expelled from school; and especially the State supported schools such as the University of Wyoming. We taxpayers are getting fed up with the added taxes that such unrest in the schools demands."—Mrs. J. S. Bookout, Wheatland.

"If there are injustices, correct them. Expell student trouble makers and fire faculty members who support student rioting and terrorism. Prosecute individuals who are guilty of destroying property."—George W. Steinbrech, Lander.

PROBLEMS FACING U.S. 6TH FLEET

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in view of the present threats to peace in the Middle East, I invite the attention of Congress to a news column written by Henry J. Taylor and published in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., on September 25, 1970.

Mr. Taylor correctly points out the decline of U.S. seapower as evidenced by our naval forces in the Mediterranean. He notes the U.S. 6th Fleet is facing a growing and more modern Soviet Navy in that area of the world as well as elsewhere.

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

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

SIXTH FLEET UP AGAINST IT: AGING U.S. SHIPS FACE GROWING RED ARMADA

(By Henry J. Taylor)

ATHENS.—While rumors swept the Middle East that the U.S. Sixth Fleet would intervene against the Palestine commando sky-jackers, our force was tied up tighter than a drum in the eastern Mediterranean.

In fact, this country—Greece—is the only country in the entire eastern Mediterranean where the Sixth Fleet can congenially call.

It cannot go to neighboring Turkey, long a solid anchor of NATO in the eastern Mediterranean, without provoking street riots, protest-bombings and crippling internal strikes. That represents a complete reversal in our defense capability in this explosive part of the world. And in the light of the fiery Israel-Arab situation, it is the main immediate problems of U.S. Vice Admiral Isaac C. Kidd Jr., now newly commanding the Sixth Fleet.

Moreover, west of Turkey and except for Israel, Tunisia and Morocco, the entire southern rim of the Mediterranean is hostile to us. Syrian, Egyptian and Algerian harbors are available to the expanding Soviet Mediterranean fleet. And even on the Iberian peninsula at the Atlantic gate to the Mediterranean, opinion is incensed over what millions of Spaniards and Portuguese call our double-standard—one for colonial powers, another for the Afro-Asians.

Meanwhile, Admiral Kidd, aboard his flagship, the USS Springfield, a light guided-missile cruiser, has taken over a profoundly worried fleet now alerted for immediate call in a nearly impossible situation.

Behind the scenes, and at this moment, Admiral Kidd's command consists of about 50 vessels, including two aircraft carriers and 200 aircraft. The personnel numbers 25,000. Even with the additional Marines arriving aboard the helicopter carrier Guam, his force has only a combat-ready battalion landing team of a scant 3,000 Marines.

His ships are also aging ships which show an encroaching obsolescence. Admiral Kidd does not see how he can compensate for time's natural wastage. An alarming proportion of his fleet was built during the 1939-45 war period and is 25 years old.

Its support by the once all-powerful British navy is all but negligible. In fact, Admiral Kidd finds that the entire worldwide British navy has now been reduced to 3 aircraft carriers, 2 commando ships, 8 nuclear-powered submarines, 33 conventional submarines, 3 cruisers, and 87 large and small destroyers and frigates. British naval strength in the Mediterranean is merely the converted carrier Albion at Cyprus, the guided-missile destroyer Flite at Malta, and the frigate Euryalus at Gibraltar.

Moreover, Admiral Kidd is constantly harassed today by the Soviet probings in these waters. For example, the Soviet "tanker" Kustanala suddenly arrived on the flank of his flagship Springfield in the crisis over the planes and passengers skyjacked to the Jordanian desert. A Soviet helicopter hovered nearby. Both were loaded with electronic gear to intercept messages between Admiral Kidd's Springfield and Sixth Fleet units cruising off Lebanon's coast regarding our possible intervention.

Although the Soviet has no aircraft carriers (anywhere), its Mediterranean fleet's ships now outnumber Admiral Kidd's command. Then, looking further, he sees the Soviet naval expansion not only in the Mediterranean but to all the seven seas.

Admiral Kidd estimates that the Soviet fleet now consists of 75 nuclear-powered and 320 diesel-powered submarines, 25 cruisers, 100 destroyers, another 100 destroyer escorts, 275 patrol vessels, 300 mine sweepers, 300

torpedo boats, 125 missile boats, 2 helicopter carrier vessels, 130 amphibious craft and literally thousands of support, auxiliary and service craft.

Of nearly equal importance, the Reds have in these waters and worldwide a nearly new fleet. Only 1 per cent of the entire Soviet fleet is 20 years old, NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster told me. That the Soviet is driving all out to seize supreme seapower from our country seems obvious to Admiral Kidd—While the United States Navy is admittedly inadequate to meet our worldwide national and international commitments.

The quiet, oh, so quiet expansion of Soviet maritime power was the military phenomenon of the 1960s. At close hand this looks like a relentlessly rising flood tide in the 1970s.

Admiral Kidd has his work cut out for him around here, as the Mideast continues to boil, the skyjacks add to that explosive turmoil, and the Kremlin makes its bid to achieve the balance factor in global power.

After a visit to our NATO naval headquarters near Naples, to the Greek island of Corfu, where elements of our Sixth Fleet are visiting, and then here at our eastern Mediterranean command's control center, the grim question arises: Who is policing the peace of the world now?

FOREIGN POLICY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, foreign policy touches every family intimately. In recent years we have seen how remote, limited wars not only shatter international peace but also the basic fabric of our own society, destroying the peace and destroying precious lives and other resources. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have worked to strengthen the role of the Congress—the people's branch of the Government—in the control of war-making authority and foreign policy generally. Following is a brief summary of my efforts (full texts of statements, resolutions, bills or amendments mentioned available upon request):

SOUTHEAST ASIA

With the change in administration 2 years ago, the greatest problem faced by our Nation was the war in Vietnam. On March 24, 1969, just 2 months after President Nixon took office, I urged our new Commander in Chief to begin troop withdrawals. In a speech on the floor of the House, I stated:

Hanoi will concede nothing of importance at the negotiating table.

There is no reason that the South Vietnamese troops, who substantially outnumber the Communists, cannot if they have sufficient spirit, fight their own battle aided by our material support.

On March 25, I placed in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* the names of the 31,379 Americans killed in hostile action in Vietnam prior to the time that Richard Nixon become President. Covering 122 pages

with fine print, this Vietnam Roll of Honor—which I have since updated four times—is meant to honor the courage of the men who fought and died in Vietnam and also to show in the most graphic way why our combat involvement must be ended.

Shortly thereafter, President Nixon announced the first withdrawal of 25,000 ground combat troops.

By October 1969 the country was again getting restless over the progress, or seeming lack of it, in the Vietnam war. Some thought that a quick military blow might end the war, while many others thought that the rate of withdrawal should be greatly speeded up.

On October 6, I introduced a resolution declaring that:

The substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in the national interest and that the President be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining such forces at the earliest practicable date.

Nearly one-fourth of the membership of the House cosponsored my resolution. Shortly after this initiative, I received a personal letter from President Nixon thanking me for introducing the resolution, stating that "this legislative action is greatly appreciated."

In November 1969, as the Vietnam issue continued to boil in the country, I introduced, together with the leadership in the House of Representatives, a resolution supporting the President's diplomatic initiatives to bring an end to the conflict and calling for a "just peace" in Vietnam. However, I argued that it was not sufficient for the House merely to endorse the President's diplomatic initiatives in Vietnam. Supported by President Nixon's letter thanking me for my earlier resolution, I offered an amendment to the pending resolution "support[ing] the President's expressed determination to withdraw our remaining ground combat forces at the earliest practicable date."

To the full House, I argued:

Clearly, the House of Representatives has a duty to formulate a position on basic Vietnam policy, and I would hope it will endorse the policy being pursued by the President. . . . Our new Commander-in-Chief deserves a vote of confidence in the fundamental policy change he has initiated.

Despite my pleas, my proposal, for which the President himself had voiced approval, was not adopted.

With the approach of Christmas, my staff in Washington began collecting money for the annual "Christmas in Vietnam" project. Volunteers bought and wrapped \$3,000 worth of gifts for our servicemen in Vietnam. American and Pan American Airlines airlifted the gifts directly to Vietnam, where they were distributed on Christmas eve.

On April 30, 1970, the defense procurement authorization was before the House of Representatives for consideration. I offered an amendment to the bill prohibiting any of the funds authorized to be used to finance the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos, Thailand, or Cambodia without the prior consent of Congress "except to the

extent that such is required, as determined by the President and reported promptly to the Congress, to protect the lives of American troops remaining within South Vietnam." Debate became hot, and the House finally adjourned without voting on my amendment to await the President's address to the Nation.

That very evening, President Nixon announced in a televised address that he had sent American combat troops into Cambodia because he felt that enemy positions in the sanctuary areas were capable of endangering the lives of American troops remaining in Vietnam.

Shortly thereafter, I met with the President at the White House. Present also were other members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. President Nixon stated to the group his support for my amendment and said he thought it "splendid." He said that he hoped that it would pass when the bill was voted on that week.

Although adopted over all other pending amendments pertaining to the Cambodian intervention, when the final vote came, the House decided to say nothing.

In the aftermath of the sending of U.S. troops into Cambodia, public demonstrations were organized for Washington. I felt that such demonstrations did not provide young people with a constructive way to set forth their ideas and arguments effectively. A tremendous number of leaderless people massed together in front of the White House add up to confusion, not clarity. To help provide young people with a proper forum, I organized a special committee of Congressmen to hold 2 days of hearings on student views toward U.S. policy in Southeast Asia. Over 60 students from 50 different colleges and universities traveled at their own expense to Washington to testify. The leadoff witness was a young man from Kent State University who, like several others, spoke in support of President Nixon's policies. Other witnesses expressed opposition. All were opposed to violence in any form as a means to achieve a change in policy, and said they were willing to work within the system. The hearings have been printed and copies are available upon request.

WAR-MAKING POWERS

A bill to require Presidential reports on the commitment of U.S. troops, which I introduced, has been adopted virtually intact by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and is expected to be approved soon by the full House. The bill specifies that the President shall submit promptly to Congress a report giving his detailed reasons, and authority for sending troops to foreign soil without first securing specific approval from Congress, and the expected scope of the activities contemplated. This step will help the Congress fulfill its constitutional responsibility in the warmaking field, and I feel, reduce the possibility of new Vietnam-like involvements in the future.

NATIONAL SECURITY

In 6 years work as delegate to international conferences on security, I have de-

veloped a proposal which will strengthen NATO and yet permit a substantial reduction in our troops in Europe while protecting our national interests. On September 9, I had the privilege of presenting the details in a 35-minute discussion personally with President Nixon. On September 24 I met with Admiral Moorer, chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff for the same purpose. Earlier I presented it to German, French, and British leaders, and am gratified to know it is now receiving active consideration throughout our NATO alliance.

THE FLIMSY CASE FOR THE SST

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Roanoke Times of September 24, 1970, contains an excellent editorial entitled "The Flimsy Case for the SST."

I agree with the conclusion drawn in the editorial that the SST is at the present time a nonessential and expensive project.

The editor of the editorial page of the Roanoke Times is Forrest M. Landon.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FLIMSY CASE FOR THE SST

By this time, with the Senate vote on appropriations so near, both sides on the supersonic transport question are, we think, exaggerating their case. We have not stopped our ears, but we have ceased to pay quite as much attention to the outcries about the sonic boom's potential effect or the damage that may result from SST vapor trails in the upper atmosphere. That kind of harm may yet result, but the threat is speculative right now.

Yet even if we discount all the environmental and social arguments against the SST, we remain unimpressed by the justifications offered for it. What earthly need have we, or the rest of the world, for an 1,800-mile-an-hour airplane while earthbound traffic is mired up? Indeed, the chief point put forward by the Nixon Administration seems to be that we must develop an SST because other nations are doing it and if we don't, our balance of payments and our pre-eminent position in the aircraft industry will suffer.

Perhaps they will. But the federal government already has invested \$738 million in SST development and is being asked now to put in another \$290 million. Administration spokesmen have indicated they would be willing if necessary to go the last mile and underwrite not only development (at a total cost of \$1 billion) but also production (another \$3 billion).

And this is before there is demonstrable market demand for the craft, before there can be any assurance that enough of our SSTs would sell for the federal government to recoup its investment.

If they didn't sell, what good would that do our balance of payments or our aircraft industry's rating? Meantime, what good would all this added federal spending have done for the budget or the anti-inflation effort?

Our view is that the SST is an unnecessary prestige project, and if it is too expensive and risky for the aircraft industry to shoulder it, then neither should the taxpayer. If the industry, now in a slump, needs federal help to bail it out, let it be put to work on more useful tasks, like developing pollution-free mass-transit vehicles for our roads and streets.

**WE MUST SAVE OUR SCHOOLS, AND
OUR PEOPLE FROM CRIMINALS IF
WE ARE TO SAVE OUR NATION**

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my friend and distinguished colleague G. R. "Sonny" MONTGOMERY for arranging today's discussion. He has been in the forefront in efforts to save public education.

My friends, our public school system is being destroyed, and it is being destroyed needlessly and without bringing about the objective sought by those who are responsible for its destruction. This is a subject I have discussed many times in the Congress; and while the House of Representatives has passed provisions which I have offered as limitations on the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at least 5 times, only this year were we able to get the amendments through the other body without seriously weakening them. Of course we had the all-out support of our Senators.

These provisions, which appear in Public Law 91-380 as Sections 209 and 210, read as follows:

Sec. 209. No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to force on account of race, creed or color the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force the transfer or assignment of any student attending any elementary or secondary school so desegregated to or from a particular school over the protest of his or her parents or parent.

Sec. 210. No part of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to require the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force on account of race, creed or color the transfer of students to or

These amendments, while a limitation on the use of funds, passed the House and Senate by overwhelming votes, clearly showing the feelings of the people of the United States, as evidenced by the "People's Branch" of our Government, the Congress.

Notwithstanding this, we see the Federal judiciary rushing in to complete the destruction of the system which has existed for generations, usurping powers not given the courts by the Constitution,

a course the judges would not dare to follow if the Department of Justice, the executive department, would say no; for the courts, or the judges, are dependent upon the Marshals, representatives of the executive department, to carry out their orders.

Not only have communities been torn up by the problems thus brought to our schools, but the students are being deprived of an education. This will be felt for the rest of their lives by every child who suffers through this period of poor and unsatisfactory schooling.

I would point out again that no society or nation in history has stood for any great length of time unless it provides 3 things: internal protection of its people; protection of property rights, so men will have the incentive to work and save; and the education of its people. I can do no better than to repeat here what I have said on other occasions.

Law enforcement was seriously hampered by the Federal courts in my section of this country, and it has spread all over the United States until now in this area, as in most other cities, you are afraid to get out on the streets at night. The morning newspaper lists almost a half page on the major crimes of each preceding day. Last year we had 18,000 robberies and 9,000 burglaries and another 9,000 cases of other crimes of violence in Washington.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

The Nation's courts let property rights be destroyed in my section. It spread to the burning of Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, Los Angeles, and hundreds of other cities.

So it is here. If you stand by and let HEW or the courts destroy quality education in my section, it is bound to come home to you.

You would not believe what has been done. We have home economic students being sent to schools where they do not have the equipment for teaching the subject.

We have youngsters in the lower grades who are going to schools where all the facilities are large, constructed for seniors and juniors. We have juniors and seniors going to schools with low blackboards, low commodes, and low drinking fountains, facilities intended for elementary school students. The interchange of faculty is unbelievably disastrous. Teachers have quit and you have to hire whoever you can get. One parent, discussing the math teacher, said she was fine until she got into fractions, long division and decimals.

We are violating the intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Believe you me, we are destroying public education for all races. It is my section now but if not stopped it will spread to yours, just like violence and property destruction did.

In my hometown there are colored as well as white people who come to me and say: Congressman, isn't there something you can do to save our schools? Congressman, won't you help us see that our children can go to school where we want them to go—do they have to be carried all around over the country to teachers who are not qualified?

I have never been one who would want to visit on any section of the United States what has happened in my section. The schools and public education have been destroyed as of the moment. We are having children hauled miles from one direction to another against their wishes, to create a racial mix to satisfy some court or judge. I have one constituent—a man whose daughter and son are in one school and now the daughter in the next class is going 12 miles in another direction to a different school; and next year she will have to go 12 miles in another direction to another school—against everyone's wishes.

I am told we have more than 475 schools over our region which have been closed; we have had new school buildings closed. Yet in some cases classes are held from 7 to 5 o'clock in the overcrowded remaining buildings.

I have joined with numerous colleagues in a request to intervene and appear before the Supreme Court in pending cases to urge that Court and through it the Judges of the Court of Appeals and the District to let up.

Let us return our educational system to the local school boards, to the parents and, yes, to the teachers before it is too late.

This the Federal judges can do. To this end we need the executive department, the President, to exercise his separate and equal power as Chief Executive, to withdraw his support of the present dangerous course. Without the support of the executive department there is not a court that can or, in my judgment, would even try to carry out a single one of these school orders.

**AMERICAN LABOR MAGAZINE SPOT-
LIGHTS A LABOR UNION AND ITS
LEADER**

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, American Labor magazine is one of the few national news magazines devoted to the labor scene. As such, it is indispensable reading material for those who are concerned about the future of America's working men and women.

The 1970's are a time of challenge for all Americans, and this includes those who are part of our Nation's vital transportation network. We are in a period of great technological change and our economy and our society must cope with problems of a complexity and size unprecedented in our history.

In these years ahead, America needs a strong, free, democratic trade union movement. And in these years ahead, our Nation will be better and stronger as the labor movement produces new ideas and new concepts for the improvement of the standard of living and the quality of life of every citizen.

When a recent issue of American Labor magazine crossed my desk, I was

pleased to see pictured on the cover one of my old friends—C. L. "Les" Dennis—the leader of the largest transportation union in the AFL-CIO and a man who has made the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks a modern union on the move.

In a 10-page article, the editor-in-chief of American Labor magazine turns the spotlight on "the largest and most diversified transportation union in the AFL-CIO," its leader and his views on future trends in the transportation industry.

Illustrating the innovative thinking which characterizes Les Dennis is his bold, new plan to aid the financially troubled rail industry. In recent testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, Les Dennis proposed that \$1 billion from the railroad retirement account be loaned to the railroad industry for capital and service improvements. Whether or not this plan becomes a reality, it is nonetheless an intriguing idea and demonstrates a fresh and imaginative approach to an old and recurring problem: Whither the railroads?

I think that Senators would be interested in reading some of the highlights of this article. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM AMERICAN LABOR MAGAZINE

Dennis gets things done; no doubt about that. The size and strength of his union and the benefits he has helped win for the membership is proof enough of his abilities, but the total atmosphere is a relaxed one, for "C. L.," as most everyone refers to him, is regarded by his staff as more of a concerned leader than as a demanding boss.

The labor organization he heads covers a range of personnel that includes all clerical and related employees in the railroad industry and those in the airline and steamship industries as well—freight handlers, ticket clerks, janitors, people in the accounting departments, IBM operators, the drivers for the Railway Express Agency (REA). It also covers the patrolmen, the telegraphers, taxi-drivers in Florida and Georgia . . . and much more.

Considered a craft union by some, since its founding in a cigar store in Sedalia, Missouri, on December 29, 1899, the Brotherhood has grown from 33 railway clerks to a membership of over 300,000 and is, in reality, a kind of "universal union" in the transportation industry.

Over the past several years, mergers with the Railway Patrolmen's International Union and with the Order of Railroad Telegraphers (ORT) have been accomplished. More recently, the Federation of Business Machine Technicians and Engineers (an independent association) has been brought under the umbrella as well. In the public sector, the BRAC roster includes personnel involved in water resources and sewer systems. The range is wide . . .

ON TOMORROW

In discussing the overall economy as it related to his own particular industry, Dennis saw the unprecedented population growth not so much as a potential for business profit but as a period of re-analysis of the people's aims and needs.

Automation, with its attendant attrition of jobs and potential massive dislocation of employment opportunities, he felt was going

to remain one of the major bargaining issues for the foreseeable future . . .

"But as technology advances, as it inevitably must," he pointed out, "we have to think about the millions of people who will be entering the workforce in the years ahead. They have to live and make enough to supply themselves and their families a decent standard of living. And from every actuarial estimate, tomorrow's population will be living longer than we do now. It's a brain buster."

From the long-range viewpoint, he was convinced that some way would have to be found to develop an economy which would guarantee the creation of continuous earning capacity for the greatest number possible—regardless of whatever technological developments came along.

"Without income, there's no buying capacity," he said. "And automating millions of people out of an ability to earn their way, is a prospect of terror I don't even want to think about."

"The protection of people must come first," he said. "Without them—there is nothing."

ON BRAC'S GROWTH POTENTIAL

Looking at the potential prospects of growth for his own union, Dennis felt that the airline industry (many of whose major carriers are still only partially organized) and the airline-related freight forwarding companies, represented the largest void that needed attention. The numbers he mentioned were in the neighborhood of 150,000. He saw another possible 75,000 in the supervisory and subordinate official family of the railroads as well: the major chief clerks, the IBM analysts, the personal secretaries, assistant office managers, etc. The present union membership in the 50 United States, Puerto Rico and Canada is 305,000 . . .

Tall, big-boned, heavy set, BRAC's president moves with a surprising speed. If one of the basic qualities of leadership is energy, a cataloging of his multiplicity of union and charitable involvements on a year-round basis would be irrefutable testimony that nature has given him this ingredient in abundance. Few individuals have started lower in the economic barrel to make it to the top.

Whatever the drives and talents that led Dennis to success in his chosen field, the overall journey has sensitized one phase of his makeup in a manner different. It has enlarged rather than diminished his feeling of kinship with people at every level.

One can say of a lot of individuals, "This is a leader." And Dennis certainly fits that category. But what lingers on long after that fact has been acknowledged is the deeper image not so much of power as of the respect he engenders.

STUDY ON RIOTING MERITS STUDY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, everyone is familiar with the proliferation of committees and commissions to study endless problems and to make recommendations with respect to the recommendations made by predecessor committees and commissions. One Commission of note was the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. It was born on June 10, 1968 and, for more than 2 years, studied violence, a subject that is perhaps as old as the history of man. Violence continues, and

much to the consternation and frustration of public officials, law enforcement authorities, and the general public which is demanding a solution.

A solution, of course, comes with understanding the problem and I believe Eugene H. Methvin, associate editor of Reader's Digest, has come up with a revealing and enlightening study of violence in his book "The Riot Makers." I recommend its reading and commend to your attention the following review of the book by Walter Trohan in the September 4, 1970 issue of the Chicago Tribune:

STUDY ON RIOTING MERITS READING

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—This is the age of riots. For some years many have wondered about explosions of violence in our streets and on our verdant campuses: Are they spontaneous or are they planned?

Now comes the ringing answer that the riots are a part of a program of social demolition by old and new radicals in the volume "The Riot Makers," by Eugene H. Methvin, associate editor of Reader's Digest, who has been studying the problem for more than five years. His 587 page book, published by Arlington House at \$10, is one of the most important studies undertaken of our contemporary society.

No one can pretend to discuss this problem until he has read this book. William Shakespeare divided the life of man into seven ages. Methvin discovered the seven stages of rioting—organizational deployment, preconditioning, sloganeering and hate targeting, creating the crowd nucleus and screen, on the scene crowd management, police baiting and "confrontation," and manufacturing martyrs.

Methvin traces the technology of rioting back in history, giving a poison ivy crown of evil to Nikolai Lenin. He warns against attempts to separate the threats of "left wing" and "right wing" radicalism, noting that the two frequently blend.

Josef Stalin ordered the German Communist Party to form a united front with Hitler and his Nazis in order to wreck the Weimar Republic. Benito Mussolini was an old revolutionary socialist. Fidel Castro and his "martyred" pal, Che Guevara, were both early admirers of Hitler and might have followed in his footsteps had he not gone down in flames with his particular brand of totalitarianism before they came into power.

Today, Lenin's writings are surpassing the Bible in the number of published translations. If Stalin hadn't perfected his program of social demolition, Methvin says it would have been with us anyway, because others began it and others would have developed it.

Lenin and his followers were both borrowers and lenders of the techniques of social demolition. Borrowings came from such extremes as the vast outdoor functions in front of St. Peter's in Rome and the crowd playing of Adolph Hitler.

Methvin details what some may have forgotten, which is how the Communists encouraged dupes to make torches of themselves to gain propaganda advantage in Viet Nam. These immolations induced the United States to turn its head when President Diem was assassinated. In 1960, organized rioting in Tokyo forced President Eisenhower to cancel a state visit.

But there is more to this book than past history or even detailing of the radical influences at work in the organized social demolition underway from coast to coast. He not only tells how riots can be started, but how they can be prevented, in large part thru proper public education.

Methvin, the son of a Georgia newspaperman, who was born to the craft he loves, has done one of the finest jobs of reporting these aging eyes have seen. He wrote his book because a study of rioting was needed; there were no experts on the subject even though this country was being damaged by rioting abroad and at home.

Let it not be assumed that Methvin is expounding a gospel of the extreme right. He is aware that there could be no rioting unless there were explosive tinder lying about in slums, unrest and discontent. These have a role in his program of counter action but he cautions against launching any study of the problem by stacking committees and commissions with people who have made up their minds before they know the problem.

DESTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the problem facing Government research centers on college campuses was the subject of an editorial entitled "A Look at Campus Research," published in the Aiken, S.C. Standard, of September, 22, 1970.

The editor of the Aiken Standard, Mr. Samuel A. Cothran, has written a thoughtful article which deserves the attention of the Congress. It is my feeling the views Mr. Cothran has expressed in this editorial are similar to those of the present administration and of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A LOOK AT CAMPUS RESEARCH

Defense Secretary Laird is quite correct in saying that need now exists for a good look at the question of government research on college campuses. Mr. Laird's comment was occasioned by the bombing of the Army's math research center at the University of Wisconsin, a deplorable act but one which could provide a point of departure for an overall program evaluation.

If, Secretary Laird observed, federal research facilities on campus are adding to administrators' headaches, then there are other locations where they could be built. That, certainly, is an alternative, but not necessarily the best course. If security is a prime consideration, relocation may be advisable. If it is not, cost factors deserve attention.

New buildings and complex equipment take money and the taxpayers have a stake in such government spending. Savings are realized in some university research centers where federal and institutional projects make use of the same labs, tools and manpower.

Reaction of student militants has focused attention on defense research, but sight should not be lost of the multi-million-dollar projects in such fields as health and environmental sciences which are included in the federal research program on campuses. What contributions are anticipated from which projects must be measured carefully before decisions are made to divorce federal research from college centers.

We question the argument of liberals and leftists that there is no place at a university

for defense-related research while in the same breath they demand of that university greater political involvement and a larger role in reshaping society. If it is wrong for a university to conduct or help conduct scientific research that is military-oriented, then it is equally wrong for the university to enter the political arena or to engage in efforts to effect socio-economic changes in the neighborhood.

If, after a hard look, departments of the federal government elect to make changes in campus research programs, their reasons should be other than the hue and cry raised—and the bricks and bombs tossed—by would-be revolutionaries. The idea of a minority band of student dissidents and drop-outs telling the American government where it can have research done is hard to swallow.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st Congress I have introduced more than 70 bills and resolutions in the House of Representatives. Many of the proposals they contain have become law. Following is a report on those of major interest:

H.R. 50, to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$1,200. Exemption increased to \$750 in Tax Reform Act of 1969.

H.R. 10595, to extend the Great Plains conservation program. Enacted as Public Law 91-118.

H.R. 4599, to extend in lieu of taxes payments on certain federally owned properties, such as Air Force Plan 13 in Wichita, to assist Sedgwick County, Derby and Wichita school districts. Passed House and reported by Senate Government Operations Committee.

H.R. 6290, to extend head of household benefits to single taxpayers. Some provisions enacted as part of Tax Reform Act.

H.R. 9331, to improve the operation of the legislative branch of Government including amendments to end secret voting procedures. Passed House, pending in Senate.

H.R. 11047, to provide cost-of-living increases in social security benefits. Passed the House, pending in Senate.

H.R. 11046, to increase to \$3,600 amount individuals may earn without suffering deduction in social security benefits. Amount was increased to \$2,000 in legislation now pending in Senate.

H.R. 11142, to prohibit the use of the mails to convey salacious materials to anyone. Passed the House.

H.R. 12490, to extend the Golden Eagle passport fee program into Federal recreation areas. Enacted into law.

H.R. 8188, to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Wichita, Kans. Enacted into law.

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. H.R. 16039 to authorize Council

on Environmental Quality to conduct certain studies relating to solid wastes passed the House. H.R. 16039 to amend Clean Air Act passed and in House-Senate conference.

House Concurrent Resolution 359, expressing sense of Congress with respect to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam complying with requirements of Geneva Convention relating to humane treatment of prisoners of war. Passed the House and Senate.

House Resolution 614, expressing support of President Nixon's efforts to negotiate peace in Vietnam.

H.R. 18876, to provide for fiscal responsibility through the establishment of a limitation on budget expenditures. Pending in Government Operations Committee.

House Concurrent Resolution 729, expressing sense of Congress that the administration should act immediately to enter into bilateral agreements with all nations providing for mandatory extradition of hijackers of aircraft. Hearings held by Foreign Affairs Committee.

MISSISSIPPI A GOOD AND SAFE PLACE TO LIVE

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, for many years we Mississippians have advocated that our State is a good place in which to live. Once again it has been pointed out, by an outstanding journalist in my congressional district, Mr. Clayton Rand, that Mississippi has the lowest crime rate nationwide, thus further emphasizing the "safe" and the "good" aspects of the Magnolia State.

I want to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the article by Mr. Rand in this regard:

CRIME ON INCREASE

(By Clayton Rand)

Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in his report for 1969, shows that there were nearly 5,000,000 serious crimes committed, with the risk of becoming a victim having increased 120 percent since 1960. There was an increase of 12 percent over 1968.

Of the 50 states, Mississippi had the lowest crime rate in 1969, as it has before, and California had the highest. The crime rate for Mississippi was only 740.5 crimes per 100,000 population, while the California rate was 4,110.5 per 100,000 or over five times as high as Mississippi.

Mississippi is often made the scapegoat among the states by the sensational press and the networks for its alleged violence. They should be told that according to the FBI record Mississippi is the safest place to raise a family, own a business, or stay alive.

In the observance and enforcement of the law, Mississippi leads. One's person is secure there unless one happens to be a Communist or an outside meddler.

Mississippi is also censured because it has the lowest per capita wealth and earning power of the States. She is poor but proud, and being the most impoverished state, she has proven that poverty is not the primary cause of crime.

VITAL MESSAGE ON CAMPUS UNREST

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in its editorial "Vital Message on Campus Unrest," the Boston Herald Traveler writes about a recent article by Dr. Sidney Hook which caught the attention of the President who recommended it to some 1,000 college and university officials.

Dr. Hook, a professor of philosophy at New York University, warns that although the university was once in danger of intimidation and intellectual corruption from without the system, it is now in danger from within. The goal of learning, he says, has been changed to a goal of political action, and many campus leaders are condoning tactics of force and violence by those leading the assault on academic freedom.

To assume that campus unrest and disruption will continue until the political and social problems of our society are solved is nonsense, says Dr. Hook, as that leads inevitably to the conclusion it will never stop because we will always have problems which need solving.

As the report of the Commission on Campus Unrest has just been released, I think my colleagues will find this editorial of particular interest:

VITAL MESSAGE ON CAMPUS UNREST

On today's editorial page, the Herald Traveler is pleased to reprint the text of an excellent article by Dr. Sidney Hook, a professor of philosophy at New York University.

Yesterday President Nixon sent copies of Professor Hook's article to nearly 1,000 college presidents and other university officials, with a note reminding them that they bear the primary responsibility of maintaining order and discipline on the nation's campuses.

Professor Hook is one of America's most distinguished scholars. His reputation is based, more than anything else, on his staunch defense of academic freedom over the years. A generation ago, Dr. Hook warned that academic freedom was in danger as a result of ignorance and intimidation outside the Halls of Ivy. Today, he says, it is menaced by intimidation and intellectual corruption coming from within the academy itself.

Too many college administrators, faculty members and students are yielding quickly and easily to the unreasonable demands of campus dissidents, he asserts. And too many of them are quick to blame the foreign policies of the Nixon administration—or almost anything else, for that matter—as the cause of campus violence.

The assumption that collegiate unrest and disruption will continue until the political and social problems of our society are solved, says Hook, is nonsense. For that leads inevitably to the conclusion that it will never stop, since we will always have problems to solve.

Even if that were not so, he reminds us, no assumption concerning the causes of student unrest can justify the perversion of the university's purposes from the goal of learning to the goal of political action—much less condone the tactics of force and violence employed by many of those who are leading the assault on academic freedom today.

Dr. Hook's article contains a message rather similar to the one which President Nixon delivered last week in his speech at Kansas State University. So it is no surprise that Mr. Nixon would describe it as "one of the most cogent and compelling documents I have read on the question of campus violence," and that he should send it along as recommended reading for many of the nation's top college officials.

We trust that he also sent copies to members of the White House commission on campus unrest, headed by former Pennsylvania Governor William Scranton, which is expected to issue a report shortly that will arrive at somewhat different conclusions. From what we hear, the commission is unlikely to bear down on the vital point stressed yesterday by Mr. Nixon—to wit, that "those who cannot accept the rule of reason, those who resort to the rule of force, have no place on a college campus."

EASING THE PROBLEMS OF OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have become increasingly aware of the difficulties faced by our senior citizens in coping with their financial problems. Congress has sought to ease this burden in a number of ways. Enactment of medicare did much to dispel the fear of the cost of protracted illness. More recently, Congress has raised the level of social security benefits to keep pace with inflation. And earlier this year, the House passed and sent to the Senate legislation raising the level of annual earnings from \$1,680 to \$2,000 a year which a person receiving social security benefits may retain without penalty.

One of the most difficult problems confronting the senior citizen is that of meeting ever rising real property taxes. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I take this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues in our State delegation to a referendum question which will appear on the November 3 election ballot in New Jersey. That referendum question will propose that the State constitution be amended to increase from \$80 to \$160 the tax deduction allowed on real property for New Jersey residents 65 years of age and over.

Mr. Speaker, this may seem to be a modest sum, but I can assure you that this additional \$80 tax saving would, in many cases, mean the difference between a senior citizen's ability to retain a home or lose it. I am also aware that our municipalities can ill afford to lose tax income. But the proposed amendment takes that situation into account by providing that the \$80 increase will be reimbursed to the municipalities by the State. I sincerely hope and trust that my colleagues will join me in supporting this worthy proposal and in bringing it to the attention of our respective constituencies.

THE PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND DISPOSAL REFORM ACT OF 1970

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would eliminate the Federal Government's practice of exchanging surplus lands for the buildings and other real property it needs. The bill, known as the Property Acquisition and Disposal Reform Act of 1970, requires that surplus lands and other real property be sold outright to the highest bidder so that there can be no question about whether or not full value is received by the American people.

My bill would eliminate the poor business practices which result when the General Services Administration negotiates property trades rather than coming to Congress for appropriations to erect necessary facilities.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the GSA needs sufficient authority to act quickly on high priority projects, and there are provisions in my bill providing for that. Sixty percent of the proceeds of surplus real property sales would go into the U.S. Treasury. However, the other 40 percent would be retained in a Federal property fund and would be available to the GSA without going through the appropriation process, where the projects in question have been authorized by Congress. The establishment of the Federal property fund will enable the GSA to move even more quickly on high priority projects than is presently the case in exchange negotiations.

Another provision of the bill gives the GSA Administrator authority to construct or acquire buildings without specific congressional authorization if the total cost of the project is under \$100,000. The same authority would be extended to the GSA to alter or renovate existing public buildings if the total cost of the project is under \$200,000.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the GSA took steps to tighten up its procedures for determining the fair market value of properties involved in trades, but in my opinion this is merely treating the symptom, not the ailment. There is no doubt in my mind that, regardless of how scrupulously the GSA supervises its appraisal procedures, the exchange procedure places the Federal Government in a poor bargaining position, and the chance that full value will not accrue to the American people hangs heavily over every transaction.

I want to carefully note that I am not criticizing the GSA and its employees for the system which exists. They are dedicated public servants who want to provide the public with essential buildings and other properties with a minimum of lost time. The fault lies in the system within which the GSA must operate. That system was set up by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be possible to consider this legislation before the conclusion of the 91st Congress.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. George Fair, of 1375 South Clermont Street, Denver, Colo., has been a student of history for many years and has written an article concerning the late President Theodore Roosevelt, and I am inserting it in the RECORD so that it may be read by other Members of Congress:

THE LATE THEODORE ROOSEVELT

(By Mr. George Fair)

My first time to see Theodore Roosevelt was at the Union Station in Indianapolis in June, 1918. His train from St. Louis was three hours late because of a wreck on the Pennsylvania lines. It was one of those hot, humid Indiana days, but despite the heat and the long delay, a huge crowd of people awaited the arrival of the dynamic man from Sagamore Hill. When he emerged from the station and entered an open car, he was greeted by a spontaneous burst of applause, which was one of the greatest I was ever to see or to hear.

After all of these years, I can see him now, standing in the back of the car waving an old Panama hat to the people leaning out from windows high above the street and to the ones pressing close to his car. Theodore Roosevelt's boundless energy generated enthusiasm to people in all walks of life.

My two brothers and I were fortunate in obtaining standing room close to the speakers platform in the coliseum at the Indiana State Fair Grounds. We could look up and see the former president delivering his speech, the perspiration rolling down his face, as he exhorted a large and enthusiastic crowd of people to buy Liberty Bonds. He was interrupted many times by shouts from the huge coliseum, "T. R. for President in 1920."

As his birth date, October 27, nears, fond memories of those colorful and stirring days in Indiana during the Presidential campaign of 1912 come back to me. Roosevelt was nominated by the Progressive Party at its Convention in Chicago. At the close of the convention, the delegates sang "Onward Christian Soldiers," and Roosevelt started his campaign with the battle cry, "We stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord."

We looked upon Theodore as our friend and mentor as thousands of others in Indiana and across the nation did. We thought of him as fair to the working man but he was ever ready to denounce a Samuel Gompers if he was convinced labor was wrong in its demands. On the other hand, he was quick to condemn "the malefactors of great wealth." He was President of all the people.

He awakened the imagination of the American people and fired it with his forceful ardor to strive for more noble ends. Roosevelt touched the nation's pride and made the world appraise the greatness of America. He was a fighter, a challenger, ever ready to do battle for a righteous cause, and he had a hatred of dishonesty and trickery. Throughout his life, he had independence, character, and courage. When convinced he was right, he had no fear of any public clamor or pressure from any source.

Those large, black headlines in the Indianapolis Sun on January 6, 1919, "Roosevelt Dead" were heard to believe, for Theodore Roosevelt always gave one the impression of lasting youth that would go on and on. It seemed that his vigor would never diminish and that his enthusiasm and love of the strenuous life would always sustain him.

TWENTY-TWO HOUSE MEMBERS
URGE PRESIDENT THIEU ABIDE BY
TERMS OF GENEVA CONVENTION

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, today 22 Members of this House have sent a letter to His Excellency Nguyen Van Thieu, President, Republic of Vietnam. The text of that letter is appended to this statement, as is the text of a letter to Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker.

Those of us who signed the letter have done so because we are concerned about our prisoners of war now held by the North Vietnamese and treated in an inhumane way. We believe that it is in the interests of our own kith and kin that we do all we can to assure humane treatment for prisoners of war captured and held by our own U.S. Army and those forces allied with us. When we ask that the Geneva Convention be observed by all parties involved in combat in Vietnam we are first and foremost desirous of aiding our own young men held in captivity but recognize that all military prisoners, no matter by whom held, are entitled to the protection of the Geneva Convention.

The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1970.

HON. ELLSWORTH BUNKER,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
U.S. Embassy, Saigon, Vietnam.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: The original of the enclosed letter was sent directly to President Nguyen Van Thieu. The mails what they are, I am taking the liberty of asking that you forward to His Excellency the within copy so as to make certain that delivery is made.

I do hope, Mr. Ambassador, that you agree with the sentiments expressed in the letter addressed to His Excellency Nguyen Van Thieu and that you will endeavor to support in the strongest terms our request. An additional copy of the letter is enclosed for your file.

Sincerely,

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1970.

HIS EXCELLENCY NGUYEN VAN THIEU,
President, Republic of Vietnam,
Saigon, Vietnam.

DEAR PRESIDENT THIEU: As Members of the United States House of Representatives, we are directly appealing to your humanity and that of your nation in the matter of military and political prisoners of war now held by your government. In the conflict that is taking place in Vietnam, prisoners of war must include those taken in actual combat as well as those men, women, and children who are taken into custody by your government as political prisoners.

It is with a growing sense of outrage that the American people and many Members of Congress view your nation's continued insensitivity to the feelings of the families of these prisoners. You have disregarded basic standards of human decency and morality in your nation's continued refusal to abide by the terms of the Geneva Convention. That Convention requires that you not only publish the names of those prisoners in your custody, provide them with proper food and

medical care, permit inspections of your prisoner of war facilities and allow the free flow of mail between prisoners and their families but that you also provide recognized standards in your detention facilities. Your government's violation in providing such facilities was recently documented at Con Son and caused most Americans to be filled with revulsion against your practices.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we will not now attempt to debate the merits of present American policies in Southeast Asia. Many of us hold differing views on such policies but we are united in our insistence that you exercise compassion and humanity to those prisoners of war who are now in your custody. This concern far transcends questions of international politics; it recognizes a kindred humanity apart from consideration of race, color, or political persuasion.

We are among those Members of Congress who have written a letter to President Pham Van Dong appealing to his humanity and that of his government in the matter of prisoners of war who are our sons now in their custody and have advised him that the families of these men and a concerned American people look to him as the leader of his government to respond to our plea.

We look to you for a similar response.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH, JOSEPH P. ADDABO, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, DANIEL E. BUTTON, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, JEFFREY COHELAN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., DON EDWARDS, JAMES G. FULTON, MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, ABNER J. MIKVA.

ROBERT N. C. NIX, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, JAMES H. SCHEUER, LOUIS STOKES, and ROBERT O. TIERNAN,

Members of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM W. A. BOYLE, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following message in the RECORD from W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America:

W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president, United Mine Workers of America, today called for federal loan guarantees to help overcome the severe shortage of coal cars.

Boyle said that while he is generally opposed to such federal guarantees, the "facts of life" make them necessary at this time because of the growing energy crisis in the United States. He said also that present tight money, high-interest policies make relevant the question of an interest subsidy to stimulate coal car construction.

"The United States today faces a major energy crisis because of past inattention to the problem of coal. We have all the coal we need to meet this energy crisis. One of the major obstacles is the lack of means to transport coal to electric power plants," the UMW president said.

Boyle urged congressional hearings without delay into the problems of the coal car shortage. He said that such hearings should consider both the problem of coal car financing and of locating power plants at or near the mine mouth.

"A crash program of coal car construction and rehabilitation must be undertaken at once if we are to meet the energy needs of the 1970's. International problems threaten world oil supplies; natural gas is already in short supply; our hydro-electric sites are all but exhausted; atomic power presents serious hazards to human life and will grow increasingly expensive because of the already apparent exhaustion of uranium ores. In these circumstances, there will be increasingly reliance upon coal transportation and the alternative to national action may well be serious brownouts.

"Mine mouth power represents a viable alternative to rail transportation and, used in conjunction with coal car construction, can do much to meet the energy shortage now looming while minimizing urban air pollution. Congressional inquiry should focus upon the lack of research in this area. Certainly, American ingenuity can find answers to transmission difficulties that will make it possible to meet much of our growing need for power by shipping it via wire from the mine areas to the consumer," Boyle said.

AMERICAN LABOR MAGAZINE SPOTLIGHTS A LABOR UNION AND ITS LEADER

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, American Labor magazine is one of the few national news magazines devoted to the labor scene. As such, it is indispensable reading material for those who are concerned about the future of America's working men and women.

The 1970's are a time of challenge for all Americans, and this includes those who are part of our Nation's vital transportation network. We are in a period of great technological change and our economy and our society must cope with problems of a complexity and size unprecedented in our history.

In these years ahead, America needs a strong, free, democratic trade union movement. And in these years ahead, our Nation will be better and stronger as the labor movement produces new ideas and new concepts for the improvement of the standard of living and the quality of life of every citizen.

When a recent issue of American Labor magazine crossed my desk, I was pleased to see pictured on the cover one of my old friends—C. L. "Les" Dennis—the leader of the largest transportation union in the AFL-CIO and a man who has made the Brotherhood of Railway & Airline Clerks a modern union on the move.

In a 10-page article, the editor in chief of American Labor magazine turns the spotlight on "the largest and most diversified transportation union in the AFL-CIO," its leader and his views on future trends in the transportation industry.

Illustrating the innovative thinking which characterizes Les Dennis in his bold, new plan to aid the financially troubled rail industry. In recent testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, Les Dennis proposed that \$1 bil-

lion from the railroad retirement account be loaned to the railroad industry for capital and service improvements. Whether or not this plan becomes a reality, it is nonetheless an intriguing idea and demonstrates a fresh and imaginative approach to an old and recurring problem: whether the railroads?

I think my colleagues in the House would be interested in reading some of the highlights of this article—excerpts are reprinted below:

Dennis gets things done; no doubt about that. The size and strength of his union and the benefits he has helped win for the membership is proof enough of his abilities, but the total atmosphere is a relaxed one, for "C. L.," as most everyone refers to him, is regarded by his staff as more of a concerned leader than as a demanding boss.

The labor organization he heads covers a range of personnel that includes all clerical and related employees in the railroad industry and those in the airline and steamship industries as well—freight handlers, ticket clerks, janitors, people in the accounting departments, IBM operators, the drivers for the Railway Express Agency (REA). It also covers the patrolmen, the telegraphers, taxi-drivers in Florida and Georgia . . . and much more.

Considered a craft union by some, since its founding in a cigar store in Sedalia, Missouri on December 29, 1899, the Brotherhood has grown from 33 railway clerks to a membership of over 300,000 and is, in reality, a kind of "universal union" in the transportation industry.

Over the past several years, mergers with the Railway Patrolmen's International Union and with the Order of Railroad Telegraphers (ORT) have been accomplished. More recently, the Federation of Business Machine Technicians and Engineers (an independent association) has been brought under the umbrella as well. In the public sector, the BRAC roster includes personnel involved in water resources and sewer systems. The range is wide . . .

ON TOMORROW

In discussing the overall economy as it related to his own particular industry, Dennis saw the unprecedented population growth not so much as a potential for business profit but as a period of re-analysis of the people's aims and needs.

Automation, with its attendant attrition of jobs and potential massive dislocation of employment opportunities, he felt was going to remain one of the major bargaining issues for the foreseeable future . . .

"But as technology advances, as it inevitably must," he pointed out, "we have to think about the millions of people who will be entering the workforce in the years ahead. They have to live and make enough to supply themselves and their families a decent standard of living. And from every actuarial estimate, tomorrow's population will be living longer than we do now. It's a brain buster."

From the long-range viewpoint, he was convinced that some way would have to be found to develop an economy which would guarantee the creation of continuous earning capacity for the greatest number possible—regardless of whatever technological developments came along.

"Without income, there's no buying capacity," he said. "And automating millions of people out of an ability to earn their way, is a prospect of terror I don't even want to think about."

"The protection of people must come first," he said. "Without them—there is nothing."

ON BRAC'S GROWTH POTENTIAL

Looking at the potential prospects of growth for his own union, Dennis felt that the airline industry (many of whose major

carriers are still only partially organized) and the airline-related freight forwarding companies, represented the largest void that needed attention. The numbers he mentioned were in the neighborhood of 150,000. He saw another possible 75,000 in the supervisory and subordinate official family of the railroads as well: the major chief clerks, the IBM analysts, the personal secretaries, assistant office managers, etc. The present union membership in the 50 United States, Puerto Rico and Canada is 305,000.

Tall, big-boned, heavy set, BRAC's president moves with a surprising speed. If one of the basic qualities of leadership is energy, a cataloging of his multiplicity of union and charitable involvements on a year-round basis would be irrefutable testimony that nature has given him this ingredient in abundance. Few individuals have started lower in the economic barrel to make it to the top.

Whatever the drives and talents that led Dennis to success in his chosen field, the overall journey has sensitized one phase of his makeup in a manner different. It has enlarged rather than diminished his feeling of kinship with people at every level.

One can say of a lot of individuals, "This is a leader." And Dennis certainly fits that category. But what lingers on long after that fact has been acknowledged is the deeper image not so much of power as of the respect he engenders.

VOTING RECORD

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, each year hundreds of votes are taken in the House of Representatives. Some are on controversial issues where the vote is close while others receive overwhelming majorities.

Since coming to Congress in 1961, there have been 1,708 recorded votes to date, and we have not yet completed this second session of the 91st Congress.

It is not practical to list every vote I cast during the 91st Congress. However, in order that I can report to my Kansas constituents, I herewith present my record on some of the more important bills.

LEGISLATION SUPPORTED BY CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER

I voted in favor of the following bills: 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 provide for reform procedures in the House of Representatives.

Postal reform bill including a prohibition on postal workers strikes and containing a right-to-work amendment.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizing \$5.3 billion per year through 1972.

Office of Education 1971 appropriation bill of \$4.4 billion, including amendment prohibiting use of funds for forced busing.

Unemployment compensation bill authorizing States to amend their pro-

grams to provide for 13 weeks' additional benefits during periods of widespread unemployment.

To provide additional funds for the home mortgage market.

To authorize \$775 million to control air pollution.

To establish the Council on Environmental Quality.

To authorize \$348 million for a 3-year period to control water pollution.

To amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

To authorize special educational programs on the dangers of drugs.

Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

To extend the Hill-Burton hospital construction aid program for 3 years. Later voted to override Presidential veto.

Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act with provisions for mentally ill children.

Health Act extension bill for research and training in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other diseases.

Tax reform bill closing or modifying various tax loopholes; increasing the amount of the personal exemption from \$600 to \$750 and a gradual increase in the standard deduction; phaseout of surtax; and 15-percent increase in social security benefits.

To provide for a 15-percent increase in benefits for retired railroad workers.

Agriculture Act of 1970 including \$55,000 limitation upon crop payments.

Supporting President Nixon's effort to negotiate a "just peace" in Vietnam.

Calling for humane treatment and release of prisoners of war held by North Vietnam.

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.

LEGISLATION OPPOSED BY CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER

I voted against the following bills:

Senate amendment to add \$587.5 million in urban renewal funds.

Lowering the voting age to 18 by statute rather than through submission to the States of an amendment to the Constitution.

Guaranteed minimum wage in family assistance plan.

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.

Senate amendment to Export Control Act which would ease U.S. exports of nonstrategic goods to Communist countries.

Authorization for 1970 foreign-aid program of \$2.2 billion.

Pay increase for Members of Congress which was untimely, ill-advised, and contributed to inflation.

Seating of Adam Clayton Powell of New York.

UNITED STATES AND ASIA

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walt Rostow, assistant for national security affairs to former President Lyndon Johnson, has written an article for the New York Times in which he explores the consequences of unconditional immediate withdrawal from Southeast Asia.

Mr. Rostow discusses the possible effects this would have not only on Southeast Asia nations, but also such other nations as China, Burma, Japan, and India. Lastly, he asks that out of our knowledge of our country's history and character, could we passively deal with our domestic problems as we read of "slaughter in Vietnam and elsewhere; of an Asia thrown into chaos or worse; of a world seized of a proliferating arms race?"

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the article "United States and Asia" in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1970]

UNITED STATES AND ASIA

(By W. W. Rostow)

Contrary to every short-run political and personal interest, three successive American Presidents decided over the past decade that the events set in motion by a prompt withdrawal of our forces and commitment from Vietnam and the Asian mainland would risk a larger war there and create dangerous instability elsewhere.

Right now, in sustaining that assessment, we face at home: rising unemployment and rising prices, yielding insufficient real resources for public purposes from the tax base; an infirm balance of payments; acute racial tension; massive tasks of urban rehabilitation; an ardent margin of the affluent young who have come to believe that a quick route to the humane and decent life they seek lies in confrontation, violence and destruction.

Driven by these domestic pressures, some Americans have concluded that the United States should abandon its commitment to Asia and let the forces at work there find their way to chaos or equilibrium, war or peace.

No one can reconstruct fully the lines of argument which led the Presidents to their contrary, painful judgment. But at least some of the costs of unconditional immediate withdrawal from commitment in Southeast Asia are apparent.

First, such withdrawal of commitment would change radically the terms of the debate going forward within mainland China. Powerful forces are at work there to move post-Mao-China toward concentration on the modernization of its life. American withdrawal would inevitably lead Peking to exploit its new opportunities to the south. No one can predict the precise way in which a nuclear China, with preponderant ground forces, would exercise its power in the vacuum we would create. But it is most unlikely that Peking would remain passive.

Second, the nations of Southeast Asia, certainly as far as Singapore—quite possibly as far as Indonesia—would lose their independence or be thrown into a protracted military or quasi-military effort which would shunt them from promising paths of economic, social, and political progress.

Third, Burma would either fall under Communist domination or become the scene of an Indian-Chinese struggle.

Fourth, almost certainly Japan and India would quickly move to manufacture their own nuclear weapons; and the Nonproliferation Treaty would probably die. The willingness of many nations to forgo the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons is based on a carefully balanced calculation that reliance on the United States, explicit or implicit, provides somewhat greater security and less risk than would going it alone and creating a national nuclear capability. The reversal of American policy in Asia would shift that marginal calculation. An America that walked away from a treaty commitment because it could not handle its domestic problems, after putting into the field a half-million of its armed forces and encouraging a small ally to fight desperately for its independence, might well not be regarded as a reliable ally.

An American withdrawal from a treaty commitment on the grounds of domestic problems could well be judged an extraordinary event related to the subject matter of the Nonproliferation Treaty jeopardizing the supreme interests of nations which now depend upon us.

Fifth, there is a question every American must answer for himself, out of his knowledge of our country, its history, and its character: Would the United States observe passively these consequences of its decision? Would we turn with energy and pride and unity to clean the air and the water, deal with ghettos and racial inequity as we read of Hue-like slaughter in Vietnam and elsewhere; of an Asia thrown into chaos or worse; of a world seized of a proliferating nuclear arms race?

And what of the effects of all this in Moscow and Cairo?

We might repeat the process of erratic withdrawal and return to the world scene which has cost us—and all humanity—so much in this century. We might, again, deceive our adversaries as Vishinsky once accused us of "deceiving" Moscow about the seriousness of our interest in South Korea. But it is most unlikely that, in the end, we will turn our backs on Asia.

GOLDBERG WANTS TO LEGALIZE MARIHUANA

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the pledge by New York gubernatorial candidate Arthur Goldberg to lead a drive to legalize marihuana if a scientific commission so recommends is symbolic of the Democratic Party's attitude on law and order—do not enforce the laws, just remove the penalties.

Goldberg said he would not recommend marihuana for children, of course. I am certain that parents of America can count as a measure of thanksgiving the fact that Goldberg no longer sits on the Supreme Court which is wrestling with the problems of law enforcement, compounded by the drug traffic in which marihuana plays a major role.

Goldberg is the darling of the arch-liberal wing of the Democratic Party,

which AFL-CIO chief, George Meany, has warned is taking over control of the party's leadership. The failure of this Congress to move for over a year on anti-crime legislation is further proof that the opposition party's leadership is afflicted with unenthusiasm for an all-out war on crime.

One thing certain about Mr. Goldberg's blatant appeal to the hophead vote—his campaign has really gone to pot.

BURLISON BILL LIMITS DISPENSING OF DRUGS

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which if enacted would put an end to an unseemly practice which threatens to besmirch the reputation of the Nation's physicians. The bill is directed at those physicians Senator HART has aptly called the "doctor-merchants." These unscrupulous practitioners charge their patients for professional services. Then switching from the role of doctor to that of pharmacist, they sell drugs and other devices to the patient, generally at inflated prices. I believe there are no such doctors in my district. Nevertheless, the national problem is enough to warrant action.

The abuse takes several forms—some obvious, some subtle. The doctor may simply assign one of his office girls or nurses to fill the prescriptions he has ordered. The cost of the drugs is added to the charges for professional services. This endangers the patient in at least two ways. Those who dispense drugs in doctor's offices are seldom properly trained for the job. Second, space will not allow a doctor to keep a large enough inventory of drugs to fill all the possible prescriptions. The unfortunate tendency in such cases is to prescribe the next best thing. When the exact drug needed is available at the drugstore around the corner, second best is not good enough.

If the doctor does not want to use his own staff to fill prescriptions, he may own or take a percentage lease on a pharmacy, frequently on his own premises. This practice can be a bonanza especially when several doctors are involved. Most independent pharmacies net a profit of no more than 5 percent. By contrast physician-owned pharmacies may make much more. In one year a pharmacy owned by a group of doctors in southern Illinois netted \$110,000 on gross sales of \$333,000. The reasons for success are clear. In his patients, the doctor has a ready market for his pharmacy. Since the market is, for all intents and purposes, captive, he need not concern himself with competitive pricing. Prices may be readily set several percent higher than those of the independent drugstores.

A less apparent, but equally profitable, system is provided through the physician-owned drug companies. They are not

really drug companies. Rather they are small, regional "repackaging" companies buying established drugs in bulk and marketing them under their own brand names. Since druggists must follow a prescription to the letter, the doctor-stockholder is free to specify the products of the company in which he has an interest. If the pharmacist wants to keep the doctor's business, he must stock the doctor's brand irrespective of its comparative quality or economy.

The vast majority of physicians, Mr. Speaker, do not engage in these practices, but the profit potential is so alluring that the physician is subjected to very great temptation. Despite the publicity of several years of congressional hearings and the ethical ban of the American Medical Association, the number of doctor-owned drug companies and the number of percentage-lease drugstores has increased.

The bill I introduce would put an end to these practices by prohibiting doctors from merchandising the products they prescribe. However, it would clearly not prohibit doctors from dispensing drugs in emergencies, in one-dose units, when there is no community pharmacy, or if it is occasional dispensing and not a part of his usual course of business.

CHURCH AND POLITICS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is much discussion in the country about the churches getting into politics. We see every day in every field where supposedly religious men are engaging in active lobbying and pressure politics designed to influence legislation in the direction which suits their ideological motivations.

Many people are fed up with this attitude since there is usually no connection between true religious feelings and the ideological politics which are being waged in the name of the church.

The Charleston News and Courier last Sunday had an interesting editorial entitled "Church and Politics" which points up this problem. In this editorial the News and Courier endorses the idea that the church perhaps has a role in the political arena. However, the role is not the role being played by the political churchmen.

The News and Courier's suggestion is that if members of the churches feel that public policy is not adequate that the members themselves should get out into the rough and tumble of secular politics. The News and Courier says:

Perhaps if church members themselves had been less reticent in the past either to run for office or support others' campaigns the churches might have been less likely, as institutions, to enter the "rough and tumble of secular politics." Certainly there is plenty of all kinds of work for laymen to do, inside the church and out, if they are willing to do it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Church and Politics," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

CHURCH AND POLITICS

Many church members have been disturbed when their church has entered political or economic arenas in which ecclesiastical leaders are ill-equipped or poorly informed to act. There are members, however, who believe their church has a duty to go beyond its walls in some way and seek an active part in secular affairs.

It is to these, perhaps, that Stephen C. Rose addresses himself in his book, "Sermons (Not Preached) in the White House." It has become fashionable, writes Mr. Rose, "in sophisticated church circles to play down politics, to accuse the churches of having canonized politics to the exclusion of emphasis in changes that can be brought about outside the political arena. Personal conversion, Meditation. The renewal of home life. But this complaint reveals an institutional confusion."

Churches, says Mr. Rose, are wholly inadequate as political instruments. "Even if they were adequate," he says, "nothing would be less desirable than for the churches, as institutions, to seek to influence public policy by political means. We have had enough of that." (To which many will add a hearty "amen.")

What, then, ought churches to be doing? Mr. Rose's suggestion is remarkably simple: get laymen out of "church work" and "into the rough and tumble of secular politics." The church, he says, "would do well to stay out of politics while encouraging lay members to immerse themselves in it. Then the church and its minister in his role as preacher can bring biblical and theological criticism to bear on the political options."

Mr. Rose suggests that "the establishment person who is serious about seeking change should run for office. And if he is reticent, let him either encourage others to run and support their campaigns or enter some other phase of politics to exert pressure on existing political institutions."

Perhaps if church members themselves had been less reticent in the past either to run for office or support others' campaigns the churches might have been less likely, as institutions, to enter the "rough and tumble of secular politics." Certainly there is plenty of all kinds of work for laymen to do, inside the church and out, if they are willing to do it.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 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?

ABORTION ON DEMAND IN U.S. MILITARY HOSPITALS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, American law has never admitted the concept that "the king can do no wrong." Certainly the Federal Government was never intended to be above the law, or a law unto itself.

In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, Federal statutes can take precedence over State law in certain instances. But this has never been extended to basic criminal law. Crimes are defined by State law, with some Federal additions, and subject to the review, for constitutionality, by the Federal courts, which has been so much abused lately.

But this year, a middle echelon Federal bureaucrat has acted on his own to override the criminal laws of 49 out of the 50 States by creating a sanctuary for their violation in U.S. military hospitals. Only one State, Hawaii, permits abortion on demand without even a limit on the age of the fetus to be killed. In every other State, abortions, performed outside specified legal limits, including a limit on the age of the fetus, are crimes, even though carried out by a licensed physician.

By a mere exchange of bureaucratic memorandum within the Defense Department, abortion with no limit except the requirement that a doctor perform it, has now been legalized for every U.S. military hospital. Only July 22 of this year, Surgeon General Alonzo A. Tower of the U.S. Air Force submitted a memorandum regarding sterilizations and abortions in U.S. military hospitals to Dr. Louis Rousselot, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health and Environment, which contained the following sentence: "3. Abortion: (a) Abortions will be performed within the limits of local State laws."

On July 31, Dr. Rousselot replied as follows:

Your proposed implementation of our memorandum of May 20 and July 16 is approved with the exception of paragraph 3(a). In accordance with the policy guidance set forth in our memorandum of May 22, authorized family planning procedures should be provided in military facilities in the United States without regard to local State laws.

Neither the May 22 memorandum nor any other applicable regulations place any restrictions on abortions by doctors in military hospitals. Dr. Rousselot's office has confirmed that there is no limit on the age of the aborted fetus.

Those who support Government-sponsored birth control, but still oppose abortion on demand, should take note that the Government planners now regard both as "authorized family planning procedures." And even those who may not take the abortion issue as seriously as I maintain it should be taken, should grasp the significance of this new Federal

intrusion into the jurisdiction of the States. If Federal institutions are to become, by mere bureaucratic memoranda, sanctuaries for acts which are criminal according to the law of the State in which they are located, an extremely dangerous precedent will have been set which could further undermine remaining restraints upon potential tyranny in this country.

On September 29 I introduced a bill to nullify this action of the Department of Defense regarding abortion and to require that military hospitals comply with State laws on abortion. The bill will be cosponsored by at least eight other Congressmen—four Republicans and four Democrats representing districts in California, the Northeast, the Middle West, and the South. Incidentally, the majority of them are Protestants. This is far from being, as abortion advocates would have it, a sectarian religious issue.

Any hope for action on this legislation at this late date in the session depends upon Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who is by no means hostile to it. Letters to him expressing public concern about this issue might strengthen his hand in giving support to this bill.

Since the continuing clamor of the "population explosion" propagandists has done so much to create a climate of opinion favorable to abortion, every American should be aware of the immense significance of the returns from the 1970 Census, which show that our population has been overestimated by no less than five and a half million. Instead of the 205,700,000 people we were supposed to have, the actual total according to the nearly complete census count is 200,200,000—a level we were supposed to have passed 3 years ago.

OREGON HOSTS NATIONAL DISCUSSION FORUM CONCERNING FEDERAL LAND RESOURCES

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, my State of Oregon has just hosted a National Discussion Forum to review the recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission concerning Federal land resources. This was the first public forum on the recommendations of the Commission, which issued its report in July following 5 long years of deliberation and study of the 6,000 laws which have built upon themselves since the birth of this Nation. I should like to commend the Commission chairman, a Member of this body, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL of Colorado, the other Members of Congress on the Commission and the dedicated Commission staff, all of whom gave of their time, talents, and energy to this important project. Recommendations of the Commission are of vital importance to my State of Ore-

gon, which has 52 percent of its land area under Federal control. Praise also is due Oregon's Governor, Tom McCall, for the State's hosting of this important forum, and to Oregon State Representative Sam Johnson of Redmond who has been a member of the Commission and did so much to bring the forum into being.

Gathering for 3 days at the Hilton Hotel in Portland were persons concerned with all aspects of public land management. Such diverse viewpoints as those of the Sierra Club and various forest product associations were represented in six concurrent panels which discussed the topics of land disposition and acquisition; financing intensive resource management; user fees, revenue sharing, payments in lieu of taxes; recreation and wildlife; multiple use policies, and advisory committees and appeal procedures.

A speaker was featured at a forum luncheon held on each of the 3 days. They were Mrs. Nancy Smith, a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission and a member of the board of supervisors of San Bernardino County, Calif.; Roy Utke, president of Western Wood Products Association and general manager of Fruit Growers Supply Co., a companion company with Sunkist; and Phillip Berry, an attorney from Oakland, Calif., and president of the Sierra Club.

Serving as master of ceremonies for the Tuesday luncheon was Carl Stoltenberg, renowned educator and dean of the School of Forestry at Oregon State University. His comments on Mr. Utke's address affirm my reasons for inclusion of that address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Roy Utke is typical of the new leadership in the forest industry. He has been a director of Western Wood Products Association, the Nation's largest lumber trade association, for several years, and was elected president in March of this year. He also serves on the board of directors of the National Forest Products Association, headquartered in Washington, D.C. He joined Fruit Growers Supply Co., in October 1947, as supervisor of industrial relations for three mills in northern California, and was named general manager in 1967. Dean Stoltenberg said:

I believe Mr. Utke's comments are typical of those voiced by participants throughout the course of this conference. Mr. Utke is an outstanding leader of an industry which is producing vital benefits to the public from Federal land resources. He speaks in a clear and forthright manner in his area of expertise. He also listens attentively. His comments today indicate his sincere awareness of the importance of other inputs and other expertise in ultimate decisions concerning how our public lands can best be used to serve all of the people of this country. The breadth of his concern and his open reception of new insights regarding the management of both public and private lands for the production of public benefits is typical of the concerns and awareness of top leaders in the forest industries today.

Mr. Utke, we thank you for your contributions to this conference and also for the insights and expertise which you have shared with us. We also thank you for your receptiveness to new ideas. It is the purpose of

this conference to bring together you and others with varying outlooks concerning the management of our public lands.

Mr. Utke's address follows:

ADDRESS BY ROY UTKE

I am a citizen of the United States who is very much concerned with the condition of this Nation in which we live—including its lands, cities, forests, air, and water. I know of no person affiliated with Western Wood Products Association who feels otherwise.

My own interests are deeply involved in both agricultural and timber land. Fruit Growers Supply Company, where I earn my livelihood, is a lumber and container manufacturer. It is also a separate but companion company with Sunkist, which markets many varieties of citrus fruits. The involvement of a company such as ours in the lumber business is indicative of the changes in American life which occur through the years—changes which have affected our public land as well as those of private industry. Fruit Growers Supply Company is in the lumber business because more than 60 years ago we bought timber land and started sawmills to assure our owners of an adequate supply of shipping boxes for citrus fruit. Today, oranges, lemons, grapefruit, or tangerines are no longer packed in wooden boxes. We still have lands growing timber and a sawmill so we are in the business of manufacturing lumber for homes and supplying those much needed shipping containers from corrugated wood fibre material manufactured in our own separate facilities especially built for that purpose. Citrus sales and the distribution of citrus through this vehicle—the carton—have been supported by the Nation's Consumer—the public—for which we are deeply grateful.

Strangely enough, years ago when we were manufacturing citrus shipping boxes, we were also manufacturing a unique type of furniture. Many of you in my generation will recall how difficult it was to establish a new household before or after World War II. Many a young husband, a returned veteran probably, was attending school. There was no money for furniture, but the young couple had to have bookcases, chairs, even vanities. Many young homemakers obtained these by the simple process of building them out of orange crates—the young housewife decorated the product with a bit of cloth, and serviceable furniture was provided.

Certainly, when Fruit Growers Supply Company was manufacturing citrus crates, it did not think it was manufacturing furniture. That was a by-product created by the using public. An administrative decision relating to public lands may be made with one thought in mind, but the final result may be completely different from the original plan. And sometimes that final result may not be as beneficial to the public as was the conversion of citrus crates into furniture. Such thinking may be applied to forest preservation without access or forests infested with insects. I am thinking of the 191,502 acres of timber destroyed last month by lightning fires in the North Cascades, and the 1,394,280 acres of beetle-infested trees in the Yellowstone Park vicinity. In fact, 111,280 of those acres are inside the park itself. No one responsible for the care of these lands planned for this final result. The plans were made for a far better purpose, and might well have been achieved through the application of accepted technology which makes intensified forest management possible.

The Public Land Law Review Commission reviewed 6,000 laws during five years of intensive study of our nation's public land problems. Thousands of persons testified before the commission. This meeting is the first major national discussion to be held on the recommendations of the commission. It is

showing that the recommendations are controversial. They are controversial in that they cannot possibly please all points of opinion of those who concern themselves with the management of our public lands. If the recommendations were all things to all people, then those five long, hard years of study put in by the Commission and its staff would be worthless. However, the recommendations of the Land Law Review Commission were hardly dry upon the paper when those recommendations were attacked in a type of knee-jerk reaction by a segment of the public which thinks that only its position can possibly be correct.

Apparently from this reaction their idea of two sides to a question is their side and the wrong side. Fortunately, some of the most respected members of Congress and of the Senate served on the commission, and their findings will be weighed carefully by their fellow legislators before laws are finally drafted to implement the recommendations of the commission.

We have suffered for some time from the view of many in this country that wilderness is good and managed forests are automatically bad. We have also labored under the thought that common sense would finally prevail in our land management problems, but I am slowly coming to the conclusion that much discussion and good listeners will be needed since common sense does not appear to be too common.

Those in the forest products industry and stockmen who could be most directly affected have not made immediate comments or taken an early position upon the recommendations of the Commission. After all, this document of 342 pages contains 137 primary recommendations plus many other appropriate suggestions. All of these deserve the best of our deliberations, and thoughtful study necessarily takes time.

Those who seem best informed, and those who have thought deeply about this matter, including our Association's Board of Directors, commend Commission Chairman Wayne Aspinall, the congressional and other members of the commission and its staff for their effort in the difficult task of reviewing the great multitude of land laws accumulated since the birth of the Nation and for its profound report and recommendations to simplify and improve the management of the public lands and their resources. The members and staff of our Association have been asked to make the necessary commitment of time and effort to provide the soundest possible advice on individual recommendations before the next Congress convenes.

My interests as a lumberman can perhaps be considered unique in that I am a resident of a megalopolis—that environmental problem area known as Los Angeles. As an urban resident who commutes to work on crowded freeways, through smog-laden air, I am quite concerned over my environment. I can relate to others who have the same concerns including those of urban rehabilitation and pursuits of a better life. As an urban resident who is in the lumber and manufacturing business, I also am aware that if we are to renovate our cities and rehabilitate many of our older residences, then the best and most reasonably priced material to use is wood. This means that to enhance our urban environment, we will have to alter our forest environment. This is not a permanent alteration, and this is what many urban residents do not realize. Nor do many understand that forestry under proper management plans can enhance the environment in many ways—within the forest and at home. We harvest trees to benefit man, and we re-seed and re-plant either by assisting nature, or by direct methods, to provide a continuing growing stock of new trees. When a city neighborhood becomes old, decrepit and dangerous, cor-

rective action either can tear it down and rebuild it from scratch or rehabilitate it. Is it not then in the public interest when the forest industry seeks to utilize forests which have also become overripe and in need of revitalization? For years we have replaced this type of timber crop on private lands with new, vital and growing forests. We feel strongly that the long range effect of better managed forest operations are well established and lay positively in the public interest regardless of ownership.

There have been periodic predictions of impending timber famine over the last three quarters of a century. One of the earliest was made by another Californian, a Congressman from that State named Loud. When the forest preserves—predecessors of our national forests—were established, Congressman Loud said: "The moment you open the forest reservations to the cutting of timber you begin to destroy the forest reserves themselves." Today, the Forest Service alone annually appraises and puts up for sale more than 12 billion board feet of timber each year, some of it on land producing its second or third crop of trees. In 1928, another warning was given that the nation's forests were being denuded. This was contained in a widely distributed pamphlet written by a man who organized and headed the Philippine Forest Service, Major George P. Ahern. He warned that "by 1937 it will be difficult to find in the entire United States 20 percent of our forests meeting a standard" of well stocked and well managed forest. Managed forests helped prove the predictions of timber famine to be in error. Shortly after the 1937 date, the forest industry provided wood resources in tremendous quantity which helped the nation win a great war. Later in 1952 an intensive National Timber Resource Review conducted by the Forest Service revealed that the nation is growing more timber volume than ever. Today, our nation's forest growth exceeds current use of wood products.

But today, also, the finite extent of the Nation's forest resource is recognized in the face of the needs of a constantly increasing population. The wood resource need in this country in the foreseeable future will require intensive forestry practice on all forest lands capable of producing such crops. The concerns for our nation's timber resource and that of housing for a constantly increasing population must be met squarely—and soon—or we will fall in our objectives to meet the interests of this nation's people.

Intensive forestry practices have been a concern for several centuries. Those of you who live in the East are beginning to hear more than those of us in the West about something called "The Third Forest." This third forest is in the Southeastern part of the United States. Simply stated, it means that *three forests have now grown in the South* to satisfy man's needs. The first forest, standing when the first settlement in Georgia was made by Governor Oglethorpe in 1723, was harvested and utilized to develop that part of our nation. It was replaced by a second forest, which in turn was utilized by man for further development in the area. Today, the third forest is growing on the timberlands of the South and it, in turn, will serve our needs. Intensive scientific forest management will assure that a fourth forest will appear, as will others, until the end of time.

Some of the best forest around Lake Tahoe is a second forest. The original forest was used to develop the Central Pacific Railroad and the Comstock Silver Mines in the 1800's. There are men who could be still alive who remember the complete liquidation of the first forest in the Mother Lode country by the miners from 1849 through to 1900. These areas now support beautiful stands of coniferous forests which many visitors consider

a forest primeval. Similar examples can be shown in other areas of this great, forested nation.

A forest, being a living thing, follows a life-cycle the same as all other living things. It is born, matures, ages and dies in a natural cycle. This natural cycle continues, it cannot be frozen in its present stage to be kept unchanged.

The beautiful Douglas fir forests of Oregon and other forests of shade-intolerant coniferous species came into being because of ancient forest fires. These fires, as big as or bigger than the Tillamook Burn, or other natural catastrophes, cleared the areas and let the new forest grow in its preferred seed bed of bare soil, warmed by direct sunlight. With human settlement and social development, there is the necessary control of these great fires. If man does not then open the forests, Douglas fir, for example, will be replaced by other less desirable species.

Where man abrogates the responsibilities he has undertaken, then nature moves quickly to show the fang and claw of destruction. An example of this occurred this summer in northern Washington, where 191,502 acres of federal, state and private forestland were burned over by lightning-caused fires. Some of this was in the Pasayten Wilderness, some in the new North Cascades National Park. Other acreage was in areas which the Forest Service had announced were being proposed as roadless and scenic areas. Another example of nature's destruction is the 1,394,280 acres of beetle-killed trees in the Yellowstone Park vicinity of the Rocky Mountains. 111,280 acres are in the Park itself. This area now presents a sorry picture in comparison to the forest that was intended to be preserved for all time. The benefits of multiple use management have been proven. We should not discard this proven principle in favor of non-management or unproven procedures.

Basically, the Land Law Review Commission has recognized that our growing population brings changing conditions and needs. While recognizing the great significance of management to maintain and enhance a livable environment, the Commission does not assume a doomsday attitude regarding the problems at hand. The report, in fact, expresses a "cautious optimism" due to recognition of a "growing awareness of the danger" and recognizes that steps are being taken which should correct any damaging trends.

Before commenting further on the Commission's report, let us refer briefly to the Organic Act of June 4, 1897, in which it was directed that "No national forest shall be established, except to improve and protect the forest within the boundaries, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flow, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States."

The intent of that legislation is as valid today as it was a little over 70 years ago. Congress in creating the Commission and directing its work said: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the public land of the United States shall be (A) retained and managed or (B) disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public." The Commission's praiseworthy effort to review and correlate the more than 6,000 laws dealing with the nation's public lands has been a monumental task. Perhaps an indication of just how monumental was the task is the fact that the Commission found that there apparently were 1,000 more laws dealing with public lands than the Commission had previously planned to review.

In doing its job, the Commission has expressed a highly desirable idealism. It will, however, remain for Congress to assess the costs to all users of public land resources

in moving from the "here" of present-day laws to the "there" proposed by the Commission. The ultimate goals of the Commission are important, and we in the industry will press for many of those goals.

Let me now expand upon the Commission's report on some specific topics:

Many of the Commission's proposals are based on the assumption that a massive land use planning classification of the federal public lands can be performed promptly and effectively. This may well be too optimistic. Land use planning in sufficient intensity and with sufficient public acceptance to resolve land use conflicts would be a fantastic attainment. It is a commendable objective, the development of which should be fostered, and supported. State or local zoning is still in the formative stage and so far has not been an entirely satisfactory panacea. Despite the state and local problems, if land use planning can be achieved by any reasonable means within the public interest, it would aid greatly in this nation's land problems.

The Commission recommends that Congress establish a network of goals, guidelines, standards and performance requirements for virtually every facet of land use planning and resource management for the public lands. Over the years, it is hoped that Congress will do all that the Commission has recommended. Resource agency performance has no doubt suffered from lack of this guidance from Congress. However, it is unrealistic to expect Congress to act on all these recommendations all at once. By design, a legislative body is weighted against hasty decision and action, and rightly so. The Commission has accomplished a tremendous task, and I am sure that Congress is likely to be greatly influenced by its recommendations.

The Commission recommends public participation in land use planning. This would be by means of public hearings and by consultation and coordination requirements with State and local government agencies and interagency and regional coordination of plans. These are worthy objectives, but the defect in this recommendation is the possibility of delay for the sake of delay which is inherent in any provision for elaborate consultation and coordination.

Construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, in Washington, D.C. crossing the Potomac River has recently been halted by court order because requirements for a public hearing on its design were not met. The start of this bridge project had already been delayed for several years by disputes at every step of the planning and programming process. Those who brought the suit which resulted in the court order appear to have little if any interest in the bridge design. They just want construction stopped. Of course, it is possible to get across the Potomac on other bridges and to endure the traffic congestion which this new crossing would relieve. But, intricate procedural requirements such as now involved in the Three Sisters Bridge situation can become a means to obtain a court order to stop timber sales until a minor procedural defect is remedied. This could be fatal to a local timber-dependent mill, causing loss of jobs and distress in the local community.

It is important that management of our nation's land be vested in professionally trained individuals under stronger and clearer direction from Congress. Land management by poll, by emotional campaign or by promises offered in political campaigns are not in the best interests of either the land, the public or the nation. The physician is allowed to treat his patient without interference. The newspaperman writes his story as he is trained to do. You would not expect the circus performer on the high wire to have the competence of a football player. There-

fore, in any public hearing, the conducting agency must, in public interest, weigh most heavily the testimony of those trained and educated in land management.

All public administration is presently going through a major change in which the right to challenge administrative decisions is being greatly expanded by the courts. We all have much at stake in the progress of this transition for the Federal resource managing agencies. A way must be found that will not endanger the ability of the agencies to maintain schedules of planned flow of timber offerings or other resources to avoid serious disruption of useful products to the detriment of the general public.

Forestry with tree harvesting is the one use which provides benefits to every member of this nation's population. These include benefits to those large masses of people in our urban centers who—in the main—are going to have little or no opportunity to enjoy the other assets of our public lands.

The "merger of the Forest Service with the Interior Department into a new Department of Natural Resources" is one of the recommendations of the Commission which has received many of the headlines. In 1950, before a Congressional Committee seeking to implement a Hoover Commission recommendation for consolidation in Government timber management agencies, one of our predecessor associations, Western Pine Association, testified that we were wholeheartedly in favor of the efficiencies and economies to be expected from a single Federal timber management Bureau, but we were dubious then of removing this function from Agriculture and turning it over to Interior.

One of the benefits from the merger as conceived by the Commission would be to open the way for consolidation of Congressional committee jurisdictions. This is an important consideration for Federal forestry. The experience of our industry with Congress does not indicate that interest in timber and the national forests by both the Interior and Agriculture Committees is entirely unworkable or inadvisable. But it would be much more logical to keep the "service" functions of the Forest Service that relate to timber growing on all stands inside Agriculture with other crop growing services. Federal forest land issues might be well handled in a single department. Of substantial interest would be the creation of an independent federal timber corporation which the Commission sees as a desirable alternative. No doubt, Congress will watch closely the development of the Corporation for the Federal post office service with a view to using it as a model for other efficiencies which can be achieved in government.

The Commission indicated that there are some 40 plus million acres of Federal land which should be classified for dominant timber use. But there are indications within our industry that this figure is far too small. Let me suggest why.

First, there is absolutely nothing wrong with growing timber whenever and wherever timber grows. The better it grows, the better for posterity and the public, intensive timber growing practices with very few exceptions, benefit the other multiple uses. Or—if that term "multiple use" bothers you—the "corollary benefits" in watershed, range, outdoor recreation, wildlife and fish production will be increased.

Second, the prevailing concept of the areas best suited for dominant timber use appear to be those areas of historically high timber production such as the Douglas fir region here in the Northwest and the pine forests of the Southern States. But of great importance for the future is the productive potential for growing timber in hitherto undeveloped forest lands, with no history of production.

In this connection, most predictions from both Federal and private studies indicate that intensive timber management will produce an additional two billion board feet per year from Federal lands in the Douglas fir region. However, intensive forest management studies by the Government indicate this much or more additional volume could be produced each year from Federal timber lands in the Rocky Mountain area if developed and properly managed. This includes an access road system, prompt planting, spacing, and an attitude of management for maximum timber growth. The eventual needs of this country may well require that intensive timber management be practiced in both areas.

Maximum timber production must be encouraged in any area that will grow timber, knowing that the corollary benefits of water, range, access, recreation, fish and game can also be enhanced. The adoption of a rigidly classified "dominant use" could lead to management for one use to the detriment of other desperately needed uses.

Dominant use, if we are speaking of good forestry including tree harvesting, does not preclude enjoyment of most of the other benefits. In particular, good forestry is recognized by all experts as a vital function of wild life management.

The Commission's recommendations must now be acted upon by the Congress. I am sure that our lawmakers will carefully scrutinize each recommendation. They will then move in this Nation's historical way to place into law those recommendations of the Land Law Review Commission Act which direct the provision of the maximum benefit for the general public. Our industry can be expected to provide continued assistance and support.

In our concern today with the pursuit for a better life for all of the citizens of this Nation we must not forget that, as far as natural resources are concerned it is not a case of either food or recreation; either shelter or hiking, but instead food and recreation; shelter and hiking. This Nation has achieved its prominent position in the world through utilization of its natural resources by man's technology. We must turn that technology to the correction of any ills which we find apparent. We cannot for our own well-being and that of the world, afford to discard man's capabilities for wise use of his natural resources in favor of a return to nature. To do so would disregard the techniques and knowledge obtained through education and training from those who serve our governments, our universities and our industry.

THE 1971 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT—AS OF SEPTEMBER 23, 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting certain factual highlights from the introductory section of the 11th in a series of periodic "budget scorekeeping" reports prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. This report reflects the cumulative actions of the Congress on the President's budget estimates—as originally submitted and as revised by him—through September 23, 1970.

This report, distributed to all Members on September 28, reflects all the cumulative actions of Congress to Sep-

tember 23 as identified by the Joint Committee staff—beginning with the actions of each committee as a bill is reported—on regular appropriation bills; on legislation containing so-called "backdoor" appropriations; on legislation providing for mandatory spending; inactions on legislative proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays—the negative spending proposals—and actions or inactions on revenue-producing proposals.

In briefest summary, as of September 23
[In billions]

ENACTED BY CONGRESS

1. The Congress, in final actions to date (appropriation bills, +\$335 million; legislative bills +\$1,754 million) has increased budget spending (outlays) by about... +\$2.1
2. The Congress, in final action to date (appropriation bills, +\$373 million; legislative bills, +\$2,600 million) has increased new budget obligating authority by about... +\$3.0

INITIAL HOUSE ACTIONS

1. Initial House actions to date (appropriation bills, +\$226 million; legislative bills, +\$3,225 million) have increased budget spending (outlays) by about... +\$3.5
2. Initial House actions to date (appropriation bills, -\$746 million; legislative bills, +\$6,313 million) have increased new budget obligating authority by about... +\$5.6

INITIAL SENATE ACTIONS

1. Initial Senate actions to date (appropriation bills, +\$1,045 million; legislative bills +\$1,752 million) have increased budget spending (outlays) by about... +\$2.8
2. Initial Senate actions to date (appropriation bills, +\$1,369 million; legislative bills, +\$3,068 million) have increased new budget obligating authority by about... +\$4.4

NOTE.—The supporting detail, bill by bill, is shown in Supporting Table No. 1, September 23 "budget scorekeeping" report.

In reference to variations in the above totals, it should be noted that while some bills have passed through both the House and the Senate—sometimes in identical amounts, sometimes otherwise—other bills have passed the House but not the Senate, and vice versa. Examples: The House has passed 12 of the 1971 appropriation bills; the Senate has passed eight. The House has passed the bill for increased social security benefits above the budget; the Senate has not yet acted.

In elaboration, the following is from the introduction to the September 23 budget scorekeeping report:

INTRODUCTION: STAFF REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE 1971 FISCAL YEAR FEDERAL BUDGET
HIGHLIGHTS AND CURRENT STATUS OF THE 1971 BUDGET

Presidential revisions in the budget

A. New budget authority for fiscal 1971 in the February 2 budget submission was estimated to be \$218,030,495,000. By budget amendments, legislative proposals and reestimates (May 19, 1970), the President has increased the estimates for new budget authority for 1971 by \$4,080,566,000 to a new total of \$222,111,061,000.

B. Budget outlays for fiscal 1971 in the February 2 budget submission were estimated to total \$200,771,129,000. By budget amend-

ments, legislative proposals and reestimates (May 19, 1970), the President has increased the estimated budget outlays for fiscal 1971 by \$6,082,871,000 to a new total of \$206,854,000,000.

C. Budget receipts for fiscal 1971 in the February budget submission were estimated to total \$202,103,000,000, including \$1,522,000,000 for increased taxes proposed to the Congress. By additional revenue proposals for estate and gift taxes (\$1,500,000,000) and leaded gasoline tax (\$1,600,000,000) offset by some adjustments downward in his May 19, 1970 reestimates, the President has increased fiscal 1971 estimated receipts by a net of \$2,006,000,000 to a new total of \$204,109,000,000.

Congressional changes in the budget

A. Budget authority for fiscal 1971:

1. House actions to September 23, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have increased the President's requests for fiscal 1971 budget authority by \$5,567,375,000.

2. Senate actions to September 23, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have increased the President's budget authority requests for fiscal 1971 by \$4,436,524,000.

3. Enactments of spending bills—appropriations and legislative—to September 23, 1970 have added \$2,973,074,000 to the President's budget authority requests for fiscal 1971.

B. Budget outlays for fiscal 1971:

1. House actions to September 23, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have added a net of \$3,450,723,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

2. Senate actions to September 23, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have added a net of \$2,796,629,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

3. Enactments of spending bills—appropriations and legislative—to September 23, 1970 have added \$2,089,161,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

C. Budget receipts requested by the President for fiscal 1971 requiring Congressional actions total \$4,622,000,000:

1. House actions to September 23 on revenue proposals total \$548,000,000 (including a net of \$13,000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of \$4,087,000,000 for revenue increases requested by the President but a balance of \$4,074,000,000 to meet the President's estimated budget requirements.

2. Senate actions to September 23 on revenue proposals total \$1,011,000,000 (including \$693,000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of \$4,304,000,000 for revenue increases requested by the President but a balance of \$3,611,000,000 to meet the President's estimated budget requirements.

3. Enactments of revenue proposals to September 23 total \$516,000,000 (including \$194,000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of \$4,300,000,000 for revenue increases requested by the President but a balance of \$4,106,000,000 to meet the President's estimated budget requirements.

Facts on the budget deficit

The budget for fiscal 1971 submitted to Congress February 2, 1970 reflected a unified budget surplus of \$1.3 billion, made up of an \$8.6 billion surplus from the trust funds and a \$7.3 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

The budget for fiscal 1971 as revised by budget amendments, additional legislative proposals, and reestimates, exclusive of any separate direct Congressional actions on the budget, as announced by the President on May 19, 1970, reflected a unified budget deficit of about \$1.2 billion. Including congress-

sional actions, as announced by the President May 19, 1970, the unified budget deficit was estimated to be \$1.3 billion, made up of an \$8.7 billion surplus from the trust funds and a \$10 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

Since the budget for fiscal 1971 was updated by the President on May 19, additional amendments have been transmitted and re-estimates of certain designated uncontrollable items have been announced by the President in connection with adjustments in the outlay limitation established by Public Law 91-305. The updated estimates have added about \$1,511 million to the May 19 outlay estimates; and of this amount \$333 million are in trust fund outlays. This updating of estimated outlays increases the projected May 19 deficit of \$1.3 billion to about \$2.8 billion, prior to reflecting the Congressional actions and inactions outlined below. This revised deficit estimate is made up of an \$8.4 billion surplus from the trust funds and an \$11.2 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

These surplus and deficit projections are dependent upon various factors of an uncertain nature, such as:

1. Experience shows that actual outlays are likely to increase over earlier projections—thus increasing the deficit. For example, as reported earlier, since submission of the fiscal 1971 budget in February the President has revised his official outlay estimates upward by about \$6.1 billion. Congressional enactments to September 23 have also added approximately \$2,089 million to the total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

2. The economic slowdown may decrease actual revenues from the amounts projected—thus increasing the deficit. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimated last May that revenue collections for fiscal 1971 will be about \$3.2 billion less than the administration was then projecting.

3. The revised budget contained about \$2,414 million in estimated outlay reductions for legislative proposals to the Congress such as postal rate increases, sales of surplus stockpile commodities, revisions in various Veterans benefits, Medicaid reform, sale of Alaska Railroad, etc. The effective date of the proposed \$1,568 million postal rate increases has been delayed by at least six months reducing that saving by at least \$784 million (which is reflected as a Congressional increase in spending above); and only \$180 million of the \$250 proposed surplus sales have been approved. No other actions have been completed. Thus \$666 million of these proposed outlay reductions have not yet been acted upon by the Congress.

4. The budget as revised to May 19, 1970 contains receipt estimates from various revenue producing proposals in the amount of \$4.8 billion (including \$503 million for trust funds of which \$194 million was not requested by the President) which, if not enacted by Congress, will automatically reduce receipts of the Treasury by the amounts estimated—thus increasing the deficit. Congress has enacted, to date, \$322 million of the President's new revenue requests plus \$104 million in new revenue not requested by the President. This leaves a balance of about \$4.3 billion of the revenue requests of the President not yet enacted or, because of the enactment of \$194 million not requested by the President, a balance of \$4.1 billion yet to be enacted toward meeting the President's estimated revenue requirement.

Taking into account Congressional actions to date on the uncertain budget estimates outlined above, and unless pending budget proposals for outlay reductions and additional revenues are enacted, the unified budget deficit for fiscal 1971 estimated by

the President on May 19, 1970 to be about \$1.3 billion would be increased to about \$8.1 billion. Adding the \$1.5 billion for increased outlays from updated estimates adjusting the outlay limitation this unified budget deficit estimate would be increased to about \$9.6 billion. Adding the loss of \$3.2 billion revenue collections as estimated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation the total unified budget deficit could be as much as \$12.8 billion, made up of a \$7.6 billion surplus in trust funds and a \$20.4 billion deficit in general Federal funds.

These deficit figures are not projections. They are simply arithmetic computations. Additional and pending actions by the Congress enacting revenue measures or increasing or decreasing expenditures will have a direct effect on any deficit computations. In addition, any increase in uncontrollable expenditures, like interest, or any additional savings made by the Executive will also have a direct impact on the projected deficit.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AFFECTING 1971

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the summary highlights quoted above, I include a tabulation summarizing the effects of Congressional actions and inactions to September 23 on various spending and revenue measures affecting the President's budget estimates. This summary has been compiled from tables 1, 3, and 4

of the comprehensive "budget scorekeeping" report.

The tabulation reflects the effects of congressional actions and congressional inactions in terms of both budget authority and budget outlays. The budget outlay side of the picture has been combined with the actions remaining to be taken on various revenue-producing proposals to reflect the current status of the President's May 10, 1970, fiscal 1971 deficit estimate as that deficit estimate has been affected by congressional actions or the lack of congressional actions to September 23 and by reestimates upward of certain uncontrollable outlays as reported by the President.

Again, the arithmetical deficit figures shown in this summary tabulation are not projections; the many remaining actions of the Congress on various spending and revenue proposals which are pending disposition will necessarily adjust these figures up or down as those actions are taken.

Furthermore, these deficit figures do not reflect consideration of any shortfall in revenues below those projected in the budget estimates.

The tabulation follows:

FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT—AT A GLANCE—AS OF SEPT. 23, 1970

[In thousands of dollars]

Spending authorization	Changes from the budget			Budget outlays		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
1. Appropriation bills	-745,549	+1,368,844	+373,412	+226,150	+1,044,500	+334,850
2. Legislative bills with "back-door" spending authorization	+4,774,851	+1,407,051	+974,851	+50,000	+50,000	+50,000
3. Mandatory-type spending authorizations in legislative bills (pay, pensions, etc.)	+599,073	+876,629	+840,811	+2,240,573	+918,129	+920,311
4. Legislation affecting proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays—on which final action has been taken	+939,000	+784,000	+784,000	+934,000	+784,000	+784,000
5. Total changes from the budget as of Sept. 23 for spending authority (the sum of items 1-4)	+5,567,375	+4,436,524	+2,973,074	+3,450,723	+2,796,629	+2,089,161
Other adjustments affecting the budget and the deficit						
6. Legislative proposals to reduce budget authority and outlays—on which no Congressional action has been taken				+450,564	+665,564	+665,564
7. Balance of \$4,622,000,000 in revenue requests or equivalent still pending enactment				+4,074,000	+3,611,000	+4,106,000
8. Impact of spending changes and remaining unmet revenue requests on the deficit (the sum of items 5, 6, and 7)				+7,975,287	+7,073,193	+6,860,725
9. Increase in uncontrollable outlays since May 19, as stated by the President				+1,511,000	+1,511,000	+1,511,000
10. Presidential deficit estimate May 19, 1970, excluding Congressional actions				1,234,000	1,234,000	1,234,000
Total deficit—potential without further Congressional changes in revenue or spending, or without reestimates of either (the sum of items 8, 9, and 10)				10,720,287	9,818,193	9,605,725

THE POLAR REGIONS AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the discovery of vast stores of oil beneath the permafrost of the north slope of Alaska and the adjacent seabed of the icy Arctic Ocean has focused the eyes of the world on a region long thought to be virtually useless and of little concern to civilized man except for its effect on our weather. Even those who were aware of the great potential wealth in those barren, inhospitable regions were frustrated by the seeming impossibility of extracting it and getting it to market. But the oil is there and man will get it out as testified to by the historic voyage last year of the giant icebreaking tanker *Manhattan* through the Northwest Passage of the Arctic Archipelago. The frozen stillness of earth's last frontier has been shattered.

As the inevitable commercial exploitation proceeds, this Nation should be sure that it knows what is being done; that it understands, through science, the nature of the environment and the effects of the technology of exploitation; and that there is the organization and oversight necessary to regulate these activities and strike a balance between development and environmental control.

The environmental impact of major Arctic development must come under full consideration.

I have quoted from a thought-provoking article appearing in the June issue of *Undersea Technology* magazine, entitled "The Polar Regions and Congressional Oversight." The author calls attention to the "almost totally lacking" review by the Congress of the Arctic and Far North ecosystems and interrelationships of economic and political factors. And the situation is similar with regard to Antarctica. He urges that the polar areas receive a serious focus of attention by the Congress and suggests that the proposed new Joint Committee on the Environment, which passed the House in May as House Joint Resolution 1117, might provide an excellent forum to initiate the needed comprehensive study.

The text of the article by John M. Drewry, marine consultant and former Chief Counsel of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, follows:

THE POLAR REGIONS AND CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

(By John M. Drewry)

More and more attention is being focused on the Arctic by the national interests with jurisdiction over the various territorial portions of it. The apparent imminence of economic pay-out from exploitation of the oil discovered on the Alaskan North Slope places fresh emphasis on the need for survey and understanding of the resources of the Arctic. The mineral potential, especially oil and gas, throughout the whole Alaska/Canada northland is considered to be tremendous.

Until recently, hopes for economically feasible exploitation of these resources have been constrained due to the inhospitable environment and resultant high costs. However, the possibility of year-round or even

substantial seasonal use of the Northwest Passage is stimulating thoughts of exploitation of all the far-north mineral resources on a large scale.

Strategic considerations affecting the western world *vis-a-vis* the Soviet Union are evident.

Yet, despite these very important factors, U.S. review of the Arctic and far-north ecosystems and interrelationships of economical and political factors by the Congress has been almost totally lacking.

In a paper entitled "The North Today," Prof. Trevor Lloyd, chairman of the Board of Governors of the Arctic Institute of North America, made these observations:

"The North of today is increasingly international and it will be even more so tomorrow. The present upsurge of northern interest is circumpolar, and it may prove more lasting than any in the past. Having at last started to roll, the northwest course of development may this time keep right on, so that, at long last, the North will be drawn into the urban-technological world. Against that time, intensive study and research will be needed to anticipate the physical and social problems that will be encountered."

Three years ago, the Senate Committee on Appropriations requested and received "A Report on Federal Arctic Research" from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress (90th Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Document No. 71). The late Senator E. L. Bartlett of Alaska requested this study as chairman of the Senate Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee. As a result, Sen. Bartlett had recognized the inadequacy of the current situation and the necessity for meaningful and remedial action. To our knowledge, nothing else has been done.

In 1966, the Atomic Energy Commission published a 1,250-page report, including charts and maps, entitled "Environment of the Cape Thompson Region, Alaska." It covered a comprehensive, \$4.5 million environmental study conducted between 1957 and 1962 in the area of Cape Thompson, Alaska, near Kotzebue Sound, where the AEC had proposed blasting an experimental ship harbor of major magnitude. The Kotzebue proposal was part of the Plowshare program and was referred to as Project Chariot. After 1962, nothing came of this tremendous study, except the publication of the Cape Thompson report in 1966.

In light of the North Slope discoveries, the potentialities of the *Manhattan* voyage last summer and the possible uses of the Northwest Passage to both the East and the West, it appears worthwhile at this time for a high-level Congressional review of the previous studies to see whether major port facilities in Arctic Alaska might now serve an even far greater purpose than the Plowshare people originally had in mind. Such major facilities providing refuge, repair and other services would be essential in developing a viable transarctic transportation system.

As the inevitable commercial exploitation proceeds, this nation should be sure that it knows what is being done; that it understands, through science, the nature of the environment and the effects of the technology of exploitation; and that there is the organization and oversight necessary to regulate these activities and strike a balance between development and environmental control.

The environmental impact of major Arctic development must come under full consideration.

Recently the impact problems have received some attention. Injunction action has been brought against the Secretary of the Interior to inhibit the issuance of a pipeline permit. The needs of Arctic Research have been recognized to the extent of consolidating responsibilities in this area within the National Science Foundation. However, NSF has requested only \$2 million in Fiscal '71

for its various responsibilities in coordinating and assessing the Arctic research activities, stimulating technological development of the area and facilitating international cooperation in Arctic research.

The Trudeau Government of Canada has formally introduced bills in the House of Commons asking for authority to expand Canada's sovereignty over offshore waters from 3 mi. to 12 mi., to close off certain unspecified bodies of water to foreign fishing fleets and to assert anti-pollution jurisdiction over "safety control zones" reaching 100 mi. into Arctic waters.

ANTARCTICA

Antarctica, in the South Polar region, belongs to this commentary also. At what we call the bottom of the Earth is a continent of nearly 6 million square miles in area, largely contained within the Antarctic Circle. Although the problems of the North and South Polar Regions are quite distinct, there are, nevertheless, relationships and similarities which seem fully to justify their joint consideration.

Since the early 19th Century, there has been a great deal of interest on the part of many nations in this forbidding area. But except for whaling activities in the plankton-rich seas, exploitation opportunities in Antarctica have been sparse.

The International Geophysical Year in the late 1950's focused major attention on Antarctica. U.S. participation in the program which began at that time has been kept alive, but no Administration has wanted either to downgrade it too much or to take any steps toward significant development. In other words, level-funding support has been continued and has kept the show on the road, but there has been little enthusiasm for advancing the cause.

Much good work has been and is continuing to be done under the auspices of NSF's Antarctic Research Program. But NSF funding for the program in recent years has held at about \$7 million annually.

The polar regions are vital portions of the environmental systems affecting the so-called "civilized" world. What we may do in these seemingly barren and useless areas could wreak irrevocable harm on future generations.

We believe that the most effective Congressional appraisal of the problems of the polar environmental systems should be accomplished through not more than one committee of each House. Congress is not organized along precise lines of environmental jurisdictions. We do not propose at this time any changes or consolidation of traditional areas of legislative jurisdiction among the existing committees.

The problem of which committee or committees should take the burden of our subject matter is highlighted by last year's water pollution and environmental quality control bills. Two committees of each House were actively involved in hearings and action on both of these measures since each bill met the standards for referral to them. And each committee had sufficient interest to press for action.

Committee jurisdiction over matters dealing with Antarctica presents another example of the problem of which is the "right" committee in a unique situation.

In 1968, George Doumani of the Science Policy Research Div. of the Library of Congress' Legislative Reference Service published an article in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* entitled "Science Policy for Antarctica." Doumani reviewed the recent background history of U.S. and world interest in the region. He called attention to the periodic legislative proposals on Antarctic matters introduced in Congress since 1938, noting that they had been "referred to different committees at different times with no discernible pattern."

Doumani wondered which congressional committees should assume responsibility for our Antarctic affairs. Should they be referred to the committees dealing with foreign relations, by virtue of Antarctica's "foreignness"? Should the Appropriations Committees play the major role? Or should they be handled by the Judiciary Committees? But, then, since our proclaimed interests in Antarctica are mainly scientific, perhaps they should be referred to one of the committees concerned with science and technology.

He concluded that the Committee on Science and Aeronautics might be best suited. His conclusion is undoubtedly strengthened now that this committee has been authorized responsibility over the National Science Foundation, which, in turn, is responsible for the U.S. Antarctic Research Program. And it is further strengthened by the fact that NSF is the lead agency for the International Decade of Ocean Exploration and the lead agency for a National Arctic Research Program. The Committee on Science and Astronautics also oversees responsibility of matters involving international scientific cooperation.

Despite the strong case that can be made for the House Science and Astronautics Committee and its Senate counterpart to conduct the polar studies proposed here, it does not rule out conflicts with jurisdictions of other existing committees.

Avoidance of friction and a happy solution to the dilemma may soon be found, depending on favorable Congressional action on a House Joint Resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology. The proposed joint committee would be comprised of members of the Senate and House from majority and minority members of the several committees that are concerned in important ways with environmental and technological matters. It would not be a legislative committee, but would rather provide oversight and review and recommend legislative directions.

The bill, with minor amendments, was passed by the House last month, but there has not yet been any action in the Senate. No matter what happens to the proposed joint committee—indeed, no matter to which committee or committees this matter may be referred—time should not be allowed to drain off much longer. The potentials of both the Arctic and the Antarctic have too long been neglected from the standpoint of comprehensive Congressional oversight. The unique characteristics, the vital importance and the current awareness of the polar areas in regard to the national and, indeed, world interest justify a serious focus of attention by the Congress.

UNICO HONORS JOSEPH ZAZZERA

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening it was my distinct privilege to address the 11th Annual Past President's Night of the Carbondale Chapter of UNICO National. On this occasion the dinner was in honor of past President Joseph Zazzera who concluded an extremely successful year as president of this outstanding organization before turning the gavel over to the current president, Mr. Paul Carachilo.

During the course of the evening Toastmaster William F. Farber reminded us of UNICO's dedication to civic action. Dr. Benjamin A. Cottone, president-elect

of UNICO National, stressed the volunteer spirit that UNICO exemplifies and reminded all that the initials of UNICO stand for unity, neighborliness, integrity, charity, and opportunity. At that point it became the duty of Mr. Joseph Lopez to provide a history of President Zazzera's tenure during the years 1969-70. The report was indeed impressive and exemplified the spirit contained in the remarks of Dr. Cottone and Messrs. Carachilo and Farber.

I bring to the attention of the House some of the beneficiaries of UNICO's civic action: St. Joseph's Hospital School of Nursing, Carbondale Chamber of Commerce, our servicemen in Vietnam, the Junior Football League, the United Fund, Catholic Charities, the Salvation Army, the national health program, YMCA, Carbondale Library Fund, Carbondale Teener League, and the Little League of Simpson.

What better example can one find of civic action by a group of public-spirited men? To them I extend my warmest congratulations.

A GREAT WOMAN HAS PASSED OUR WAY—EDNA GELLHORN—A LEGEND IN HER LIFETIME

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are in public life meet and greet unknown numbers of people as we go on our way. Some make an indelible impression upon us and we often recall their activities and contributions to the way of life. One who became a legend in her lifetime has left us—Edna Fischel Gellhorn, of St. Louis. No one who knew her or of her would mention her name without recalling at least a few of her countless activities and her expertise and indefatigable support of causes which she believed to be in the common good. Mrs. Gellhorn reached the wonderful age of 91 years—active to the end in her beloved causes. The League of Women Voters, in paying tribute to her memory, has said:

Edna Fischel Gellhorn, founder of the League of Women Voters, died September 24, 1970. Her contribution to the League was so vast that it can only be matched by the devotion of everyone who knew her.

It was my privilege to know, work with and admire Mrs. Gellhorn over a period of many, many years—she was truly a great, great woman.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in an article has told of some of her activities which I would like to share. It is as follows:

MRS. EDNA GELLHORN DIES AT 91; SUFFRAGIST WORKER, CIVIC LEADER

Mrs. Edna Gellhorn, a national leader in civic reform, charter member of the League of Women Voters and pioneer in the struggle to obtain for American women the right to vote, died of infirmities of age yesterday at her home 5961 Laclede Avenue. She was 91 years old.

A commemorative service will be at 4 p.m. on Oct. 11 at Graham Chapel on the Wash-

ington University campus. Funeral services will be private, with burial in Bellefontaine Cemetery.

Mrs. Gellhorn, a tireless worker for public causes, headed the old Missouri Equal Suffrage League in 1919 and 1920. She was head of the St. Louis Equal Suffrage League when the national organization held its jubilee convention here in 1919.

The next year, when the suffrage objective had been achieved, Mrs. Gellhorn became first vice president of the National League of Women Voters. She was elected also as the first president of the newly formed Missouri League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Gellhorn led the Missouri League's campaign in support of the Missouri Constitution that was adopted in 1945. Ten years earlier, she had led a National League drive against the spoils system in Government. She was president of the St. Louis League and a director of the national organization.

Her advocacy of the merit system helped move the St. Louis and state governments toward civil service. She was instrumental in bringing about better personnel practices in St. Louis public schools, and helped found John Burroughs School, a private institution.

"She belongs to almost all the white-hat organizations," a friend once said. The list at one time included the Social Hygiene Association, the Interracial Committee, the Social Security Commission, the Slum Clearance Commission and the boards of Children's Guardians and the People's Art Center.

BACKED UNITED NATIONS

In recent years, she helped organize chapters of the American Association for the United Nations. She was one of the founders of the Citizens Committee on Nuclear Information and was active in its behalf.

Mrs. Gellhorn was the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Washington E. Fischel, leaders in the Ethical Culture movement here. She was introduced to society when the family lived in the 2600 block of Wisconsin Avenue. She attended Mary Institute, where she was class president, and Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, where she became life president of the class of 1900.

In 1903, Edna Fischel married Dr. George Gellhorn, a Breslau-born German physician who had come to St. Louis three years earlier. He became professor of clinical obstetrics and gynecology at Washington University. He died in 1936.

ENCOURAGED BY HUSBAND

With her husband's quiet encouragement, Mrs. Gellhorn plunged into the suffragist work that led to adoption in 1920 of the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Later, she was fond of commenting that "you never find a good woman worker in any cause but that she has a generous husband behind her."

When she became an active worker for the vote, Mrs. Gellhorn already had a reputation for resourceful campaigning in charity drives.

She borrowed eight elephants from a circus to attract customers to a concession booth at a Delmar Garden hospital event. From merchants she begged peanuts to sell. The combination was a financial success even though the elephants got loose and had to be hunted down.

Mrs. Gellhorn's apartment on Laclede Avenue, half a block from Forest Park, remained a center of women's civic activities.

When she reached her seventy-fifth year, Mrs. Gellhorn made a statement in an interview that some of her friends considered an admirable summing up of a career not ended.

"I'm glad I was born in a time of stress. I'm glad to have lived through it. And I have infinite faith in the future."

Surviving are a daughter, Martha, a novelist living in London, who was married to Ernest Hemingway; and two sons, Walter, a professor of law at Columbia University,

and Alfred, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School.

Another son, George Gellhorn, Jr., died in 1968. He was president of the International Finance and Development Corp.

CAMPUS UNREST AFFECTS RESEARCH

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, we have seen many unpleasant trends developing on the campuses of our country over the past few years. They are also surprising because the sources of these trends are in large measure found among the people who might be expected to inveigh most ardently against them.

I refer to the threat to academic freedom and the free use of guilt by association which American universities have witnessed recently. One example has been the treatment of Government-sponsored research.

Anyone doing business on Government grants seems to be held responsible for every act of the White House; although it is interesting to note that radicals studying as a result of Federal scholarships and loans are not held to the same standards. There have also been frequent attempts to expel such Government-sponsored projects from the campus.

A recent article from the C. & E.N. points up the particular problems which this situation has presented for chemical education, particularly those departments and professors which are funded by the Department of Defense. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article "Campus Unrest Affects Chemical Education."

The article follows:

CAMPUS UNREST AFFECTS CHEMICAL EDUCATION—DOD-FUNDED RESEARCH TROUBLES SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS, CHEMISTRY "COMMUNITIES" FORM TO COPE WITH DISSIDENT

It's been a quiet summer for science and engineering departments in most universities across the country. But there is an air of nervous expectation that when the campuses reopen shortly the widespread unrest, activism, and even violence of the past two or three years will recommence.

Such concern was heard again and again from witnesses at hearings of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. And it is a view shared by many university administrators, professors, and students interviewed by C&EN's Lloyd Dunlap and Bob Hadsell during the summer.

Although the continuing war in Vietnam seem to be the major source of student discontent, even were the war to end soon student activism wouldn't cease, University of Wisconsin chemistry professor Robert West says. And his opinion is echoed by students and faculty members across the country. The war, the environment, DOD funding, and other yet undefined issues are likely to keep the campuses politicized for years to come.

Apart from the human toll—deaths, injuries, arrests—direct costs stemming from student unrest have become a heavy burden for universities to bear. Damages on campuses nationally exceeded \$9.5 million during the past academic year, according to J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau

of Investigation. In fact, insurance may be the single most rapidly rising cost for universities today.

TURBULENCE

Departments of chemistry and chemical engineering have inevitably been swept up in the turbulent currents of activism and protest. Their students and professors have joined—to varying degrees—in the debates and demonstrations. In certain critical areas the issues have produced not only an out-going concern with broad social problems but also a turning inward to grapple with values and purposes that are basic to science teaching and research.

The nature of chemical education is being altered, and some of the changes are ominous: growing enmity among faculty members and perceived threats to a free choice of research topics. Other changes, however, seem to be enabling some departments to move smoothly through periods of crisis, such as the turmoil in May following the Cambodia incursion by the U.S. Chief among these changes is the growing participation of students in departmental affairs, particularly with the formation of "chemistry communities."

Research financed by the Department of Defense is the one target of student protest that holds the greatest potential for disruption of chemical education. Classified research has been a long-standing issue, and most schools have either traditionally prohibited classified research or have in recent years taken steps to remove classified research from their campuses under pressure from students and faculty. But the protests are shifting to research that may be interpreted as war-related or that is DOD-funded—which puts some chemistry professors squarely in the target.

Two universities found the issue had suddenly come to a head in the agitation that followed the Cambodia event and the subsequent killing of four students in demonstrations at Kent State University. DOD-funded research was the subject of faculty resolutions at Princeton University and at the Stony Brook campus of State University of New York.

RESOLUTIONS

Stony Brook moved in the direction of a ban on DOD-funded research when the faculty senate on May 8—four days after the Kent State event—passed a resolution "that it be SUNY/SB policy not to seek research grants and contracts from the Department of Defense. . . ." This resolution was only advisory, however, and was sent to the graduate council, an elected faculty body that deals with academic matters affecting graduate education.

Also early in May, the university cabinet of vice presidents and deans proposed a similar ban on war-related research. The distinction between the proposal and the faculty resolution is that DOD-funded research may be unrelated to war, and war-related research may be funded by agencies other than DOD. The graduate council considered both the faculty and cabinet statements and sent its recommendations to acting president T. Alexander Pond on July 21.

On Aug. 25, prior to the return of Stony Brook president John S. Toll, Dr. Pond sent a memorandum to the faculty saying that he would submit to the faculty senate the graduate council's recommendation that "research on campus be determined by academic and scholarly criteria, not political ones." The graduate council would make recommendations on any research project questioned by a faculty member. The faculty senate is expected to consider the matter in late September or early October.

In the memorandum, Dr. Pond notes that it is already university policy that "no project is acceptable which by the nature of its results is directly, specifically, or intention-

ally dedicated to the advancement of the methodology or instrumentation of warfare."

ISSUE

DOD-funded research has been an issue with student activists at Stony Brook for the past two years, according to chemistry professor Francis T. Bonner, who has just returned to full-time teaching and research after 12 years as department chairman. The issue figured in raids on files of research records, an explosive situation that nearly closed the campus, and in a narrowly defeated motion by the faculty senate to "phase out by attrition" all DOD-funded research.

CHEMISTRY STUDENTS GRADUATE ON TIME AT KENT STATE

When the campus at Kent State University closed on May 4, five weeks of classes were left uncompleted. But after recovering from the shock of four students being shot to death by an Ohio unit of the National Guard on that day, chemistry students and professors gathered in faculty homes and in laboratories as far away as Gambler, Ohio, and Pittsburgh, Pa., to finish course work by June commencement.

Several classes—particularly advanced courses taken by small numbers of chemistry majors—met in their teachers' homes, says Dr. Milton Manes, acting chairman of the chemistry department during the absence of vacationing chairman Raymond R. Myers. Professors with larger classes rented space in Cleveland or in local Kent, Ohio, churches. About two thirds of the students in a biochemistry course intended primarily for nursing students continued their lectures and clinical training in two Cleveland hospitals.

For students who were unable to remain in Kent, courses were continued by correspondence. Even laboratory data were sent by mail, so students could finish lab reports. Final examinations were also of the take-home type.

Graduate students were permitted to return to their laboratories after about two weeks, but students in several undergraduate laboratory courses managed to continue their experiments elsewhere. Dr. William F. Barker moved his freshman honors lab to the Gambler campus of Kenyon College. Dr. Manes took his students in instrumental analysis to Pittsburgh's Carnegie-Mellon University for a day of lecture-demonstrations.

General chemistry coordinator Norman V. Duffy and graduate students Kenneth Klassen and Richard Hankett made films of 10 experiments that students in the general chemistry course had been unable to complete. The films were shown at weekly "help" sessions.

"So we really kept going," Dr. Manes says. Attendance in his two classes was better than normal, he adds. Some of the students took an "incomplete" grade in their courses, but most graduated on time.

The faculty senate resolution on May 8 to stop DOD-funded research was a consequence of the events of the preceding few days, Dr. Bonner says. Particularly, he says, it was a consequence of the faculty's support on May 6 for the third of three demands of the national student strike proposed on May 2 by leaders of a Black Panther support rally in New Haven, Conn. The demand called for an end to defense research, among other activities. But there was a sense of concern at the faculty senate meeting that academic freedom might be threatened by a committee review of all research for relevance to university purposes, Dr. Bonner says. The criteria of DOD-funding instead removes research from further judgment.

As at Stony Brook, the Cambodia and Kent State events gave a final push to a concern with DOD funding that had been building at Princeton for several years. On May 6 at Princeton University, the "Princeton

chemistry community" of faculty, undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students, and staff passed several resolutions, including two that dealt with research.

One urged Congress "to seek methods to transfer funds for basic research from the Department of Defense to civilian agencies as soon as possible." Not content to leave the matter entirely up to Congress, however, the following resolution stated that "the department [of chemistry] will henceforth discourage all faculty members from accepting any new grants from DOD or any of its sub-agencies." Faculty who already have DOD funds "are requested to seek other sources of support, as soon as possible."

POLICIES

On the same day, May 6, the Princeton faculty passed a resolution asking the university council to appoint a committee to study Princeton's policies on DOD and other sponsored research in general. The resolution also gives the committee two proposals to consider: "That the university refuse to accept any outside funds for research on campus which is directly and specifically related to weapons and weapons systems," and "That Congress be asked to channel all funds in support of research to universities through civilian departments and organizations. . . ." The council will send a report on the committee's findings to the faculty by Nov. 1.

The issue of DOD funding is already becoming a divisive one among faculties, setting science and engineering departments against the humanities and social sciences. There is also growing tension between DOD-funded scientists and those without DOD funds.

At Stony Brook, for instance, most of the faculty who voted in favor of the resolution on DOD funding won't be affected by it, Frank W. Fowler, assistant chemistry professor, says. Some of the faculty feel that they are dependent on DOD funds and they are very unhappy, Dr. Bonner adds.

At Princeton, chemistry professor Donald S. McClure, who receives a minor portion of his funds from the Navy, feels that the resolutions of the chemistry community were passed "in the heat of the moment," with no clear thinking before the meeting. There were perhaps 100 students and 20 faculty present, he says, and the faculty was outvoted.

THREATENED

The principle of academic freedom is very much at issue since the events of May, both with respect to limits on a professor's research and with respect to political positions taken to represent not individuals but entire departments, faculties, or universities. It is generally agreed that academic freedom is threatened or at least compromised by group resolutions on research funding or political issues. But opinions vary on the importance of academic freedom when weighed against other issues. The idea of faculty taking a political position is something new. Stony Brook's Bonner says, and it is disturbing to all of us.

The introduction to the resolutions passed by the Princeton chemistry community may be a good expression of the present mood: "The great dangers inherent in institutional political statements are apparent to us. In particular we are loath to appear to commit those of us who must be absent or who may not be in total agreement with us. It seems to us, however, that the dangers to the university and the Republic presented by our Government's internal and external policies constitute such a clear and present peril that great risks and drastic action are warranted."

But the Princeton resolutions aren't viewed as a threat to academic freedom by chemistry department chairman Kurt M. Mislow. The chemistry community isn't the chemis-

try department, he points out, and this makes the resolutions simply an expression of opinion from a group of people with common interests. A second point is that the resolutions merely request research funding from a source other than DOD, he says, and leave each faculty member free to take DOD funds if he chooses.

Even if the faculty resolution on DOD-funded research at Stony Brook is not accepted by the administration, the atmosphere created by the resolution is not conducive to freedom of choice on academic matters, says chemistry professor Edward M. Kosower. Dr. Kosower is one of two chemistry professors at Stony Brook whose research is funded by DOD. His research, which he describes as "fundamental chemistry for the investigation of the topology of active sites of enzymes," is indirectly related to the action of a drug used to treat malaria, a disease traditionally studied under grants from the Army.

NO PRESSURE

Dr. Kosower says that he is under no pressure from within his research group or from anywhere else to stop taking DOD funds. Nevertheless, he has had "DOD" painted on his office door, and he discovered his name on a sign at a campus demonstration in 1969 during an international meeting at Stony Brook.

Dr. Kosower has filled out an application for a renewal of his DOD grant. This renewal, along with several grant applications from other departments, has become an unresolved test case for policy on DOD research at Stony Brook.

Beyond the specific issue of DOD-funded research, some chemistry and chemical engineering students agree with assistant chemistry professor Maitland Jones at Princeton that the Cambodia event produced no sudden change in political activity of scientists but simply triggered a release of antiwar feelings that had been formed previously. But others side with chemistry graduate student Andrew V. Nowak of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who says that many people became newly involved in political activities. They may not stay involved, he says, but these people may be on tap in the future for organizations formed by others who have been active all along.

The extent to which political opinions should be sponsored by departments rather than by individuals acting as such was perplexing to many in the activities that followed the Cambodia event. The problems of academic freedom and dissension raised by positions on DOD funding are raised by any political resolutions.

RADICALS PLAY A CATALYTIC ROLE AT STANFORD

In the course of pursuing the subject of unrest on the campus, our editors noted the historical paradox of how small groups can often alter or control much larger groups or institutions. We asked one of our editors, Lloyd Dunlap, to reflect on this phenomenon on one of the campuses (Stanford) in light of his talks with students, faculty, and administrators. What follows is his brief interpretation:

There is, apparently, a willingness by those at the university to doff the cap in recognition of the catalytic role played by the estimated 50 to 200 students who actually took part in violent activity at Stanford. Chemistry graduate student Fred Schwenk, at least, believes that the violence was probably an essential forerunner to consequent campuswide, peaceful activity. Which brings out an important moral conflict: Activist students, even when peaceful and within their Constitutional rights, contribute to the success of the radical fringe by legitimizing, through their participation or acquiescence, the goals of the lawless element on campus.

Dr. Kenneth Pitzer, whose career as a college administrator was cut short perhaps by

legal dissent as well as by the more wild and woolly variety (it is doubtful that any 50 to 200 students, standing alone and totally without additional student support, could paralyze any university of 7000) has said of demonstrations: "In fact, [they are] inherently an ugly, sometimes fierce threat to and infringement upon the rights of researchers to research, students to study, and teachers to teach."

Someone, it appears, must eventually bear the responsibility for campus violence and for the erosion of the very rights to research, study, and teach that Dr. Pitzer spoke of.

It is intriguing to speculate as to whether Ken Pitzer might still be in charge at Stanford if it were not for graduate students Carol Clericuzio, Don Marquardt, Fred Schwenk, and their counterparts across the campus. It is also intriguing to imagine the possibility that demands for relevant education and a humane technology are merely steps along the way toward a totalitarianism of "now"—an impatience with any necessity to work and wait for one's rewards.

Chemists at MIT, Yale, Cornell, and Stanford—as well as those at Princeton—took political positions on the Vietnam war after the events of Cambodia and Kent State. Except at Cornell, this was an unprecedented move at each school. But in most cases, professors took great pains to explain that the resolutions didn't represent official departmental positions, and that students and staff, such as technicians and secretaries, had been included in the voting.

War-related issues have shared the stage at some meetings with university governance, an issue that cuts across all the other issues that provoke campus unrest. For every issue seems to involve a struggle for the power to make decisions that will settle the issue one way or another.

RESPONSIBILITY

University presidents have come under increasing pressure from both students and faculty to share in some degree administrative responsibility. At San Francisco State University, president S. I. Hayakawa believes firmly in the approach he has used with apparent success so far.

As a first principle, Dr. Hayakawa tells C&EN, college administrators must be more decisive. Many administrators have simply failed to realize what was happening until it was too late, he says. "My perceptions of what needed to be done turned out to be accurate. When people said, 'We are going to close the college,' many replied, 'We must listen to the young people.' I said, 'I've heard them.'"

Dr. Hayakawa's manner is clipped and certain. No, he does not think the role of the university has changed or will change. Current new left anti-intellectualism will leave little mark, he believes. Fundamentally, he is firmly convinced that universities are "inevitably intellectual institutions" and that today's furor is just an aberrant blip on the chart of higher education's long history.

Dr. Hayakawa believes, however, that some tactics regarding young people should be changed. He would like to see draft exemptions for college students abolished, for example.

"People seriously claim," he notes, "that since expulsion means being drafted, being drafted means going to Vietnam, and going to Vietnam means being killed, that expulsion is equivalent to execution. It's a silly argument, but people take it seriously."

University presidents at MIT, Yale, Princeton, and Cornell receive high marks from their professors for having "anticipated" issues that might have caused trouble. But there have been several notable resignations of presidents during the past few months. At the University of Wisconsin, president F. Harvey Harrington will step down this fall, having found his own tough stance against disruptors not tough enough to please some state legislators.

INJUNCTION

Other university presidents are also turning to the police or National Guard, as did Dr. Harrington, as campus security forces and student judicial systems prove to be inadequate. There is also a growing use of the court injunction as a means for preserving order. The court injunction has ended sit-ins effectively at some schools, but its use in other instances has seemed repressive to some.

At State University of New York at Buffalo, for instance, a sit-in at a basketball game on Feb. 24 escalated into violence in the student union on the 25th, during which both police and students were injured. Demonstrations and fire-bombings continued, and on March 5 a preliminary injunction requested by the school's administration was issued by a state supreme court justice prohibiting interference with normal university functions.

On March 15, 45 faculty members were arrested at a sit-in in the administration building and charged initially with criminal trespass. A charge for criminal contempt in violation of the injunction was soon added, as well as charges of civil and criminal contempt brought by the university. The university's charges were tried in the state supreme court in April, and the resulting conviction for criminal contempt is now on appeal. The charges brought by the Erie County district attorney will probably be tried this fall.

The injunction was used again to arrest four of about 24 people who walked out of Buffalo's commencement exercises in June. The injunction was finally allowed to lapse on July 15. Late in August, charges against the four were withdrawn by the university.

The injunction isn't repressive as worded, but it seems bad as enforced, says Robert Fleming, university advocate. Because of the injunction, the "Buffalo 45" could have been arrested for meeting anywhere on campus, in principle—with the possible exception of the student union, adds Dr. Richard A. Finnegan, professor of medicinal chemistry and one of the 45 arrested.

While administrators struggle to assert their authority, students are gaining an increasing involvement in the affairs of science departments. In some cases the arrangement is formal, as with student-faculty curriculum committees, and in other instances the involvement is through the more informal mass meeting of a "chemistry community." Student involvement has been invited by the faculty at some schools, while at others the channels of communication have been opened spontaneously in times of crisis.

At Cornell University, the "Baker Lab community" originated in the turmoil of a racial confrontation in April 1969 that climaxed with black students emerging with weapons from Willard Straight Hall after a 36-hour occupation of the student union. There were calls for a strike, chemistry department chairman Gordon Hammes says, and everyone connected with the chemistry department met as often as three or four times a week during that period to discuss issues and responses to the issues.

COMMUNITY

The community of faculty, students, and staff evolved from these meetings, and Dr. Hammes credits its existence with easing the transition of Cornell's chemistry department through the difficult period after the Cambodia and Kent State events. There were again calls for a strike—which did not occur—and the community was a ready-made forum for communication, he says.

Resolutions on national policies were passed by the Baker Lab community after the Cambodia event, and political positions had been taken by the community in the past, Dr. Hammes says. But the resolutions

are just "a consensus of the community" and not positions taken by the chemistry department, he emphasizes.

The April 1969 crisis at Cornell also led to formation of a "chemical engineering forum," and the engineering students became active in studying and reforming the curriculum, says chemical engineering chairman Charles Winding. The forum includes everyone in the department and is organized with several committees, such as one on faculty-student relations. During the past year, however, the forum didn't meet regularly and has "practically disintegrated," Dr. Winding says. Now the faculty is concerned with how to get the students involved again.

Although campus unrest may have improved communication between science faculty and students at some schools, there is some concern that science and technology are being viewed with increasing suspicion and hostility by nonscientists. The "concerned members of the chemistry department, University of California, Berkeley," stated the case indicting science in a way that even the most radical leftist might appreciate: "We feel," the 263 (out of 286 who voted) chemists said, "that the technology which science has developed, when applied in maintaining and escalating the war in Indochina, is a brutal bastardization of the entire concept of science."

On the other hand, MIT's chemistry department hasn't been the focus of any student protests, says chemistry professor Frederick D. Greene. Much of the research there is related to health matters instead of military matters, he adds. Buffalo chemistry chairman Howard Tieckelmann finds no antisocial attitudes among students at his school, either. Windows of the chemistry building there have remained conspicuously unbroken during demonstrations and riots, and student activists have even been observed surreptitiously attending chemistry lectures while supposedly on strike, he notes.

ATTITUDES

There may be more subtle changes in student attitudes, nevertheless. Graduate student Don Marquardt says that over his stay at Stanford he has detected an appreciable change in attitudes of incoming students whose high school experiences have been quite different from his. Carol Clericuzio, another Stanford chemistry graduate student who participated in a roundtable discussion with other students and faculty members, notes that students are much less "monastic" than in former years. Does this new emphasis on broad social problems mean less attention to classical chemistry? Yes, almost inevitably, the Stanford participants feel.

From outside the campuses, however, there is a growing clamor for local and state control of schools whose administrators seem unable to control unrest. Academic science is sure to be hurt by the reaction of alumni, trustees, and legislators, in the view of Berkeley chemistry professor George Pimentel.

Already in California, he notes, there have been budget cuts across the board. The summer quarter was simply canceled at US, despite the fact that departments had been staffed and had readied services. Ironically, the summer quarter had been instituted as an economy move and was then dropped for the same ostensible reason. Punitive action has taken other forms: Cost of living rates have been held up; the academic senate has had its flow of funds interrupted; the regents have interfered in faculty hiring and there is even some concern, Dr. Pimentel says, that the regents may invade the classroom by censoring course content.

"I feel that it's going to be terribly important for society to realize that this strong political influence from the right is invading the campus and threatening the quality

of our educational system," Dr. Pimentel says, "not just at Berkeley but across the country, and is putting fuel on the fire for the far left, which is doing the same thing. Society has got to recognize that you can't have a good educational system if it's going to be a political tool—either for the right or the left."

IMMEDIATE

At the same eastern universities, however, chemistry professors see a more immediate threat to chemical education. MIT professor Greene says that the decrease in support for basic research at MIT and elsewhere, along with the difficult job situation, may be the chief cause of a real change in the number of students going into chemistry. MIT will have only 52 first-year graduate students going into chemistry this fall instead of the usual 65 to 70, and a lack of funds is the reason. Yale will admit 19 instead of the usual 40.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in trying to predict what the coming academic year will bring is that the universities are so vulnerable to the unpredictable forces of events beyond their campuses. The level of student involvement in fall election campaigning depends on what the Federal Government does, says MIT graduate student Nowak, just as things would have been different in May if U.S. troops hadn't moved into Cambodia.

It is, at least, easy to agree with Harry Mosher, acting head of Stanford's chemistry department at the time of the Kent State incident, when he says, "It's safe to say that things [in the chemistry department] are not the same as they were and that they'll never be the same again."

OPERATION MAINSTREAM

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt we are facing a crucial challenge in this country in providing increased economic opportunities for our citizens. To date many of our efforts have been stopgap measures and have produced only limited benefits.

However, through effective job training programs we have been able to give many low-income persons the necessary job skills to lift themselves up the economic ladder. Helping people to help themselves has been a hallmark of the Department of Labor's Operation Mainstream program.

Operation Mainstream is an adult work training experience program which places emphasis on work as a means of producing income. Its goal is to enhance the productivity and employability of disadvantaged workers and directly aid their job placement. The training activities involve the improvement of the social and physical environment of the community. This program has been particularly successful in Meigs County, Ohio, where it is being carried out under the Leading Creek Conservancy District. A recent article which appeared in the Athens Messenger describes the contribution the OM program is making in securing meaningful employment for area residents.

The article follows:

JOB TRAINING PROGRAM HELPS MORE THAN 100 IN MEIGS

(By Beulah Jones)

RUTLAND.—A new approach to the job problem in Meigs County which has been carried out under the Leading Creek Conservancy District, has resulted in more than 100 job placements with industries in the area.

Jack Crisp, president of the Leading Creek Conservancy Board, and director of the Operation Mainstream-E Program, which operates under the Vocational Labor Department, reported that 27 enrollees have been trained and placed in jobs with local industry since July 6, and that 112 have been placed in jobs since the program began three years ago in 1967.

Crisp announced this week that the Operation Mainstream-E Program now has five job openings at \$1.76 per hour for 30 hours per week.

Under the training and job placement program, enrollees are given training in various types of employment during the operation of small bulldozers, timber work, and they receive wages while learning, then are placed in industry in the area.

Crisp reported that they have had excellent cooperation with local firms and have been able to place all of the trainees with the exception of one or two. Crisp said that contrary to the popular notion that there are no local jobs available, there are openings not filled because of lack of trained workers, especially in the field of heavy equipment operators.

Crisp is hoping to secure approval to purchase larger equipment which will be used to train jobless men in Meigs County and to secure employment for them in the area.

The program is also conducting Remedial Education and Counseling classes in such subjects as math and English, budgeting, consumer credit, first aid, planned parenthood, Christmas shopping, geography and film, and local government.

The Meigs County Ministerial Association members have volunteered their time and assistance in counseling, and the remedial educational classes being conducted for the job enrollees and their families. The trainees are counseled on the importance of being at work daily and on time.

Crisp has received letters from firms that have employed some of the trainees expressing concern with the program.

One of the companies, the F. A. Bartlett Tree Expert Co., in a recent reply to Crisp stated appreciation for the help received from the conservancy program in seeking men for jobs.

The letter from L. W. Rimmons, public utility manager of the company stated: "In the past I have been critical of government programs to assist the poor people. My thinking has been that they were directed more at temporary make work projects, rather than aimed at solving the problem.

"I have observed that your program has at least two long lasting results: cleaning off the creek banks has produced very evident results in reducing flooding in the area. In the process, the men are learning to use the equipment necessary to make a living, utilizing the natural resources of the area.

"Four times in the last six months I have taken men from your project to use as foremen. If these men had not had experience with your project they would not have been able to be leaders."

This same company also pointed out that they could use trained power saw operators from time to time in right-of-way clearing jobs. They also indicate an interest in trained men who could climb and trim trees, saying that they would be willing to send a man to train those men under 30 willing to permanently relocate and at the present time could use as many as 25 trained men throughout the eastern United States.

The trainee program also includes a physical examination and those found to have medical problems will be referred to appropriate health service agencies for treatment needed and follow up, including the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Projects of Mainstream seek to reclaim areas seriously damaged due to siltation and sulphuric acid run-off. This would be accomplished by four projects; by building small, but efficient silt retention dams; proper use of lime to sweeten the sulfuric acid deposits; removal of trees and brush from the streams to speed up the run-off of water during a heavy rain, allowing the silt and acid to be flushed out and diluted until no longer damaging, and to plant trees on barren strip mine areas, which will result in building the soil and holding moisture.

It appears that the Conservancy District has a proven record of success in the area of Job Development and Job Placement.

This is the only such program being carried out in the county other than the vocational program at the Meigs High School and the Distributive Job Training courses being offered at the school.

These are the types of programs where Meigs County can work to help itself become self-supporting. This points up the need for a survey of available labor and the type of skill and those desiring to use their skills in industry. There should perhaps be a central reporting agency to collect this information and place it where the public may give such information as well as receive it.

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the respected editor in chief of the Christian Science Monitor, Erwin D. Canham, served as a member of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. In a column appearing in the September 26-28, 1970, issue of the Monitor, Mr. Canham comments on the Commission's work and its impact on him. I found Mr. Canham's comments to be thoughtful and compassionate. I include the text of the column at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING

(By Erwin D. Canham)

WASHINGTON.—Service on President Nixon's Commission on Campus Unrest has come close to being the most stirring extra-curricular episode in my professional life. And that includes membership on President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals in 1960.

The need for bridging the gap of understanding between the conventional culture and the "new" culture, largely shared by young people, is very serious indeed. It exists all over the world, but especially in an advanced industrial society like the United States.

VIOLENCE CONDEMNED

The contents of the Scranton commission's report are being very fully covered in news columns, on radio and television. What I should like to emphasize here is how a group of nine very different people, with no partisan political overtones whatever, came to grow together into a very closely agreed perception of the problem.

We nine have all sorts of difference in life experience, in race, in age, in style. But after we had looked at the facts, we had very little difficulty in agreeing, even in language.

No one of us would have written our report in the exact terms in which it appears. But on the thrust and general thinking we were deeply in accord.

We are all fully in accord in condemning violence and lawbreaking. We are aware of the shortcomings of university administrations, and point them out. We recognize the operation of deliberate troublemakers, although we identify their limited scope. We describe many of the follies and oversimplifications of some protesters. But what is most important is our profound sense of the challenge and significance of the new culture.

The crisis, in our view, is one of violence on both sides—which must be condemned and prevented—and of understanding—which must be awakened.

We urge President Nixon to draw the nation closer together, rather than drive it farther apart. We feel this must be his own instinct, even if the immediate political advantage may seem to be to take a hard line. But a sharp distinction must be drawn between a hard line manifest as effective and wise law enforcement and a hard line which condemns, angers or even kills students.

VOTES AT WHAT COST?

The law must be enforced. But an anti-intellectual wave is easy to arouse in the United States today. It might gain votes in 1970. It would desperately harm the country in the long run.

At any rate, readers can ponder our report and recommendations for themselves, and reach their own conclusions. Ours came from our on-the-spot investigations and from direct exposure to many people, young and old. We also discussed and formulated our views for many long hours, pooling our observations and convictions.

We hope our report will not be made a political football, for petty advantage. We regret the political attacks which preceded its issuance, based on misinformation and misjudgment.

ENFORCEMENT NEEDED

We do not think we overestimate the gravity of the crisis. We are aware of some very explosive situations on many campuses today. We recommend the most vigorous law enforcement to cope with them. These immediate sparks must be put out. But such sparks exist in the minds of a vast mass of tinder. It is the tinder that concerns us most, the misunderstanding between groups in American society, the divisions in a nation which is proudly diverse but should never be riven by chasms of misunderstanding and of hate.

Speaking for myself, I learned a great deal in these last few months. I learned more vividly than before why blacks feel themselves increasingly the victims of repressive—they say genocidal—policies even though their material conditions are improving in some ways.

Relatively, and in profound spiritual ways, their status has not improved that much. I learned why many young people also feel themselves repressed and alienated, even though objectively society is growing freer. I learned how their deepest goals express the unfulfilled American dream.

I learned that the American nation must move toward deeper mutual respect, away from violence, toward understanding.

THE PROBLEM OF SMUT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most aggravating problems of concern to society is the continued and increasing flow of smut into our Nation's homes.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been tussling with this matter for years, certainly throughout my membership on the committee. The problem is not an easy one to find legal controls that will stand the test of our courts.

But our committee has been successful in several important instances and has approved additional legislation which is awaiting Senate consideration.

The subject of obscenity and pornography is particularly in the limelight today on the eve of the issuance of the report of the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography.

In a special order in the House today I have included the text of the minority report which, regrettably, is the only redeeming feature of the Commission's work. The Commission majority chose to ignore the congressional mandate, went off on a tangent and came up with a fiasco.

Instead of recommending ways to control smut, the majority wants our Nation to follow in the footsteps of Denmark and abolish all related laws.

Who can honestly believe that smut will go away because you repeal all the restrictive laws? Will burglaries cease because you make them no longer a crime? Will auto thefts stop because you make them no longer a crime?

Of course not.

One of the great—though reluctant—conveyors of smut is the U.S. mail. This is despite the vigilant efforts of the Post Office Department. It is also despite the efforts of our committee and the Congress to provide the Department with the needed tools to control the flow.

I was delighted to notice the Postmaster General's concern with this subject when he made it the single theme of a speech last night in Nashville, Tenn. His remarks speak for themselves and since they are so timely I am including them with mine:

REMARKS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT, NASHVILLE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NASHVILLE, TENN., SEPT. 28, 1970

This is a time of paradox in the United States. It is a time of great opportunity, and a time of grave concern.

We have within our grasp a future of peace and prosperity with justice and freedom for all. But all about us we see the limits of our freedoms being tested.

We see militants of the left and right claiming absolute freedom where framers of our constitution intended relative freedom.

And today you can work your way through the Bill of Rights and at almost any point find those rights abused.

How we respond to these abuses will have a lot to do with the kind of country we pass on to our children.

How we respond to these abuses will help determine whether they shall inherit a nation that is strong, free and at peace with itself, or a nation crippled by its own moral ambiguity and characterized by a greater concern for its appetites than for its integrity.

PROBLEM OF PORNOGRAPHY

One of the most time-consuming and certainly the most unpleasant part of my job involves dealing with one of those abuses—the problem of pornography.

The sea of obscenity that floods America from within the nation and from without is

a truly disturbing example of an open society under attack.

Most disturbing of all is that fact that this attack is predicated on our First Amendment freedoms.

The First Amendment to the Constitution, as you know, is one of the keystones of America's structure of ordered liberty. The amendment says, in part, that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press . . ."

Under the cover of this amendment, the dirt merchants have erected a multi-million dollar empire dedicated to human degradation.

We are now testing whether that empire will stand or if it will be destroyed.

The post office is a primary force in the struggle to see it destroyed.

USE OF MAILS FORBIDDEN

The law forbids the use of the mails for conveying obscene materials. The mere existence of the law, however, has not prevented pornographers from making extensive use of the mails for this purpose.

The number of dealers in mail-order pornography has increased in recent years to something over four hundred; of that number, however, only about twenty at any one time are considered major dealers. These are big-league operators, who use direct-mail advertising on a scale comparable to the nation's large mail-order houses.

These mailers commonly send two and three million advertising pieces into American homes during an advertising campaign, frequently with little or no discrimination as to the recipient.

As a consequence, our children are often subjected to pictures and printed matter of the most vile sort.

As a parent and a grandparent, I find that unacceptable, and I find particularly unacceptable the use of the postal system for this purpose.

But there is another dimension to the matter. In any discussion of the problem of pornography, the effect of pornography on the young always seems to emerge as the central issue. Certainly it is of critical concern.

WHAT ABOUT EFFECT ON OTHERS?

But, personally, I am deeply concerned about the effect of pornography on any human being, and on the civilization of which each human being is a member.

If we consider for a moment those values which underlie our American institutions, we find that what America is all about can be summed up in two words: human dignity.

We seek freedom for our people because freedom is the condition most conducive to human dignity. We seek security for the same reason.

We seek prosperity, because prosperity is the condition most conducive to human dignity; because poverty crushes the human spirit.

At our best we honor diversity—because the right to be what he chooses, to act and live as he chooses are all vital to the dignity of the human being.

MEANING OF HUMAN DIGNITY

But who do we mean by "human dignity?" What is it that gives these two words so much importance to us here in America?

Let me tell you in this manner: In the story of Creation, the Bible says: "And Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

As a people we believe that each man has a spark of divinity within him; we accept the sanctity of the human spirit and of the human body. And as we preserve and sustain these, we preserve and sustain human dignity.

As we violate these for sensation or for profit, we act against the dignity of man, and

we act against all that we have suffered and struggled to build for more than two centuries on this continent.

Pornography is not simply a threat to the best interests of our children.

It is an act of violence against the human spirit.

LEGALIZATION EFFORTS

With disturbing frequency, however, it is being argued that pornography ought to be legalized.

What are the arguments of those who favor such a course?

One of the most important—the one we pay perhaps the greatest attention to—is the argument that censorship of pornography violates the First Amendment's prohibition against interference with freedom of speech and of the press.

If this prohibition were absolute, the argument would be sound.

But it is not absolute.

It was Justice Holmes who pointed out that the first amendment would not protect a man who falsely shouted fire in a crowded theater, for such an act created the sort of clear and present danger that Congress has the right to prevent. In a different way, but to the same effect, we have laws against libel which make freedom of the press relative.

ABOUT THE ARGUMENTS

The argument that pornography cannot be censored without destroying our civil liberties is, it seems to me, fundamentally wrong.

There is the argument that we cannot be sure pornography has an effect on children.

If we are to take this seriously, then we must ask if any book—if any picture—has an effect on children; indeed, such a position questions the effect of education itself, for education asks that a child respond to what he is exposed to.

And how shall a child respond to a photograph of, for example, a human being, without clothing, bound helplessly, and being beaten with whips to the apparent gratification of all involved.

This example, if you will believe me, is relatively innocuous in comparison to much of the smut that is pushed on people in this country. I am far from being a prude, and I don't want to be hypocritical about that. But I have seen things in this job that would make the most sophisticated people sick to their stomachs.

EFFECT ON CHILDREN

And yet we're told we can't be sure this has any effect on children. Who's going to swallow that? Who's going to risk swallowing that?

Childhood is a constant testing of what is fantasy and what is reality; it is a time when values are established.

Are we willing to accept, in the service of some dubious argument about the limits of civil liberty, the argument that we cannot be sure pornography has an effect on children, and the logical extension of that argument, that it therefore ought not to be prohibited?

There is the position that if we legalize pornography, it will soon lose its interest for people, and eventually the traffic will end.

Well, one of the members of the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography is the Rev. Winfrey Link from over in Hermitage, and Rev. Link's comment about pornography being eliminated through availability was this:

He said, "I don't run an open sewer through my yard and think that after a month the germs won't bother me any more."

I think that's pretty much to the point.

RIGHTS OF ADULTS

And then, of course, we have the argument that there is no evidence that pornography has an adverse effect on adults, and even if it could be shown to have such an effect, adults have a right to abuse themselves in this manner if they choose.

Let's examine that argument.

I think it is false on both counts.

While it is difficult to establish a cause and effect relationship between an anti-social act and an avid interest in pornography, it is possible to suggest that an inclination toward anti-social behavior may be reinforced and even encouraged by pornography.

Cases in the files of the Post Office Department provide sufficient instances of people acting out in fact the fantasies of the pornography they have collected, of people engaging children in unnatural acts, or seducing children into this behavior, to justify a concern that there is some relationship between pornography and anti-social behavior.

CASES IN POST OFFICE FILES

There is a significant risk, I believe, that some people may be led by curiosity to purchase this material, then to purchase material showing even more bizarre behavior, until finally they are led to commit the same behavior.

Now, is it true that these people have the right to subject themselves to these ill effects if they choose?

I don't think so.

Such a position supposes that these effects are kept within the individual. This is not the case.

The evidence suggests that people can become addicted to pornography just as others become addicted to alcohol or drugs. And just as the alcoholic and the junkie are capable of anti-social behavior beyond their own will, so is the person hooked on pornography.

Some have seriously argued that pornography may have a beneficial effect. This is the theory of catharsis, and it maintains that pornography provides a harmless outlet for sexual energy which might otherwise be expended in some objectionable manner.

PORNOGRAPHY AS THERAPY?

The logic of this position would require that sex crimes should go down as the availability of pornography goes up. All the evidence available indicates that this doesn't happen.

I find that reassuring. I am not a psychologist. Neither am I indifferent to the fact that there are a lot of lonely people in this society.

But is the human condition so mean, and the resources of our culture so limited that the only therapy we can provide for repressed and lonely people is pornography?

As I am sure most of you know, Denmark has lifted certain restrictions on pornography. This has had a dual effect on the United States. It has on one hand substantially increased the flow of pornographic material coming into the country.

And it has, at the same time, increased the pressure from proponents of the legalization of pornography in America. Those who argue for legalization make the case that the legalization of pornography has produced a drop in the sex crime rate in Denmark.

Of course it has.

RESULTS IN DENMARK

Pornography used to be a crime there and now it isn't. Therefore the crime rate dropped. Statutory rape used to be a crime; now it isn't. So this contributed to the drop in the crime rate.

If they legalize burglary, it will drop some more. They'll have the same number of burglaries, but these won't be crimes anymore.

We have gone to Denmark and talked to the authorities there and the real sex crime rate has not dropped. Period.

But this is the sort of reasoning we see applied to the matter. It seems to me that we have a very great deal at stake here and I think we had better stop thinking with our glands and start using some sense about these problems.

If I read the President correctly, this Administration is not going to legalize pornography. Whether the courts will do it is a different question. We hope they won't. In the past decade, some of our courts have been persuaded that the virtual impossibility of defining pornography precisely is sufficient reason for granting absolute license.

FEW PRECISE DEFINITIONS

But there are few, if any, precise definitions in Western jurisprudence. What mathematical formula identifies a "fair preponderance" of the evidence in a civil suit? At what precisely defined point is guilt established beyond any "reasonable" doubt? And what is a reasonable doubt? What is an unreasonable doubt?

There is a problem here, certainly. We are giving fallible men the responsibility for making judgments that go to the heart of our democratic freedoms, and one man's smut may be another man's art.

But it is difficult to suppose that by weighing the content of a work and the apparent intent of the creator and the purveyor of that work that we cannot tell what is pornography and what is not. And where we cannot tell, then let the presumption be in favor of the contested work, and we will still be adequately protected.

I know that the First Amendment to the Constitution says, but I think we read our Constitution selectively. I recommend reading the whole thing right from the beginning which establishes the purpose of that Constitution.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT

It says, We the people of the United States . . . in order to promote the general welfare . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution . . . if there is anything conducive to the general welfare in a graphic representation of the most repulsive filth imaginable, I confess it escapes me. It apparently doesn't escape some of our courts, unfortunately.

I am not overly optimistic about our ability to deal conclusively with this problem. For one thing, even with courts firmly disposed to eliminate this problem, there is the sheer overwhelming fact that our court system is too overburdened to deal effectively with these matters.

This fact alone contributes to the proliferation of pornography.

And for another thing, pornography is a business. It's a very big business, and like some businesses it puts a premium on survival at any cost.

So we have to find a way to reduce the profits of that business and to make it impossible for them to operate at any price.

PORNOGRAPHY IS BIG BUSINESS

In the Post Office Department we have put a great deal of effort into this, and I think we are having some success.

We have more than four hundred dealers under investigation. In the fiscal year just ended we indicted sixty dealers and ten more dealers were indicted in the first two months of this current fiscal year.

So far, we have gotten some fourteen convictions.

On the sixteenth of this month, we won a major victory in this battle when the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in Los Angeles upheld the conviction of Marvin Miller. Mr. Miller is a major dealer in pornographic materials and enjoyed the distinction of being singled out for the attention of a national magazine recently.

In February, 1969, he was sentenced to five years imprisonment and a fine of \$7,500 for himself and \$15,000 for his company. The appeals court which upheld this conviction has reversed pornography convictions in the past. We hope and we believe that we are seeing a new attitude here on this matter.

In the last six months of 1969, we had approximately 178,000 complaints from postal patrons about receipt of pornographic material. In the first six months of 1970, these were down to roughly 105,000.

LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS

The President has put the full weight of his office into this battle. He has asked Congress to make it a Federal crime to put pornography into the hands of anyone eighteen years old or under; to make it a federal crime to exploit a prurient interest in sex through advertising; and to broaden the ability of the homeowner to prevent sexually-oriented advertising material from entering his home through the mail.

Now the Congress has begun to respond; it has passed legislation that will enable homeowners to protect themselves from unwanted sex-oriented advertising, and it is, we hope, to enact the remainder of the President's legislative requests in this area.

But as with everything, the deciding factor in this matter is going to be the American public.

If the people decide against pornography, we can do away with it.

If we endorse stringent laws;

If we elect and appoint discerning judges; and if, above all, we refuse to patronize the pornographer, then we can put him out of business.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT NEEDED

Movies show violence because it shows a profit. They show cheap sex because it shows a profit.

It is the same with all media.

If it isn't profitable, it doesn't play.

I'm not suggesting a witch-hunt. I'm sure there are a lot of heavy breathing crusaders waiting in the wings for the call to arise. I'm always a little suspicious of those people, and psychiatrists frequently find them interesting.

I think we can do this job without bringing the lunatics and the smear artists out of the woodwork. At bottom, the answer rests on a very simple foundation, and that is taste.

It is still considered sophisticated in some quarters to scoff at American culture, but for a young nation we have contributed greatly.

Whitman, Robinson, Masters, Sandburg, Frost, Marianne Moore, and T. S. Eliot are all American poets.

Clemens and Melville and Fitzgerald were American writers.

Whistler and Cassatt, Eakins and Pollock and Ben Shahn are American painters.

Copeland and Gershwin are American composers. Blues and jazz are American contributions to music. The greatest symphony orchestra in the world is an American orchestra.

We have virtually stamped out polio.

Our cancer research is among the most advanced in the world.

We have gone to the moon.

OUR MANY CONTRIBUTIONS

These are the things that reflect America. This is the heritage we must pass on. There is no room in America for the commercial degradation of the human spirit.

There is no room in America for those who use our freedoms to destroy the very habits of mind and spirit that give meaning to these freedoms.

It is true, as the poet said, that—

Not only under ground are the brains of men—Eaten by maggots.

Shall we then pay allegiance to those things we have in common with any animal?

Or shall we hold ourselves above the animals, where God placed us, and pay allegiance to that spark of divinity in each of us—the spark of divinity that this nation was founded to protect and to exalt?

Ladies and gentlemen, in the awful balance between human degradation and human dignity, let us put ourselves down on the side of dignity as our people have always done.

MR. HOOVER'S OPEN LETTER TO STUDENTS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover's recent open letter to college students is an excellent statement of concern at the highest of Federal investigative levels that the natural intent ideology of youth should not be subverted by advocates of violence from the new left. I am sure the Congress to a man is responsive to the just interests and concerns of young people. In the same sense, I am confident that our governmental system permits adequate expression of those concerns and the fruition of those that are meaningfully constructive in improving the quality and conditions of life in America for all citizens to benefit from.

The door to the offices of Congress is open to the youth of America at all times. Speaking for myself as one Member, I can only say that I value and respect the recommendations of both individual young persons and groups, and will work to see that those which have socially constructive values are implemented—to the extent this is possible in the legislative branch.

I hope all young people will take the time to read and ponder Mr. Hoover's message because it is their world and future that the extremist minority that advocates violence and campus chaos seeks to destroy.

The open letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO COLLEGE STUDENTS
FROM JOHN EDGAR HOOVER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., September 21, 1970.

As a 1970 college student, you belong to the best educated, most sophisticated, most poised generation in our history.

The vast majority of you, I am convinced, sincerely love America and want to make it a better country.

You do have ideas of your own—and that's good. You see things wrong in our society which we adults perhaps have minimized or overlooked. You are outspoken and frank and hate hypocrisy. That is good too.

There's nothing wrong with student dissent or student demands for changes in society or the display of student unhappiness over aspects of our national policy. Student opinion is a legitimate aspect of public opinion in our society.

But there is real ground for concern about the extremism which led to violence, lawlessness, and disrespect for the rights of others on many college campuses during the past year.

The extremists are a small minority of students and faculty members who have lost faith in America. They ridicule the flag, poke fun at American institutions, seek to destroy our society. They are not interested in genuine reform. They take advantage of the tensions, strife, and often legitimate frustrations of students to promote campus

chaos. They have no rational, intelligent plan of the future either for the university or the Nation.

The extremists are of wide variety: adherents of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) including the Weatherman; members of the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA), the Trotskyist youth group; the Communist Party's Young Workers Liberation League (YWLL). Or they may be associated with the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (SMC), a Trotskyist-dominated antiwar group.

Many are not associated with any national group. The key point is not so much the identification of extremists but learning to recognize and understand the mentality of extremism which believes in violence and destruction.

Based on our experience in the FBI, here are some of the ways in which extremists will try to lure you into their activities:

1. They'll encourage you to lose respect for your parents and the older generation. This will be one of their first attacks, trying to cut you off from home. You'll hear much about the "failures" and "hypocrisy" of your parents and their friends. The older generation has made mistakes but your parents and millions of other adults worked hard, built, sacrificed, and suffered to make America what it is today. It is their country too. You may disagree with them, but don't discredit their contributions.

2. They'll try to convert you to the idea that your college is "irrelevant" and a "tool of the Establishment." The attack against the college administration often is bitter, arrogant, and unreasonable. SDSers, for example, have sought to disrupt the colleges by demanding the right to select professors, determine the curriculum, and set grading standards.

3. They'll ask you to abandon your basic common sense. Campus extremism thrives on specious generalizations, wild accusations, and unverified allegations. Complex issues of state are wrapped in slogans and clichés. Dogmatic statements are issued as if they were the final truth. You should carefully examine the facts. Don't blindly follow courses of action suggested by extremists. Don't get involved in a cause just because it seems "fashionable" or the "thing to do." Rational discussion and rational analysis are needed more than ever before.

4. They'll try to envelop you in a mood of negativism, pessimism, and alienation toward yourself, your school, your Nation. This is one of the most insidious of New Left poisons. SDS and its allies judge America exclusively from its flaws. They see nothing good, positive, and constructive. This leads to a philosophy of bitterness, defeatism, and rancor. I would like you to know your country more intimately. I would want you to look for the deeper unifying forces in America, the moods of national character, determination, and sacrifice which are working to correct these flaws. The real strength of our Nation is the power of morality, decency, and conscience which rights the wrong, corrects error, and works for equal opportunity under the law.

5. They'll encourage you to disrespect the law and hate the law enforcement officers. Most college students have good friends who are police officers. You know that when extremists call the police "pigs" they are wrong. The officer protects your rights, lives, and property. He is your friend and he needs your support.

6. They'll tell you that any action is honorable and right if it's "sincere" or "idealistic" in motivation. Here is one of the most seductive of New Left appeals—that if an arsonist's or anarchist's heart is in the right place, if he feels he is doing something for "humanity" or a "higher cause," then his act, even if illegal, is justifiable. Remember that acts have consequences. The alleged sincerity

of the perpetrator does not absolve him from responsibility. His acts may effect the rights, lives, and property of others. Just being a student or being on campus does not automatically confer immunity or grant license to violate the law. Just because you don't like a law doesn't mean you can violate it with impunity.

7. They'll ask you to believe that you, as a student and citizen, are powerless by democratic means to effect change in our society. Remember the books on American history you have read. They tell the story of the creative self-renewal of this Nation through change. Public opinion time after time has brought new policies, goals, and methods. The individual is not helpless or caught in "bureaucracy" as these extremists claim.

8. They'll encourage you to hurl bricks and stones instead of logical argument at those who disagree with your views. I remember an old saying: "He who strikes the first blow has run out of ideas." Violence is as ancient as the cave man; as up-to-date as the Weatherman. Death and injury, fear, distrust, animosity, polarization, counter-violence—these arise from violence. The very use of violence shows the paucity of rational thought in the SDS, its inability to come up with any intelligent critique of our society.

Personally, I don't think the outlook for campus unrest this year is as bleak as some prophets of pessimism proclaim. The situation at some colleges is serious, but certainly not hopeless.

Along with millions of other adults, I'm betting on the vast majority of students who remain fair-minded, tolerant, inquisitive, but also firm about certain basic principles of human dignity, respect for the rights of others, and a willingness to learn. I am confident our faith has not been misplaced.

THE BEST ADVICE I EVER RECEIVED

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a column entitled "The Best Advice I Ever Received," Maj. Gen. Joseph G. May, adjutant general of Iowa wrote the following.

This is an excellent, reflective dissertation from which all could benefit. I encourage all my colleagues to read it:

THE BEST ADVICE I EVER RECEIVED

When I was appointed a second lieutenant, I received the following advice from my first battalion commander (Col. Charles Radosevich, deceased), which I have used as a guiding principle during my military career:

"As a leader of men you will never be more than their evaluation of you, and it is that evaluation that will be your real efficiency report. The individual soldier has a very sensible view toward leadership. From most of them you can expect courage to match your courage, guts to match your guts, endurance to match your endurance, motivation to match your motivation, esprit to match your esprit and a desire for achievement to match your desire for achievement.

"You can expect a love of God, country and duty to match your love of God, country and duty. They won't mind the heat if you sweat with them. They won't mind the cold if you shiver with them.

"From time to time you'll receive orders appointing you to a command, but remember this . . . There are no orders, no letters,

no insignia of rank that can appoint you a leader . . . Leadership is an intangible thing. Leaders are made . . . they are not born . . . and leadership must be developed within yourself.

"You can't wear leadership on your sleeve, shoulder, cap or calling card . . . be you a lieutenant now . . . or a higher rank in years to come. You've got to convince the men in the ranks of this fact . . . and they'll meet you more than halfway.

"You don't accept troops . . . They were there long before you got there . . . They accept you . . . and when they do you'll know.

"It won't be with a beating of drums or the waving of flags . . . nor can you expect to be carried off the drill field on their shoulders. But maybe it will be something as subtle as someone raising a canteen cup of beer at a company party and saying, 'Lieutenant, you're O.K.' . . . Just that . . . and nothing more. Then you'll know you've passed the test."

SPEECH OF HON. DURWARD G. HALL

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 21, 1970, U.S. Representative DURWARD G. HALL spoke to the members of KEMPAC, Louisville, Ky. His remarks were appropriate; they covered the spectrum of medical needs of our country and also proposed developments in the medical field. I commend them for your perusal:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE DURWARD G. HALL

I thank you so much for your kind words of introduction, after hearing myself so eloquently eulogized, I feel that the only decent thing left for me to do is to expire.

Seriously, it goes without saying that I am more than pleased to be with you this evening. Your State of Kentucky has contributed so much to the history of this Republic, that I always look forward to my visits.

Kentucky gave us Churchill Downs and the run for the roses. Kentucky gave us the baron of basketball, Adolph Rupp. Kentucky gave us great statesmen like Abe Lincoln, Henry Clay, and Jefferson Davis.

It was Kentucky's Alben Barkley who teamed with Missouri's Harry Truman to pull off the political upset of the century.

And, of course, I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to another great Kentuckian, a man who coined a phrase that ranks with "I've just begun to fight", and "don't give up the ship." I refer to those immortal words that ring throughout the land, "It's finger lickin' good", by Colonel Sanders. Bourbon, my ancestors and AMA friends—Ingram and Long—Joe Sandford and Tim Lee Carter.

All joking aside, I would like to spend the remainder of my time discussing what I deem to be the proper role (if any), for the Federal Government in the area of health insurance.

There is little doubt that the concept of national health insurance is being built into a major issue for the 1972 presidential and congressional elections. More than 300 bills suggesting changes in medicare and medicaid have already been tossed in the hopper during this session of the Congress.

As of now, the health care "sweepstakes," counts at least six major entries in the field, with more in various stages of development.

There is the AMA "medicredit" bill, the UAW-Kennedy proposal, one by Governor Rockefeller, another by Senator Javits, Congresswoman Griffiths has another, and the

list goes on. Even I am going to offer an idea or two that could possibly end up as a compromise version of all.

To date, of all the plans that I have had an opportunity to review, the AMA's "medicredit" appears to be the most preferable, mainly because it neither disturbs the medical care system, but properly improves it, nor does it displace the in-being insurance industry with a federally operated program.

The AMA's proposal is designed to encourage all people to be protected against illness through health insurance policies. They would hope to achieve this end by a system of tax credits.

The AMA has suggested that all families having an income tax liability of \$300 per year or less, be given a certificate that could be used to pay health insurance premiums. This certificate would buy a policy from the private carriers, with certain specifications on what the policy would have to provide. Those families with larger income tax liability would have available an income tax credit. The resulting benefit would be 100 percent of the health insurance premium when the income tax liability is \$300 or less. The benefit-ratio would then grade downward for persons with higher income tax liability.

The acceptable minimum health insurance policy for those with income tax liability of more than \$300 would be similar except that a system of cost-sharing would be permitted.

The cost of the AMA's plan has been estimated to run something like \$10.2 billion per year, to the Federal Government. If this plan were to be adopted, the elimination of medicaid would result in a savings of \$2.6 billion, giving a net cost of about \$7.6 billion. There are those who say that the figure is too low, and that the cost would probably run considerably higher. I might add that, historically, the House has not dealt favorably with "tax credit" plans.

Incidentally, the AMA plan would incorporate a proposal for peer review, by the State medical societies.

Most of the national publicity in the health field of late has been focused on the so-called "committee of 100" proposal. This plan, introduced in the Senate by Teddy Kennedy, is the brainchild of the late Walter Reuther, and is the most sweeping, and expensive of all. I might add that in my opinion it is also the worst.

This plan, national in scope, would apply to all residents of the United States. The benefits provided would be most comprehensive, and would have few limitations, and cost sharing provisions. The benefit structure would be so devised as to strongly favor comprehensive group practice prepayment plans, and to discriminate against individual practitioners.

Among the services to be provided without cost sharing would be:

Hospital, nursing home (except for a 120 day maximum per illness), physicians' services, drugs, dental up to 15 years of age, even eyeglasses and ambulances. The list is almost without end.

The various providers would be reimbursed in a manner that would strongly control costs; in essence, by a "strait jacket" method. The total funds available, after first using 2 percent to 5 percent for developing group practice prepayment plans (GPPP's) would be apportioned on an "appropriate" basis to the ten regions of the Nation. The money available in each region would then be apportioned to the various institutional providers of services on a "cost" basis based on advance budgeting. Whatever money would be left over, would be divided up among those physicians not in the GPPP's, or agreeing to provide services on a capitation basis in proportion to their charges.

The Kennedy-UAW Committee for National Health Insurance, now chaired by Leonard Woodcock, the new president of the United Auto Workers, would be financed from three sources, 35 percent by employer

payroll taxes (on total payroll, without a maximum taxable earnings base): 25 percent by contribution of individuals, at a uniform rate on the first \$15,000 of earnings and other income; and 40 percent from general revenues, that's you—the taxpayer! In other words, the Federal Government subsidy would be equal to two-thirds of the combined employer and individual taxes. Total cost of this package has been conservatively estimated to be a "whopping" \$40 billion annually to the Federal Government, and that figure may be way too low.

Now, I have offered another plan, that would, I think, do the job that has to be done correctly as need be, while at the same time holding down the cost.

As one of the three physicians in the House of Representatives, I have long been concerned with the health of the American people, and legislation proposed to the Congress to deal with it. Recently, I have felt it incumbent on me to offer legislation based on my personal knowledge of the field of medicine, and that legislative expertise (if I may use the sophisticated term), that I have gained from ten years in the Congress.

I now have on my desk a bill which I will soon offer that is designed to serve a two fold purpose. It will provide for those who are unable to provide for themselves, and will also assist those who are able to meet their health care responsibilities; yet run the risk of being "wiped out" should an extensive catastrophic illness or injury occur.

First, let's examine part I, which is directed toward the "medicaid" type recipient. This part will in fact do away with the medicaid program should it be enacted.

Research has shown that the average cost, per individual, paid out by medicaid, is in the neighborhood of \$400 per person, per year. Let me stress that this is the national average, the figure is arrived at by simply dividing the total number of people receiving public assistance (about 1 million), and dividing by the amount of money paid out, which is about \$4.5 billion. Of that \$4.5 billion (60 percent), was the Federal share, with the remainder paid by the states.

For these individuals, my bill specifies that the Federal Government will purchase for them an insurance policy, from the regular, established, private, insurance companies. This would mean of course, that the Government would keep up the premiums.

In order to preserve the Federal-State relationship, the States would participate in the program, whenever the recipient used up the benefits provided in his federally furnished policy. This would mean that the States would assume the financially devastating, but rare expenses of the catastrophic cases (injury as well as disease), based on the \$400 national average figure, the States share would be roughly 15 percent.

Figuring prominently in such a plan would be the eligibility requirements. They would, quite naturally, be based on the economics, definition, and cost-of-living figures, of the area in which they lived. Where living is high such as New York, the eligibility requirement might be as high as \$4,500 for a family of four. Where the living is a bit easier, it could be as low as \$2,600. In all probability, an average national amount of about \$3,500 would emerge. (That will get you on the federally established poverty roles anyway.)

I feel that the States would be more than willing to go along with a proposal such as this for three reasons:

1. It would cost them considerably less in "pay out" than they are spending. Now days most all State governments are singing the economic "blues."

2. They could plan, budget, and appropriate for it much easier. They would have a pretty accurate and dependable basis on which to calculate and work.

3. The States would be acting in their tra-

ditional role of assuming long term care such as tuberculosis, mental illness, etc.

Although the Federal share would be increased by about \$1 billion annually, the Federal Government should be agreeable to such a plan because sudden fluctuations and vagaries would be eliminated. It would improve planning and budgeting, if nothing else. It would avoid big State "steals"!

As far as national health coverage is concerned, part II of my bill involved itself in that area by offering assistance to those who are financially able to purchase their own health plan, but could find themselves in financial difficulty in the event of a catastrophic illness.

Research has shown that the average quality health insurance policy gives protection of up to about \$5,000. That assures the average beneficiary of good quality care. However, they can become vulnerable when those dollars are used up. The daily newspapers frequently point up examples of such occurrences. If these individuals are to be included, it will require a financial contribution on their part, albeit an insignificant amount. Remember, as you medical doctors know best, the catastrophic case is relatively rare, exceptionally costly to the family—even to the point of ruinous accidents, living vegetable cases, and chronic illness, but most publicized; yet percent least part of medical expense.

1. For those who contribute to social security, there would be an additional .4 percent placed on their taxable earnings. This amount paid by the individual worker, would total something like \$40 a year if he was in the \$10,000 bracket.

2. Those who are not in the social security framework would pay, on their income tax return, .4 percent of their taxable earnings.

3. All persons with gross non-earned income in excess of \$2,000 would pay on their income tax return, .4 percent of those earnings. There would be the proviso, that no one individual would pay more in total, than .4 percent times the maximum taxable earnings base under social security.

I have been given estimates that about \$2.5 billion could be collected annually under such a system.

This money would be placed in a "pool" from which the Social Security Administration would be able to reimburse 90 percent of the medical expenses per family, in excess of either \$5,000 annually or, if larger, 25 percent of the gross income.

For individuals 65 and over, because of their "medicare" protection, the benefit would be 90 percent of the medical expenses (per family) actually paid by the individual (or family) in excess of either \$1,000 annually or, if larger, 25 percent of the gross income. In other words, a Part I Medicare policy is now worth approximately \$4000 annual when used to maximum.

All government efforts to date have been directed at first medical dollar coverage, with the relatively large administrative costs involved in processing small claims, that eat away at the substance of the program. My aim, is to protect the public from disastrously high costs, and at the same time, give meaningful relief to those hardest hit by extensive medical expenses, while making the greatest possible use of the dollars available.

It appears that the time is fast approaching when drastic changes in the nation's health programs will be brought about by the Congress. The programs offered to date from the socialistic Kennedy-United Auto Workers Committee for National Health Insurance proposal costing \$40 billion annually, to the AMA's package tabbed at \$7.6 billion. Mine is still under all, estimated at about \$4.6 billion.

It is important that the initiative be taken by responsible people, lest we find ourselves "waiting at the church" while some "glib

talking, irresponsible, socialist-oriented, super salesman," foists off another unworkable ill-advised, and costly piece of legislation on the American people. It is my intention to do my utmost to keep such a travesty from occurring, and I suggest that you do the same.

In a little more than a month, a most important election will be held. Let me recommend that before you go to the polls, you look carefully into the qualifications of the individual whom you intend to support, and more importantly, where he stands on the issues of the day. This is elementary to casting any vote, but it must be said over and over. A.M.P.A.C. and K.E.M.P.A.C. gentlemen, as far as the health of the people of this republic is concerned, we must be able to make the best deal possible. For the nation, the States, the family, and the needy individual. We must do it prudently and unemotionally. I am speaking of quality health care for all people, not just those in absolute need. Certainly not for the greedy! The time for action is now. I hope we are up to the task.

PURPOSEFUL ACTIVISM

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, while a minority of our young people are out protesting, the majority of our young Americans are engaged in a motley assortment of worthwhile projects. These young people should be given credit for committing themselves to such admirable social service projects as: tutoring, recreational programs in nursing homes, work with mentally retarded, and sundry community action programs. These industrious young people should be recognized in this time of news-grappling radicals. I submit to the RECORD an article praising productive "student activism":

[From the Provo (Utah) Daily Herald, Sept. 18, 1970]

CONSTRUCTIVE STUDENT EFFORT

Students who participate in campus demonstrations are far outnumbered by those taking part in constructive activities aimed at improving conditions in the community around them.

A survey of the 101 universities holding membership in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges reveals that student involvement in social service projects will be at an all-time high this fall.

Activities have expanded to the extent that many campuses have set up centralized offices to match student volunteers with community needs.

Rutgers University, for example, has appointed a community development specialist who will take over the coordination of student volunteers this fall. North Carolina A&T University has set up a similar position.

Other universities with central offices for volunteer placement include Pennsylvania State University, the University of Kansas, the University of California at Irvine, Clemson University, Delaware State College and the University of Arizona.

In addition, new courses, many of which call for community service as part of their requirements, are also springing up.

Some examples of the "new activism":

At Michigan State University 10,000 students (one out of every four MSU students)

worked through its Volunteer Program Office last year.

At the University of Illinois, 800 students assisted 40 different community agencies in a variety of projects, including tutoring, recreation work and programs in nursing homes, mental health and retardation.

At the University of California in Santa Barbara, 3,000 students donated nearly 160,000 hours in community service.

At Michigan State University, students opened a 24-hour refuge center, "The Raft," where juvenile runaways could come for shelter or just to "rap"—talk—with someone who tried to understand them. A student agency at the University of Colorado has a "rapline" people can call when they need help.

At Montana State, architect students are helping Blackfeet Indians plan community buildings and University of Connecticut students are taking performing artists and exhibits into prisons to interest prisoners in vocational or avocational opportunities in the arts.

The list is a long one—at least 101 universities long. It's something to keep in mind to balance against the news telling of the latest campus riot.

"NATIONAL WOMEN IN EDUCATION DAY"

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution calling upon the President to designate the first day of November each year as "National Women in Education Day." In a time of vigorous public debate over issues of public importance, the great majority of our Nation's women are pursuing educational and community service goals which will better enable them to exercise their franchise and the leadership which they have gained through responsible use of their vote.

In an effort to encourage women to continue their educational pursuits, Aware International—Association for Women's Active Return to Education—has offered scholarships for both part-time and full-time study to women beyond the usual college age. This year, Aware International is celebrating its 50th year of distinguished service and activity.

In addition, its members are joining the celebration of other anniversaries of importance to women this year including the 50th anniversary of women's suffrage.

It is a privilege to contribute to this effort by commending to my colleagues the resolution calling for observance of "National Women in Education Day."

JOINT RESOLUTION

Authorizing the President to proclaim annually the day of November 1 as "National Women in Education Day."

Whereas, it is recognized that a complex, technological society such as the United States requires expanded knowledge, acquired both formally and through experience, by all its citizens;

Whereas, the genius and skill of our Nation's youth is dependent in great measure upon the wisdom and technical knowledge of

the Nation's women during the critical formative years;

Whereas, historically women have had less opportunity than men to participate to their own full educational potential;

Whereas, the women of this Nation have continually and persistently, at a cost of great personal sacrifice in many instances, expended energy, money, and time in acquiring advanced education from the Nation's great institutions of learning;

Whereas, further achievements by women will be encouraged by recognition of the contributions of the educated women of this Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first day of November as "National Women in Education Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SAN DIEGO BAY MODEL FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the September 25, 1970, issue of the New York Times carried an excellent article by Mr. E. W. Kenworthy on the effort to clean up San Diego Bay. Mr. Kenworthy's article makes it clear that our water pollution problems can be resolved if we but utilize the knowledge and technical means which are at hand.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I include it at this point in the Record:

SAN DIEGO CLEANS UP ONCE-DIRTY BAY AS MODEL FOR UNITED STATES

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

SAN DIEGO.—In this sea-washed city where the sun shines an average of 353 days a year and the mean high temperature of the coldest and warmest months varies by only 14 degrees, autumn comes imperceptibly.

The warm waters of San Diego Bay are blue and sparkling and clear. They are also clean—with a purity well above the anti-pollution standards set by the State of California.

As recently as the summer of 1963, however, the bay was not blue. It had a brownish-reddish cast, imparted by the proliferation and death of phytoplankton, the salt-water equivalent of the algae that is causing the eutrophication of so many fresh-water lakes.

The transformation from the 1963 condition was cited last month by the President's Council on Environmental Quality as one of the two outstanding examples in the nation of water quality recovery by a municipality. The other example, cited in the council's first annual report, was Seattle's cleanup of Lake Washington.

These two cities have demonstrated that waters receiving sewage can be cleaned up by a combination of aggressive and imaginative leadership by a few citizens and a willingness by the electorate to pay off the bonds. In Seattle the charge is \$2 a month per household; in San Diego it is \$1.50.

LITTLE FEDERAL HELP

Both cities undertook the job long before environmental decay became a national issue, and they finished it with almost no Federal subsidies. The Federal Government

contributed about \$8.5-million to Seattle's \$145-million program and about \$2.5-million to San Diego's \$60-million program.

San Diego Bay is a crescent-shaped basin 15 miles long and one-quarter to 3/4 miles wide, with a single outlet to the Pacific at Point Loma. It is the home port for one-fourth of the Navy's active ships and 100 tuna fishing vessels and is a port of call for about 700 commercial ships a year.

On weekends the bay is dotted with white sails and churned by the wake of power boats. The bayside beaches opposite the United States Naval Station, where aircraft carriers, cruisers and destroyers are berthed, are crowded with swimmers and water skiers. The sea-walls of harbor and shelter islands are lined with fishermen.

Posh motels have recently been constructed on harbor and shelter islands.

In 1963, though, the plankton "bloomed" wildly as a result of the nutrients—phosphates and nitrates—supplied by the sewage that was dumped into the bay from San Diego and its suburbs. The sewage discharge had risen from 37 million gallons a day in 1951 to over 60 million gallons a day. Most of the sewage received inadequate primary treatment (the settlement of solids) from a single, overloaded plant. The City of Coronado was dumping into the bay 2.5 million gallons of raw sewage a day, and the Naval Amphibious Base was dumping 200,000 gallons.

In addition, there were 3.7 million gallons a day of industrial discharges, mostly from tuna canneries and a kelp processing plant, plus an undetermined amount from naval and commercial ships.

PLANKTON DECOMPOSITION

The oxygen in the bay waters was consumed not only by these sewage and industrial wastes but also by the decomposition of plankton after death.

Water clarity—as measured by the distance from the surface that an eight-inch disk can be seen—was an average of six feet and was down to one foot in some areas.

Along one stretch of the waterfront in the central city, solids had formed a sludge mat on the bay floor 900 yards long, 200 yards wide and seven feet deep.

Most serious of all, from a public health viewpoint, was the density of coliform bacteria. In 1956, because of an alarming increase in the coliform density, San Diego, Coronado and the Naval Amphibious Base were ordered by the state's Regional Pollution Control Board at San Diego to chlorinate sewage discharges. While this emergency program reduced coliform intensity in some areas, it was not able to keep up with the city's increased discharge, and in some areas the count was 10 times the permissible level. Several beaches were quarantined.

The prelude to the San Diego success story was long, arduous and often disheartening. It began in 1949 when the State Legislature passed a water pollution control act, providing for nine regional pollution control boards to be appointed by the Governor.

The San Diego regional board was set up in 1950, and two men immediately stood out as leaders. They were Dr. J. B. Askew, the county health officer, who served for 19 years, 13 as chairman; and the late Harold E. Miller, a sanitary engineer who was the board's first executive officer and who later became executive officer of Seattle's metro sewerage system.

In 1952, the board employed the State Departments of Health and Fish and Game to make environmental studies of the bay. They revealed dangerous bacteriological concentrations, oxygen depletion and sludge deposits.

The same year a team of three engineers hired by San Diego County at the instigation of the regional board prepared a study of sewage disposal needs.

The engineers, Mr. Miller and the regional

board all agreed that the problem could only be dealt with on an area basis; that interceptors should be built around the bay leading to a primary treatment plant on the ocean side of Point Loma, and that the treated effluent should be dumped far offshore in deep water through diffusers—openings in the pipe that would scatter the discharge.

In 1953 the city and county accepted the engineers' recommendations. The city decided that it should finance, construct, operate and own the core facility and negotiate contracts with surrounding incorporated suburbs and sanitary districts for tie-ins to the system.

NEW SITE IS SOUGHT

In 1954 the city went to the voters with a \$16.5-million bond issue. There was no significant political or industrial opposition to the project because it was obvious the bay was so grossly and dangerously polluted that, as Dr. Askew said in a recent interview, the system either had to be enlarged or a whole new system had to be built.

Nevertheless the bond issue was defeated. Dr. Askew attributed this to three things—first, many people thought the planned plant on Point Loma was too close to a residential area; second, there was considerable opposition to the plan for paying off the bonds through an ad valorem property tax rather than by a standard monthly charge for each household, and finally, the inclusion on the ballot of a referendum on fluoridation of drinking water helped to defeat the sewerage bond issue.

As a result, the city spent \$100,000 a year over the next five years for oceanographic and biological studies with the hope of finding an alternative site. Another engineering concern was engaged in 1958 to prepare a new plan.

By this time, the situation in the bay had become so bad that, despite emergency chlorination programs, the beaches had to be put under quarantine and the Navy issued warnings to all personnel about bodily contact with bay water.

The new engineering report moved the plant almost to the end of Point Loma. Where the old plan would have run the outfall only 7,500 feet into the ocean at a depth of 125 feet, the new plan called for discharge 11,450 feet—over two miles—from shore at a depth of 200 feet through two Y-shaped diffuser legs, each 1,368 feet long.

In 1960, the voters overwhelmingly approved a \$42.5-million bond issue. Construction began in 1961 and the system began operating Aug. 15, 1965. The system now serves seven cities and six sanitary districts and all the naval shore installations.

The final cost of the core system was \$51-million, and, with ancillary projects, the total cost was \$60-million. The metro now serves a population of about one million; it is designed to serve 2.5 million.

The results of the project were prompt, according to Dennis A. O'Leary, executive officer of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

FROM BROWN TO BLUE

"Almost immediately," he said in a recent interview, "remarkable change occurred. We had expected slow improvement, but the bay quickly began to clear as if there had been a few, great tidal flushings. Where the bay had been brown and red, it became blue and sparkling."

The phytoplankton disappeared at the outset. As early as April, 1964—eight months after the system began operating—sculpin, sole, sand bass, steelhead trout, silver salmon, bonefish, black sea bass, barracuda, bonito, yellowtail, octopus, shark, seal and porpoise "were swarming back into the bay," according to a 1965 report by the United States Public Health Service.

Dissolved oxygen is now at safe levels, water clarity ranges from 10 to 30 feet and the

sludge beds have been cut in half. Most important, coliform density has decreased so that the beaches are now safe for swimming, although it remains high near naval piers where ships continue to dump raw sewage.

The discharge of sewage, galley and laundry wastes from naval ships and of toxic industrial wastes from the North Island Naval Air Base is the biggest remaining problem in the cleanup of the bay.

The Navy in 1968 announced a five-year, \$253-million plan to eliminate raw discharge from vessels. Congress, which must appropriate the funds said in this year's Water Quality Improvement Act that all boats—naval, commercial and pleasure—must be fitted with waste disposal devices.

Outside the Navy, the most troublesome industrial wastes come from Kelco, a kelp-processing plant, and from tuna-packing plants. But a tie-in with the metro system is expected to be completed within a year.

A year ago an official from the Federal Bureau of the Budget asked Dr. Askew, "What institutional mechanisms did you employ to get this cleanup of San Diego Bay?"

Dr. Askew smiled and said: "We said to the people of San Diego, 'you regard yourself as a high-quality community, then let's have a high-quality response to your problem.'"

A STERN DRUG BILL

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the response to the passage of the new drug bill has met with an extremely favorable public reaction.

People are increasingly dismayed about the growth and depth of the drug problem and the evidence that the Congress is deeply concerned about this matter and seeks to provide legal means of coping with it has been received with general approval.

An excellent analysis of the bill appeared in the Waterbury, Conn., Republican on September 29 and this editorial describes the bill so clearly and conveys its message so completely that I am happy to reproduce it here for the benefit of my colleagues.

Let us hope that with the passage of this bill we have constructed a foundation upon which we can build a competent system for controlling the traffic and illegal use of drugs. The article follows:

HOUSE VOTES STERN DRUG BILL

Responding to the menacing drug crisis in the nation, the House has passed a bill by a 341 to 6 vote designed to impose stiffer penalties on narcotics traffic but with reduced penalties for users. The legislation, which is similar to that passed by the Senate last January, should provide additional impetus for controlling drug abuse while relaxing punitive sentences for the unfortunate user.

The differences between the House and Senate will be reconciled by a joint conference committee. One important measure incorporated in the House bill is the much debated "no knock" provision. This gives federal agents with warrants permission to break into homes or offices if they believe those inside would destroy illicit drug supplies if notice were given.

The "no knock" provision has been proposed on the basis that it is a violation of privacy. The limitation placed on the provision by restricting the privilege only to federal narcotics agents who must first obtain a search warrant makes it unlikely that it will be misused or abused. A surprise entry and search is often the only way narcotics agents can obtain evidence of drug pushing.

The bill reduces possession of narcotics for one's own use from a felony to a misdemeanor, but stiffens punishment for those convicted of distributing drugs for profit. Pushers who can be connected with the Mafia or other syndicate drug peddling will draw extra-long sentences.

The House bill wisely differentiates between the unfortunate user and the profit-motivated pusher, who indiscriminately destroys lives through distribution of his pernicious wares. Stern application of the search and punitive powers incorporated in the bill should do much to curb the drug traffic which has reached epidemic proportions in this country.

AWARD-WINNING SHAKER HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL PRESENTATION OF EURIPIDES' "THE TROJAN WOMEN"

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, although the August recess provided an opportunity for Members to return to their congressional districts and work on local problems, it unfortunately prevented the House from having an opportunity to see the performance in Washington of Euripides' "The Trojan Women," staged in the Nation's Capital by the drama department of the Shaker Heights, Ohio, High School of my congressional district.

The Shaker Heights High School drama department, under the brilliant directorship of Mr. John C. Barner, presented the play—by invitation—to the National Convention of the American Educational Theatre Association which met at Gallaudet College on Sunday evening, August 23, at 8:30 p.m. It was my hope that if Congress had been in session, an additional performance could have been given in one of the caucus rooms of the House Office Buildings for Members and staffs as a demonstration of what creative drama work can be performed at the high school level by a high quality educational system.

I was privileged to be present for the Washington performance at Gallaudet College. It was an exciting and stimulating experience.

The 58 Shaker Heights High School students in the play spent much of the summer working at odd jobs on the East Side of Cleveland to raise the money to come to Washington to present the play. The students, together with a parents' advisory committee raised a total of some \$3,000 necessary to obtain the two buses, scenery truck, and cover room and board in Washington. In sum, the sending of the students to Washington was a total community effort—and an effort the community can well be proud of.

The excellence of the Shaker Heights

presentation is just another example of the work of this remarkable school district. Just 2 years ago, Lomond Elementary School in the Shaker Heights system was rated as one of the 10 best primary schools in the Nation. Several weeks ago, it was announced that the Shaker Heights High School had more National Merit Scholar winners than any other school in the State of Ohio and, with 36 winners, probably established an all-time record in Ohio.

I believe that the quality of the production and the work which went into it can best be seen by in the words of the students and faculty themselves.

Printed below is a fact sheet about the play, about the translator, Mr. Henry A. Strater, teacher of Greek and Latin at Shaker Heights High, and the director, Mr. Barner.

I wish to congratulate the entire Shaker Heights school system for its successful educational endeavors.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure that the fine tradition of the Shaker Heights system will continue and I would be more than happy to match the Shaker drama department from my congressional district against any other in the country.

FACT SHEET—THE TROJAN WOMEN—SHAKER HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL DRAMA DEPARTMENT

(About the play: From Thucydides' "History of the Peloponnesian War," as presented by Miss Agnes Knight, Classics Instructor, Shaker Heights High School.)

"The Trojan Women" was written at a time when the streets of Athens were filled with thousands of women and children to be sold in the slave markets.

The year before the Athenians had sent an embassy to the little island of Melos, a neutral area, demanding that it submit to Athenian control. They needed it for strategic purposes in their struggle against Sparta. The people of Melos did not wish to give up their liberty. The Athenians in the hands of the war party, crushed the little island, killed all the men, and brought back the women and children as slaves. Thucydides, the historian, regards this action as a crime of war, with no excuse for this inhumanity. Melos fell in 416 B.C. The following spring the fleet of the sackers of Melos was sent out against Syracuse in Sicily. "The Trojan Women" was presented in Athens at the same time. Two years later the whole Athenian fleet was destroyed.

Euripides does not mean Melos when he says Troy. The story is of the Trojan War. Strife, hatred and trouble are forecast in the speeches of Cassandra, and Poseidon promises destruction of the fleet of Menelaus, Ajax, and Odysseus.

Yet Euripides' heart was filled with compassion for the suffering women and children in the slave markets of Athens. Their crying and their pitiful small desires inspired "The Trojan Women." There is little desire for revenge in the play. It is a crying, a presentation of the suffering caused by war.

The Athenians, after the destruction of their own fleet, in the midst of their own anger and turmoil at home, looked upon Euripides with hatred. Had he cast an evil omen on them? They knew that his play represented their own times (all times?) as well as the Trojan War, and so they forced him into exile. Otherwise he would have met the fate of Socrates—the hemlock cup.

ABOUT THE TRANSLATOR

Mr. Henry A. Strater, the translator, is a teacher of Latin and Greek at Shaker Heights

High School. He is married and has two children, ages 1½ and 3. At his age of 35, he has a Master's Degree in Classical Language from John Carroll University and a similar degree in English from Case Western Reserve University, both in Cleveland. Beginning in September, 1970, he will be on a sabbatical leave from Shaker Heights High School to complete his Ph. D. in Classical Languages from Ohio State University.

QUOTE FROM "TRANSLATOR'S NOTE"

Several years ago Mr. John Barner suggested that I work out a fresh translation of Euripides' "Trojan Women." His arguments were both that I had some experience in acting and directing amateur theatricals and that I knew classical Greek. We agreed that any new translation had to fulfill two conditions: it had to be faithful to the spirit and ideas of the original, and it had to be playable and understandable.

As I worked on the translation, we decided on several things which may appear strange when this new translation is compared to others: assignment of lines to the chorus, use of a small men's chorus, modernisms, colloquialisms, the simplification of names, and the absence of many geographical allusions

Thus, our translation has accomplished its aims: it is as clear as possible for the audience to understand, yet it is true to the spirit, and for the most part, even to the letter of Euripides' original.

About the director:

The director of "The Trojan Women," John C. Barner, is the head of the drama department of Shaker Heights High School. He holds a Master of Fine Arts Degree in Drama from Carnegie-Mellon University and has taught at Shaker for nine years. In 1959 he was elected the first Director of the Secondary School Theatre Conference, a new division of the American Educational Theatre Association. Ten years later, 1969, he was given The Wally Peck Memorial Award by the Secondary School Theatre Conference for "outstanding service to Secondary School Theatre" at their convention in Detroit. He and his wife, Agnes, will be attending the AETA Convention at the Washington Hilton while his students present the play for that Convention.

THREE ARTICLES OF NATIONAL INTEREST BY DR. STEFAN T. POSSONY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22 carries a series of articles by Dr. Stefan T. Possony on various national issues of topical importance. As indicated at that time, Dr. Possony is presently the director of the international political studies program at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. During World War II, he served with the French Foreign and Air Ministries, and upon coming to the United States in 1941, he joined the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. Later he served with the Office of Naval Intelligence, was on the faculty of the National War College in Washington, D.C., and in 1955, he became an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Possony has testified over the

years before various congressional committees and has taught courses on communism, psychological warfare, geopolitics, political philosophy, and on strategy and revolution in the 20th century. The author of many books on historical and military subjects, he is in addition the strategy and military affairs editor of the American Security Council, a research and educational association dealing solely with issues affecting our Nation's security.

The following articles on the use of propaganda, aspects of military victory, and reflections on international law are both topical and informative which, of course, comes as no surprise when reflecting on Dr. Possony's extensive background and scholarship:

PROPAGANDISTS AND PROPAGANDA CARRIERS

We did a good job defending ourselves against nazi propaganda but during the current era Americans appear to be highly confused by such problems as propaganda detection and defense against propaganda. In academic curricula propaganda is no longer given the attention it received in previous years. Newspapers have de-emphasized factual news reporting and they report but rarely on communist propaganda campaigns against the United States.

Let us look at the structure of organized propaganda.

An organized propaganda effort is run by a small number of professionals operating like orchestra leaders. It is successful when large numbers of publicists freely take over parts or all of the propaganda messages and distribute them through the media and if, furthermore, the audiences accept those messages and communicate them to their friends.

"Organized music" needs composers, talent agents, orchestra administrators, conductors, soloists, orchestra instrumentalists, audiences, publicity agents, and media such as concert halls, radios and records. Organized propaganda is structured in a similar manner.

The originators and planners of the propaganda effort are performing like a general staff and they are directing regional and local staffs.

Communists propaganda operators have at their disposal their own media (e.g. the communist press and international broadcasting), and they have contacts in the media owned by non-communists. Some of those contacts are dedicated overt and covert communists, and others are sympathizers and non-communists that can be influenced on certain issues. The propaganda organization also has at its disposal communicators (e.g. writers) who have access to certain media and who may be overt or covert communists or sympathizers, or professionals for hire.

Communists propaganda directives may originate in party congresses and conferences, the central committee of the CPSU and of other parties, and the speeches and writings of prominent leaders within the International Communist Movement. Many directives are announced openly and the "general line" is usually announced by a CPSU Congress speaking for the International Communist Movement (or at least for its soviet controlled wing).

The operational meaning of those directives is understandable to those who master communist semantics. It is invariably misunderstood by those texts naively.

There also are secret directives which by different methods are transmitted through secret channels.

The formulators of communist propaganda in the field may invent their own themes and arguments, and they make full use of previous experiences. They are apt to continue and sharpen campaigns which proved

successful and to take over and adapt appeals which were used effectively by non-communists.

Communist propaganda has been extraordinarily steady and repetitive. It is designed to drive home a limited number of simple and seemingly plausible points and through those points change the "categories" or the framework of political thinking. The basic ideas have been driven home indefatigably for half a century.

However, the communists display great ingenuity in adapting their basic message to changing "concrete" conditions in their numerous target countries and groups. They accept contradictions and they insist on constant renewal of the "packaging" and the semantic refinement of their messages. They also are adept at the art of variation. Now campaigns are launched frequently to stimulate and keep audience attention. Faithful disciples of Lenin, the communists are excellent sloganizers.

Propaganda is always transformed into agitation, i.e. live and burning issues. And "agit-prop" serves to recruit and organize, whereupon the enlarged organization intensifies its psychological operation.

Originally communist propaganda was easily recognized because of its over-use of Marxist-Leninist terminology. Since 1935, however, when the Communist International decided to forgo the use of "sectarian language", the communists have been systematically using their so-called Aesopian language, especially in messages addressed to non-communists. This means they are expressing their points through terms which are known and accepted and which instead of causing resentment, evoke positive associations. Thus, outside the party, the communists rarely talk about "armed struggle", "revolutionary war", or "world revolution", let alone "dictatorship", but they stress terms like democracy and peace. They also concentrate on matters and events which are regarded as critical by large numbers of non-communists, such as peace which the communists interpret in their own fashion.

The result is that in many ways, communist propaganda tends to merge with the propaganda of non-communist groups. This happens especially whenever non-communist groups propose policies which the communists think could help them to achieve operational objectives. In many instances they "amplify" the themes pressed by non-communist politicians whose attitudes are to their liking.

The primary purpose of Aesopian language is "to glid the lily," just as a hospital is doing when it reports a half-dead patient is "resting comfortably" or is in a "fair condition".

A second purpose is to change the meaning of terms. Thus, according to communist doctrine peace is predicated upon a socialist order and cannot be attained before the final victory of communism. Aesopian language, in addition to creating the impression that the communists are "peace-loving" now, here, and everywhere, also issued to convey the idea that the lovers of peace, if they want to be consistent, better embrace the cause of communism: For unless communism rules, there cannot be peace; and unless communism is accepted voluntarily, war will be inevitable. Such war, of course, will not be due to the communists but to the imperialists. Those who resist communism are imperialists by definition.

A third purpose of Aesopian language is to deceive about communist objectives and realities.

Thus, the jobs of Aesopian-style CP propagandists are face-lifting, disguising, and seducing.

Communist propaganda, far from beating the drums for the communist ideology, is designed to black out understanding of communism and to present the red wolf as a white sheep.

Operationally, communist propaganda, including the non-Aesopian part, serves to activate party members and sympathizers and to transform them into fighters, organizers, and propagandists. Propaganda also is used by the communist to paralyze their opponents by inciting them against one another and disarming them materially and morally. Thirdly, propaganda is employed to neutralize the "masses" in order to make them believe it is not worthwhile, or necessary, to resist communism as well as harmful to side with "anti-communists" (who, being "anti", obviously don't and can't have any constructive thoughts in their head).

In the narrow sense of word, communist propaganda is that type of communication which is originated by communist parties and propagated through communist communicators and communist media. In the broader sense communist propaganda includes that type of communication which is originated by communist parties and is propagated by non-communist communicators through non-communist media; the communist origin of that communication as well as its function within the overall communist propaganda effort (and within communist strategy) is concealed.

Occasionally, the communists may make use of anti-communist communicators and media.

"Narrow" communist propaganda handles communist themes and arguments exclusively. "Broad" communist propaganda handles additional themes and arguments that overlap with and parallel specific non-communist communications for the purpose of amplifying those and conditioning audiences for better receptivity. Pseudo anti-communist propaganda may be supported by communists in order to polarize a target society. Note that while the communists want to build a strong external left, they also want an extreme right and they want the extremists to fight one another, otherwise the polarization of society cannot be achieved.

Communist propaganda, therefore, is perpetrated by communists on specific communist subjects and on subjects which have no apparent relation to communist programs. Communist propaganda also is perpetrated by non-communists on communist subjects as well as on subjects which appear to be unrelated to communist issues.

Communist propaganda also serves to "taboo" certain subjects and to hide various facts. Non-communist media often participate in CP stratagems of concealment and diversion.

This particular pattern is not exclusive with the communists. During World War II, for example, British and American propaganda agencies were using what was then called white, gray, and black propaganda.

The methods by which communists enlist non-communists or even anti-communists to do their bidding differs from case to case. Communists systematically infiltrate public opinion media and they may utilize agents to subvert communicators and communication channels. It is, however, far more effective if, because of its intrinsic merit of persuasiveness, the overt or covert communist message is taken over spontaneously by non-communists.

Propaganda which is not self-propelled and which fails to develop chain reactions does not propagate widely and thus cannot reach the "masses". (Nevertheless, it may influence small key groups.)

The persuasion power of communist messages depends in large part upon prior conditioning of the communicators. This conditioning was achieved by earlier propaganda and by the impact of the repetitive and basic long run propaganda upon the educational systems.

The effectiveness of the steady and permanent communist psychological effort is precisely that gradually the number of those

conditioned to be receptive to communist propaganda is increasing.

In the short run, the effectiveness of communist propaganda depends significantly on the number, skill, and dedication of non-communist propaganda carriers. This effectiveness is enhanced because the density, variability, and attractiveness of the messages depend on the number of carriers and because those carriers appear to be above suspicion.

The carrier's services to the communists will be the greater the more naive they are about communism, the less they understand communist intentions and techniques, and the less they are interested in determining the sources of the ideas they are pushing.

Through the carriers communist propaganda is being marketed by means of "capitalist methods".

When carriers who inadvertently "swallowed a line" and are honestly non-communists, are told they are peddling communist propaganda, they either are incredulous or offended, or they regard the "coincidence" as irrelevant or as less important than their "own" message. Some carriers like to exclaim, "it is about time the communists realize what's right". Others frankly welcome communist support for their activity—every support is acceptable. Still others ridicule the "alleged tie".

Carriers are differentiated by sophistication and honesty. Some carriers are under the direct influence of overt or covert communists, and they may know or ignore the true color of their advisers.

To repeat: short-range communist propaganda which deals with current issues is successful to the extent that it is propagated by non-communist carriers and that the source as well as the utility of that propaganda for communist strategy remains hidden.

Communist propaganda must not necessarily be mendacious. It can be truthful or may appear to be truthful, especially in those cases when it is camouflaged as a communication for a non-communist cause.

Communist propaganda is rarely disseminated through financial arrangements such as bribes or stipends to non-party writers.

The communists fare best when they can latch on to an argument which is perfectly meritorious in and by itself and which its proponents are obligated to continue advocating, e.g. social betterment. This is one of the reasons why the communists—since the times of Marx—have been trying to ride the coat-tails of liberalism and moderate socialism and why they adopt suitable non-communist reform ideas and exploit those to strengthen their own case directly or indirectly.

Does this mean that the advocates of sensible progress and reform have no choice but to become communist propagandists? Of course not. Does it then mean that the communists, simply because they exist and engage in communist and non-communist propaganda, have polluted free speech? I don't doubt that much communist pollution of free speech has taken place.

But the communists cannot really be blamed for this pollution, because they have only been doing their job, which is precisely that of subverting democracy. The blame rather rests on those who haven't been doing their job of strengthening democracy. Liberals are not "liberals," and even "liberals" and socialists usually are not disguised communists. But if non-communist progressives are unable to make the distinction clear, they haven't thought through their own program; and if as a group they are unwilling to draw a visible separation line, they haven't kicked out the infiltrators; or they don't realize that unavowed or temporary, or any alliances with the communists are a sure way to joining the "great majority" of the politically dead.

The communists always have taken pro-labor postures—they claim to be the "vanguard of the proletariat." Hence it was only "natural" that they would support the labor movement. Why should a labor organization reject much-needed help? It did not take the American labor leaders too long to find out that communist support for wage demands and social programs was nothing but a CP operational tactic. The communists were instigating unrest, not in order to improve the welfare of the workers, but to promote class warfare and revolution, and they were forever ready to sacrifice the interests of the workers for CP interests. Whenever there was a suitable opportunity, they provoked unnecessary troubles and strikes that were designed to harm the country rather than increase the take-home pay. They also used "labor struggles" in the hope of establishing power positions and to create command leadership over the labor force by means of which they might acquire a capability to paralyze and seize the country. Fortunately, most of the American labor unions eliminated communist influence before it grew too strong.

Labor is the social "class" in the United States which best understands communism, its deceptions, and its perils; and which also knows that communist economics and totalitarian rule are medieval reaction and oppression, not modern progress and liberation.

The communists need labor but labor not only does not need the communists but it had to get rid of them to defend its own interests. American labor leaders realized that communist solicitude was that of the fox who robbed the raven of his cheese. They also knew the communists wanted to unload the dirty work of defeating the U.S. on the American labor movement. They understood—and they acted. The labor movement is stronger for having broken the communist stranglehold.

MILITARY VICTORY?

In a letter to Joseph Alsop, Senator Edward Kennedy concluded that the motivation of American political leadership in moving into Cambodia was the "illusion that a military victory can be won in Vietnam". Was that so, really? What would have happened if we had not moved? From the very start, this war *always* was an Indochinese war. Before the North Vietnamese were able to attack South Vietnam in force, they had, for logistics reasons, no choice but take eastern Laos; and before they could attack the Vietnamese heartland, they had no choice but move through eastern Cambodia. The Tet offensive of 1968, which had such an enormous impact upon American domestic politics, was, to a large extent, based on the Cambodian "spring boards". (The expression is General Giap's.)

Throughout the period of conflict in South Vietnam there was no let-up in military operations throughout Laos; and there were military operations in Cambodia, except that those were of a non-violent nature. Thailand also has been involved since 1965 and so have most of the remaining countries in Southeast Asia.

Before the American initiative, the Cambodians kicked out Sihanouk and the Chinese communists, seemingly with North Vietnamese concurrence, embarked on a strategy designed to put Sihanouk back into power as a communist puppet. Communist forces struck to keep the Sihanoukville supply line open and to occupy key areas of the country, including the capital. Thus, the shooting war was expanded into Cambodia before a single American soldier ever crossed the border.

In the face of this situation which we did not create, we could, of course, have remained passive. In this case, whether or not Sihanouk returned to Cambodia, or a more

authentic communist ruler was installed, the North Vietnamese would have taken over the entire eastern border of Cambodia and they would have gained an advantage which, in all likelihood, would have proved decisive.

Through his initiative of April 1970, Mr. Nixon spoiled this communist undertaking and he freed a large portion of the South Vietnam border and territory from immediate pressure. As a *bonus* the chances for the communists to develop strong aggressive power below the 13th or 14th parallel have been reduced, or else the force requirements for the communists have been considerably increased. In addition, a new possibility has been created for South Vietnam to establish effective common defenses with Thailand and Cambodia.

That this one initiative does not solve all problems is self-evident. However, in the absence of this initiative, our problems would have been far worse, and the capabilities of the communists would have been far greater. Withal, it wasn't the President who expanded the war into Cambodia, but the President reacted to the fact that Cambodia suddenly had become an active military theater; and that geographic enlargement of fighting was no illusion but a hard reality.

There has sprung up in this country a party which advocates "military victory" and another party which advocates "political settlement". The former consists of persons called "hawks", the latter of "doves". In zoology, the cross-breeding of two species of birds is impossible, but in politics it can be done. Nevertheless, this classification makes little or no sense. The dividing line must be traced along a different front.

If there were no military operations, there would be no conflict and no need for a political settlement. If military operations had no political objective, they would not take place. A purely military strategy cannot exist even in a most violent and total war for survival, while an exclusively political strategy against an aggressive opponent cannot have any effectiveness and cannot endure. By its very nature, strategy is a composite of political and military operations (as well as of many additional types of undertakings). Every successful strategy is derived from political direction of the entire effort in the pursuit of a political goal. A strategy oblivious to political factors and dominated by military and purely operational considerations will invariably fail but if the political leadership prescribes rules which negate operational effectiveness, deny tactical requirements, and preclude military success, such strategy will fail, too.

From the beginning, our strategy in Southeast Asia was hampered by political limitations which did not necessarily prevent victory but which rendered military success very difficult of attainment. Is military victory therefore an illusion? It would be more correct to say this: "Given the rules under which the war in Southeast Asia is being fought, military victory probably presupposes excessive expense and long endurance."

I hasten to add that, naturally every war must be fought under some political limitations. But several limitations have been imposed which created unnecessary handicaps and a few key limitations were poorly conceived, e.g. gradual and slow escalation.

The problem is, negatively, to allow for the irreducible minimum of both military and political expediency, and positively, to determine the best harmony between military and political necessities.

During the first few years of conflict, we were unsuccessful in harmonizing political with military strategy. If we were compelled to fight a really powerful opponent in the style of the Vietnam engagement, we would be soundly trounced. Our command and decisionmaking structures are far below the customary level of American efficiency.

A carefully nurtured super-skepticism is

rampant in this country about the efficacy of the military operations we have been conducting in Vietnam. If there is a communist attack somewhere, Mr. John Q. Public is told that again, again, and again our efforts had been for naught. But if there are no enemy attacks, the enemy is said to lie low for a while and will resume the offensive whenever and wherever he chooses—there just is no hope that we might have weakened him.

I suspect that some of this skepticism is due to some reporting of battlefield events. Some of the most brilliant battles in all history were fought in Vietnam, yet Americans never heard about them. Still, seasoned civilian reporters and social scientists should understand that even after crippling defeats, guerrilla forces remain capable of launching counter-attacks and that, especially in thinly populated jungle and mountain areas, surprise blows cannot be prevented.

Any study of military operations in South Vietnam shows that the situation has improved very dramatically and that in most areas the country has been pacified, while five years ago the guerrillas attacked almost at will. This assessment has appeared self-evident to all recent travelers. There is no need to accept the so-called statistics which are being produced to "measure" pacification, nor to assume that the enemy cannot step up operations again, or that the South Vietnamese have fully succeeded in digging out the communist infra-structure. The truth is that our military undertakings have been highly successful and that in the course of five years the overall posture of VC and the North Vietnamese forces has been weakened step-by-step. This is a long time, yes, but this type of war is time-consuming. We started way behind, we never were at full strength for any length of time, and we have been de-escalating for two years. While we were attriting the enemy, we simultaneously, of our own free will, attrited ourselves.

The great costs to the Vietnamese economy which result from military operations are a subject of continuous lament. Of course, destructions are objectionable, but they are hardly avoidable. We must cost the damage, but we must also look at positive developments, such as road building, agrarian reform, augmentation of agricultural yields, increase of electric power production, improved communications, and some expansion of medical services. Note that the labor force grows annually by 300,000 persons (*Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, May 2, 1970, p. 17).

The economic difficulties of Vietnam can be deplored endlessly and they continue to be awesome, especially inflation and a highly negative balance of payments. But it is also true that standards of living have been improving and that large investments have been made, e.g. in transportation. Whether the country has reached the take-off point of rapid economic development remains to be seen, but the old traditions of low productivity are being discarded and economic progress is beginning. Nothing of this kind would have happened if the Vietcong had not been defeated militarily. It is, therefore, a bad mistake to underrate the importance of the military factor. For that matter, war is rarely profitable but it often accelerates economic development.

The term "victory" has multiple meanings. If communist aggression either ceases or Hanoi agrees to stop further military attacks, we achieved our objective and we would be successful, regardless of how this success was described. It is not our objective to destroy North Vietnam, which would be easy, nor to knock out the communist dictatorship at Hanoi, or to unify Vietnam under Saigon. Whether we have chosen our objective wisely, can be argued. But the statement that military victory is not possible really means that Hanoi will never stop aggression and that there is nothing we can do about this. In that case a political settlement also would appear

to be an illusion, in fact a far worse illusion than the notion of military victory.

The assertion that we do not actively pursue a political settlement is false. We were trying to get such a settlement even before we deployed into Vietnam. President Johnson's peace rhetoric in 1964, while addressed to the American electorate, also was directed at Hanoi. Every step of escalation and de-escalation we took, every truce we accepted, every troop withdrawal we announced, every economic incentive we offered, and every diplomatic initiative we tried was an attempt to achieve a political settlement. All this has been utterly unsuccessful. Hanoi never yet was interested in a political settlement.

This situation does not show any signs of changing. In a remarkable speech in the House of Lords, the Earl of Avon, former British prime minister and foreign secretary, called attention to the "added complication" of the relationship between Moscow and Peking which "has never been worse". "Representatives of the two countries might not wish at this particular time to sit down at a table in the company of others." (*Congressional Record*, May 28, 1970, p. 17531.)

Accordingly, we find ourselves in a position where both a military and a political decision seem to be excluded. In similar situations, the historical remedy always has been to change military strategy. We have done so by switching to Vietnamization and the more active promotion of Asian self-defense. From a strictly military point of view, this new strategy is not ideal, that is, Vietnamization and Asianization while absolutely necessary, have been long overdue and may require complementary operations and continuing American support. The critics say this strategy won't work. This does not seem the judgment of Hanoi which shows itself to be furious about Vietnamization. The fact is this strategy can be made to work if we pursue it with energy and support it with the requisite moral and material resources. The question, therefore, is this: will we adopt this strategy in a serious fashion or will we, because we have grown to detest the Indo-Chinese conflict, make it fail?

The critics suggest that since the country allegedly rejects more assertive military moves, we better change political strategy and offer conditions which Hanoi would accept. The main consequence of the Church-Cooper Amendment, as passed by the Senate, would be to prevent—in any event, to delay—Southeast Asian self-defense. If this road toward self-defense is to be narrowed or blocked, what alternative solution did the sponsors of the amendment propose? What are the prospects of a political breakthrough?

DOUBLE THINK ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

A heavy barrage of criticism has been directed at President Nixon that by having American forces cross into Cambodia, he violated international law. This cross-border operation was described as an "invasion" and when criticizing Senators were told that use of this term was most inaccurate, some became impatient about semantic "quibbling". The term "invasion" was very handy for the critics because if there was invasion, Mr. Nixon must have started a new war; and if that was the case, he not only had violated international law but also constitutional law.

One writer asserted that Mr. Nixon was the first President "in the history of the United States deliberately to order American forces to invade another nation on his own, without seeking Congressional approval and support". The statement is ascribed to Mr. Richard Goodwin who was an assistant to President Johnson at the time when Mr. Johnson "sent American Marines storming

¹ Three precedent cases are reported in *Congressional Record*, June 3, 1970, p. 18096.

ashore in the foreign nation of Santo Domingo and then advised Members of Congress after it was a fact", to quote Senator Hansen (*Congressional Record*, May 15, 1970, p. 15731).

The Columbia Society of International Law, whose members are students at the Columbia University School of Law, analyzed the legal aspects of the Cambodian action: "The United States is in fact applying the very kind of power politics for which we condemn the Soviet Union. But the consequences of their invasion of Czechoslovakia cannot compare to the devastation and prolonged civil war which will now engulf this defenseless country." "The United States invaded a small country without its consent or invitation, in total disregard of its sovereign rights."

Students who write this sort of nonsense in a term paper should be asked to repeat the course or to look for another instructor.

In a linguistic sense, the crossing by a military force of a frontier can be described as an "invasion" of the country into which that force is moving. But that is not the legal meaning. During World War II, the Germans passed military units through Sweden and Finland, but they did not invade those two countries because the governments had granted rights of passage. The Germans also crossed through Denmark to Norway, but this was an invasion because the two governments were hostile to one another and because Germany took over the country and administered it for its own benefit.

In 1944, the United States and Britain carried out the Normandy "invasion", but they did not, for that matter, legally invade France, despite the fact that the then government of France under Marshal Petain did not approve of the operation. This case was not even argued: it was clear that the Nazis had invaded France and that the French government, though legally constituted and widely recognized, was acting under duress.

Another example, in 1938, the Nazis invaded Austria and in 1939, they invaded Czechoslovakia. In both cases they claimed they had the consent of, and even had been invited by, the ruling governments. Yet both operations were held by the Nuremberg Military Tribunal to be invasions in the legal sense of the word. The Nazis had previously maneuvered pro-Nazi types into the government and both governments had been coerced.

The United States would have "invaded" Cambodia if there had been a hostile relationship between the American and the Cambodian government, if the U.S. had infiltrated the government of Cambodia, and if the American operation had been directed at the country's sovereignty. This, of course, was not the case. The American operation was directed against a non-Cambodian military force which was in Cambodia against the will of the Cambodian government, which had established control over a portion of the Cambodian territory, which had been invited to leave, and which was refusing to leave. Moreover, this force, which was illegally in Cambodia, undertook aggressive military operations against South Vietnam with which country Cambodia was at peace. Thus, Cambodian neutrality was suspended, at least in that part of the Cambodian territory that was occupied by the foreign belligerent force. Hence the rights of self-defense of all parties aggrieved by this occupation became activated.

If the Cambodian operation was a breach of international law, the United States and Britain should have been indicted together with the Nazis at Nuremberg, for the invasions of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

Whether or not the Cambodian government invited the American initiative or acquiesced into it, formally or informally, is not reliably known at this time because secrecy is maintained. Accusations about alleged breaches of international law of this type tend to be presumptuous because no court has been set up to adjudicate them. If such a court were established, it would follow proper legal procedure and examine the evidence. This evidence is not available to self-appointed accusers.

In the present case, the Cambodian government, as observable in the daily press, acted as though it wanted the U.S. and South Vietnamese initiative but did not care to issue a formal invitation. Moreover, the U.S. government, for reasons of security, apparently did not provide full information beforehand. In similar circumstances it is unreasonable to require that the enterprising government should ask for a formal invitation to enter at a specific place and a specific time.

There is, of course, no rule in international law which says that a military penetration into foreign territory must be by explicit formal invitation or agreement, or else it is illegal. The intervening party is not expected to nullify its operation by giving warning to the opponent, nor to provide the enemy with an opportunity to entrap the advancing forces. International law is not in contradiction to common sense. Accordingly, it recognizes that whenever such a procedure is infeasible, it is not required. The point is amply covered by article 38/1/b and c of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

For example, did any one in 1944 expect the King of Denmark to send a formal invitation from Nazi-occupied Copenhagen to London and Washington asking Britain and the United States to please chase out the Nazis?

The question is, therefore, whether the government of the penetrated country is hostile or unfriendly to the penetrator, whether the two countries are on amicable terms, and whether this particular government desires or consents to the penetration, regardless of the method by which that attitude is communicated. The legality of this government as well as the intentions of the penetrator also would have to be investigated in order to test whether the penetration was legal. Naturally, assertions have been made that the CIA created the Lon Nol government but to be valid, assertions must be plausible (which they are not) and they must be substantiated (which they are not, either).

The assent by the government of the penetrated state is useful but not necessary; and such a government's opposition to penetration would not diminish or invalidate the legal rights of the state under attack by a force operating from supposedly neutral territory. The right of self-defense is not circumscribed by borderlines; and neutrality, to be respected, must be real and not spurious.

Originally, the communists penetrated into Cambodia by consent and, therefore, technically speaking, they did not then invade the country. However, they were asked to leave both by Sihanouk and Lon Nol; and when they refused to leave, they forfeited the rights of passage that had been granted to them. At that juncture, they became an invading force. If they had remained within the areas that were assigned to them, the dispute might have been regarded as being in resolution. But they became invaders again because they seized additional territory and started to exercise rights of sovereignty in the areas which had been leased to them only for a specific purpose.

The communist intrusion into Cambodia became really meaningful to us because (1) the North Vietnamese built on neutral territory military facilities and staging bases; (2) they were using those bases for train-

ing and sanctuaries; (3) they conducted military operations from those bases; and (4) they were initiating new operations that were threatening to South Vietnam, the state they had attacked before and, in fact, never ceased attacking.

In operating from Cambodian bases against South Vietnam the communists were violating the neutrality of Cambodia for the purpose of aggression.

In legal theory, it was the job of the Cambodians to defend their own neutrality and to chase out the violators. In practice, this theory can almost never be applied, because a strong neutral does not lease his territory to a foreign power for purposes of aggressive military operations, while the weak neutral lacks strength to repel the aggressor. Hence the presumption usually would be that the violation was imposed upon the neutral power and it is only on the presumption of coercion that the intruded state can be deemed to have adhered to its self-proclaimed neutrality. In the absence of coercion, the temporary cession of territory for aggressive purposes would mean that the intruded state has made common cause with the aggressor and, therefore, is a hostile belligerent. In any event, if the neutral state is unable to protect its own neutrality, the aggrieved belligerent is entitled to take measures against the violator and to re-establish the status quo in the neutral state. After March 18, Cambodia tried unsuccessfully to evict the intruder; and it rejected a request by China to allow North Vietnam to continue using the staging bases.

The violation of Cambodian neutrality provided legal title for counter-action by the United States and South Vietnam. In 1940, the Germans invaded Holland and Belgium, two neutral countries, and they were later found legally guilty of aggression in this case. Upon penetration by the Wehrmacht, the French and British armies also penetrated into Belgium and Holland, but this act did not constitute a violation of international law but was an act of collective and individual self-defense. Since it also was directed against an aggressor, it executed provisions of international law.

The rules say that counter-measures against the violator of neutrality must be proportionate to the violation. The United States has adhered to this rule very strictly. In fact, the American intervention has fallen short of being fully proportionate. The meaning of the rule is not that, for example, counter-measures against a staging base must be restricted against that base or that if the violation was executed by one division, counter-measures must be limited to one division. The essential meaning is that the state taking counter-measures is not entitled to invoke defense against violations of neutrality as a pretext for appropriating territory.

Another rule which has not been referred to, so far as I read the Senatorial debate, is that the party which takes counter-measures is not supposed to interfere with, or assume the sovereign rights of the state whose neutrality was violated. The U.S. has strictly adhered to this rule, too. In support of the objectives of the Phnom Penh government, the U.S. is most interested in the Cambodians resuming full control over their entire territory and re-establishing genuine neutrality.

The point has been raised that the communist staging bases had been in Cambodia for years and that international law authorizes action against a violator of neutrality only in case of an immediate danger. This rule exists and it has a very specific meaning. In 1940, when the Nazis attacked Norway, a neutral country, they claimed they were entitled to act because Britain was about to invade and violate Norwegian neu-

trality, which would have posed a threat to German security. The Nuremberg court did not assign too much validity to evidence the defendants adduced to show that Britain indeed had been planning to move into Norway. This evidence was perhaps stronger than it appeared to the court, yet German documents also showed that the nazis were planning the invasion before the British showed any interest in Norway.

In any event, the British had taken early action only against German violations of the neutrality of Norwegian coastal waters. The British mined those waters but they made no overt move to invade Norway. The Germans might have honestly misread the British intention which was to stop German traffic in neutral coastal waters and to bring help to Finland in its war against the USSR, for which purpose they might have wanted to secure rights of passage through Northern Norway. Yet except for a British reprisal against a German violation, there was no conclusive proof, let alone an overt act through which the British were violating Norwegian neutrality and which had to be repelled. Consequently, when the Germans attacked, they became the violators.

The Germans also claimed they were entitled to violate Belgian neutrality because the British and French, who were patiently waiting at the Belgian border, had announced they would defend Belgium against German invasion. But no illegal French and British move occurred. Since there was no clear and pressing necessity, the German claim could not be sustained.

However, the requirement of an urgent need for self-defense measures which involve penetration into neutral territory, does not apply under all circumstances. The British were able to react quickly against the German invasion of Norway. If they had not been assembling a force they wanted to send to Finland, they would have been unable to react at all for several months. As it was, they were unable to expel the Germans in 1940. But this did not mean they lost the legal title to take action against the German breach of Norwegian neutrality. Nor did it mean the German occupation became legal because it remained undisturbed for several years or that the British "invasion" of 1945 was illegal because it occurred five years after the original breach.

In the present case, the communists have been violating Cambodian neutrality since 1965. South Vietnam and the United States were entitled to take immediate counter-measures but this was merely their legal right. They were not obligated to take those measures immediately lest their rights be forfeited. As long as the violation continued, their rights remained active. Hence, they could take counter-measures when it suited their purposes or when they had the requisite capabilities. The communist occupation of the sanctuaries did not become legal because it lasted for five years.

When the counter-measures were instituted, this was in response to a major current change, namely the Cambodian request that the staging bases be liquidated, communist refusals to heed the request, attacks for the purpose of enlarging the bases and to overthrow the Cambodian government, the communist meeting in China which disclosed enemy intent, and communist preparations for, as well as initiation of large scale attack. Moreover, the customary cross-border attacks had not ceased. Hence, enough urgent reasons for counter-measures were visibly in existence.

The comparison of Cambodia with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 is invalid. The USSR was not involved in conflict with any power in which Czechoslovakia was a neutral. The neutrality of Czechoslovakia was not violated for the purpose of an attack on the USSR, or for any purpose; and Czechoslovakia itself did not make

any military preparations, nor commit any hostile acts against the USSR. On the contrary, Czechoslovakia still was an ally of the Soviet Union. The government of Czechoslovakia had in no way, directly or indirectly, consented to the Soviet intrusion. The Soviets invaded, not to eliminate a threat to themselves, whether immediate or delayed, but in order to change the government of Czechoslovakia. They have since continued a *de facto* occupation through which the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia has been curtailed. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia constituted aggression against an allied country.

Professor Kahin of Cornell University has disputed President Nixon's statement of April 30, that the United States and South Vietnam did not move against the communist bases in Cambodia before "because we did not wish to violate the territory of a neutral nation". According to Mr. Kahin, there were several hundred incidents in 1964 and 1965 as well as a few limited intrusions, and air and artillery attacks. The International Control Commission stated in July 1965 that "none of those incidents were provoked by the Royal Government of Cambodia". (*Congressional Record*, May 19, 1970, p. 16073).

This again is topsy-turvy reasoning. Since the American initiative was not directed against the government of Cambodia, but against the communist violators of Cambodian neutrality, the fact that the Cambodians did not provoke any of the border violations is irrelevant. Our policy was never to cross the border save in exceptional cases of "hot pursuit" of communist non-Cambodian attackers.

According to the data produced by Mr. Kahin, the overwhelming majority of the incidents took place during 1964 and 1965, that is prior to the United States assuming a major share of the strategic responsibility. Since he did not quote more than a handful of incidents of the later period, it would seem that indeed the United States was very meticulous in keeping on the Vietnam side of the incessantly violated border.

In many areas this border is very poorly demarcated. It was consistently crossed by communist guerrillas who were attacking South Vietnam and were seeking refuge and rest in Cambodia. As those forces became involved in a fight, it was only natural that South Vietnamese and American troops might have pursued them into Cambodia. For that matter, international law clearly authorizes hot pursuit in such instances, including artillery and air attack. Hot pursuit does not constitute any violation of neutrality.

As to the B-52 strikes mentioned by Mr. Kahin, if they were not related to hot pursuit, they might, of course, have resulted from error. Technically, this would have been violations but not hostile acts, because the policy was not to bomb targets in Cambodia. Incidents of this sort would normally be settled through compensation.

Naturally, the United States and South Vietnam were legally entitled at any time to bomb North Vietnamese troops using operations bases in Cambodia for attacking South Vietnam. We chose deliberately not to bomb them. Therefore, an occasional attack which occurred in spite of our self-chosen policy does not show that we intended to violate Cambodian neutrality. (I have argued on the hypothesis that the facts were as Mr. Kahin presented them. To evaluate the case properly the details of B-52 attacks would have to be analyzed.)

There are numerous borders in the world where border incidents occur with great frequency. Such incidents may happen without specific orders from the respective governments, and they usually are not indicative of policy. Planned incidents which serve specific tactical purposes display a pattern which

is quite different from that which prevailed at the Vietnam-Cambodian frontier.

The conditions of the Vietnam-Cambodian border have been such that incidents were bound to happen almost on a daily basis. Mr. Kahin's data do not show any excessive frequency, certainly not after 1965. Hence he did not demonstrate an American intent to violate Cambodian neutrality, but rather proved the contrary intent. The mere occurrence of incidents happening spontaneously or in line with hot pursuit does not in the slightest invalidate President Nixon's statement.

The critics who argue that Mr. Nixon started a new war shouldn't really be too happy with Mr. Kahin's theory that we have been operating in or against Cambodia all along. In this case nothing of any consequence could possibly have occurred on April 28.

If we just look at the facts, it is quite clear that the United States and South Vietnam tolerated that the communists were operating from their staging bases in Cambodia till April 28, 1970, and that at that time the two governments invoked several international rights to stop this abuse. Thereupon, the Cambodian army joined forces with American and South Vietnamese units and confronted the communists.

This is the simplest refutation of the pseudo-legal double-think on "invasion." The critics must be short of ammunition if they feel compelled to create artificial issues.

A REASONED PLEA

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a constituent in the Third Congressional District of Arizona, Mr. Ted J. Lopez, sent me a copy of a letter he recently wrote to one U.S. Senator, known for his opposition to United States assistance of South Vietnam.

I believe that his thoughts reflect that of the majority of Americans, and I would like to share them with you:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Senator McGOVERN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I know that you are a dedicated man and I also know you mean well. However, I also know that even a dedicated Senator can be wrong.

I am a retired M/Sgt and I want to take this opportunity to thank you and the rest of the American people for giving me the privilege of serving my country as a member of the US Army and the US Air Force for 26 years. I served in World War II, and the Korean War and yes, the Viet Nam war, too. I was retired two years ago.

You know Senator, every morning when I raise my flag in front of my beautiful home, I thank the Lord for the freedom we enjoy as Americans—freedom bought and paid for by our fighting men. I also thank God that people like you are in the minority or we would still be fighting World War II. I am sincere when I say this—I wonder what would have happened in World War II or the Korean War if we would have had people like you and Senator Church.

I am sure you are sincere when you say you want to bring our boys back from Viet-Nam and who doesn't want them home? If you are really concerned the best and only thing to do is back our President. I know how badly our boys want to come home—I know because I have been there three times. I also know that since they are there through no

fault or choice of their own, it is your duty and mine and every "real American" to support them to the fullest extent.

We all know Mr. Kennedy, a very dear and personal friend of mine, made a terrific blunder when he committed us to this situation and then Mr. Johnson made it worse by committing more and more troops without a definite goal of victory until we passed 500,000. Let's compare what Mr. Nixon has accomplished in comparison to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson—he did not commit any greater numbers of American troops; instead he started cutting down and is continuing to cut down to where we will have about half as many troops committed by the end of the year.

Whether you like it or not President Nixon's Vietnamization program has been a complete success—even though you and a few others have reneged your support.

When Mr. Nixon took a gamble in the operation of Cambodia out of necessity for the protection of our troops; people like you made a lot of noise because you were so certain it would fail. But now that it has proved to have been such a terrific success, you don't have the courtesy to admit publicly your mistake and throw your support behind our President to unite our country; instead of that you have tried to tie his hands.

I am a member of the American Legion Post 41, the second largest in the nation and we would like to ask that you support our President. As you know, Mr. Johnson left him with a bucket of worms in the Vietnam situation and he is doing an excellent job of coming out of it. All he needs now is your support and mine as he already has the support of 90% of the real American people. The other 10%, I am sure he doesn't want and I am sure that you do not either.

Sincerely,

TED J. LOPEZ.

GWENDOLYN POINDEXTER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to acknowledge the unique talents and accomplishments of gifted individuals in our communities. I would, therefore, like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievements of Cleveland's very dedicated educator and delightful puppeteer, Miss Gwendolyn Poindexter.

Miss Poindexter has been a teacher in the Cleveland inner city for over 10 years, and has worked extensively with preschool children and their families. She has piloted a variety of community organizations for disadvantaged youngsters while serving as supervisor for four Headstart Centers in recent years.

Miss Poindexter's teaching ability is surpassed only by her sheer wizardry with puppets. Since 1960, she has directed a traveling theater offering informative lectures and entertaining performances for all age groups. Her presentations reflect her varied talents—her puppets are handmade; she designs and manufactures their costumes; and she writes the scripts and designs the scenery. Without question, this young lady has both inspired and delighted all those who have been privileged to witness her productions.

Miss Poindexter has served as director of puppetry workshops for the Cleveland Summer Arts Festival for the past 3 years. By 1969, her workshops had an enrollment of over 300 youngsters from the Cleveland area. While continuing in her teaching capacity for the Cleveland Board of Education, she has directed several classes in the history of puppets and the art of puppetmaking for settlement homes and cultural centers. Miss Poindexter has made a number of appearances on radio and television stations throughout the city. She has also entertained audiences at a variety of schools, hospitals, churches, banks, and community centers. Miss Poindexter has been praised as often in the Cleveland newspapers as in the many letters of thanks that she has received from her audiences. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that more individuals should be given an opportunity to witness Miss Poindexter's magical talents.

REMARKS MADE BY VICE ADM. A. G. RICKOVER IN THE INTRODUCTION OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the remarks made by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover in the introduction of Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON. The occasion was the dedication of the submarine overhaul facility at the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., a division of Litton Industries, in my hometown of Pascagoula, Miss., on Saturday, August 22 last. My object in placing the remarks of this distinguished American in the RECORD is not a self-serving one considering the compliments paid the Mississippi delegation in the Congress. Rather, it is to again express my admiration for Admiral Rickover, a great American, a dedicated scientist, and, in my humble judgment, a real genius.

Admiral Rickover is not only the father of the nuclear submarine, he is one of the great geniuses of our time. It was a great honor to have him down at Pascagoula on this momentous occasion. I am confident that he would not have been there had he not been in accord with the objective to be achieved by both the Navy and Ingalls.

Admiral Rickover's remarks follow:

I have been asked to introduce to you the main speaker for this occasion. However, I would be remiss if I did not first acknowledge the presence among us of two other distinguished guests, my friends Congressmen William Colmer and Jamie Whitten.

Mr. Colmer has served this district since 1932 with great honor and distinction. He has risen to the Chairmanship of the House Committee on Rules, one of the most responsible, influential, and difficult jobs in the Congress—indeed, in our entire Government. He performs this arduous role with dedication, skill, and purpose. I have been privileged to know Mr. Colmer for many years. He is a true politician, in the sense that politics is

the highest calling a human being can engage in. This is so because it is through politics that we get things done; that the world is kept moving. To be a good politician one must possess far more than intelligence; he must also have the human touch, the innate ability to know how people think and feel, and what must be done for their welfare. Mr. Colmer is that kind of politician. In our form of government the basic function of a Congressman or Senator is to represent the people of his district or of his State; he also has a duty to the United States as a whole. Balancing these two interests can present a difficult task for a legislator, but Mr. Colmer has handled this task with wisdom and integrity. He has looked out for his district and for the United States.

Mr. Whitten has represented Mississippi's second district since 1941. A man can be a doer or a critic. Today, when more and more critics are competing loudly for popular attention and applause, Mr. Whitten remains what he has always been, a doer; a man of dedication and vision. He has been on the House Appropriations Committee since 1943, first on the subcommittee for naval appropriations, and later on the subcommittee for all defense appropriations. During World War II Congressman Whitten personally visited combat theaters in Europe and the Pacific, conferring with such leaders as Admiral Nimitz and General MacArthur. Like Mr. Colmer, Congressman Whitten has added immeasurably to making our nuclear Navy possible. In 1959, Mr. Whitten was author of the motion to override the second Presidential veto of the Public Works Appropriation bill. The passage of this bill resulted in the opening of Pascagoula Harbor and enabled the atomic submarines from this Yard to reach the sea.

I also want to pay brief tribute to your two distinguished Senators, James Eastland and John Stennis. Both of these gentlemen in their many years of service to your state and to our nation have demonstrated extraordinary statesmanship and wisdom. I am particularly grateful to Senator Stennis, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, for the time and effort he has devoted to strengthening our Navy, and for the unflagging and wholehearted support he has given to the Naval Reactors Program.

Above all, the four gentlemen I have just named share in common a deep and dedicated love of our country; they have made major contributions to the defense and to the domestic welfare of the United States. As an official of our Government and as a private citizen, I shall always be grateful for their leadership and support. I am proud to be associated with these men who have brought such honor to your State.

I will now introduce our principal speaker, the Honorable William R. Anderson, Congressman from the Sixth District of Tennessee. Mr. Anderson, a native Tennessean, graduated from the Naval Academy in 1942 and immediately entered the submarine service. He participated in eleven submarine patrols in the Pacific, for which he was awarded the Bronze Star and other combat awards.

I have been personally associated with Congressman Anderson since 1956, when he entered the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program to become Captain of the *Nautilus*. Under his command, the *Nautilus* became the first submarine to transit under the Arctic ice on a nonstop, submerged, transpolar voyage from Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, to Portland, England, a distance of over 6,000 nautical miles. For this feat, Captain Anderson received the Legion of Merit and his ship was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

Mr. Anderson left the Navy in 1962 to enter upon a career much more hazardous than the submarine service—that of elective politics. He has performed with distinction in this career as well, being elected to the Congress in 1964 and returned to office

in the two succeeding elections. Mr. Anderson's best known legislative achievement is his authorship and promotion of the law enforcement education bill, enacted in 1968, which opened broad opportunities for young men and women in police and corrections careers. His most important current effort is directed toward programs for rural revitalization and small community development.

Congressman Anderson is a vigorous advocate of a strong defense establishment and a staunch supporter of our nuclear Navy. It is his valuable support, and the support of other dedicated members of the Congress, on which we must rely to maintain an adequate defense posture in the critical times ahead.

I have the honor of presenting to you the Honorable William R. Anderson of Tennessee.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS ISSUES PROCLAMATION

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, these are times when many freedom loving Americans find themselves greatly ashamed at the actions of some of their fellow citizens who seem to have lost much of their respect for the American flag and our democratic system of Government.

It is, therefore, encouraging to see some organizations which are taking a lead in encouraging a reaffirmation of their faith in the Constitution and our whole system of Government. Jacob J. Pearson Post 637 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located at Hopewell, Va., recently issued a proclamation in support of the Constitution and reaffirming what many of us steadfastly believe. The text of this resolution is so pertinent to our needs today that I would like to have it incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. I commend Post Commander Andy W. Amburgey and other members of the Jacob J. Pearson Post 637 for recalling to our memory these great receipts upon which our country was founded.

The text of the resolution follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, HOPEWELL, VA. PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on September 17, 1787, after five months' labor the majority of 55 delegates from 12 states, meeting in Philadelphia, approved the first U.S. Constitution consisting of preamble and seven articles;

Whereas, generations of Americans, sheltered by the concepts of the Constitution, have found both motivation and a continuing sense of destiny in the ideals of human dignity and worth for which our Nation's founders fought and died;

Whereas, today, with the ideals of the Constitution being disregarded, there is an even greater need for dedication to a high sense of patriotic purpose;

Whereas, the sustaining force of patriotism is the source of positive values which endow our lives with pride and purpose, and enable us to pursue our destiny, as guaranteed by the Constitution, as a people and a nation;

Now, therefore, I, Andy W. Amburgey, Post Commander of Jacob J. Pearson Post 637, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, in recognition of the wisdom and foresight of the designers of our constitution, and of its vital importance to us, as a nation, do, on this date hereby proudly proclaim that the more than 900 members of Jacob J. Pearson Post 637, both individually and collectively reaffirm their faith in the Constitution of the United States, and publicly rededicate themselves to supporting this noble document, the very cornerstone of our nation and I urge our citizens to keep faith with our heritage by fostering an enduring belief in, and constructive use of, its ideas; and to safeguard our heritage through our willingness to take whatever steps and make whatever sacrifices are necessary for our national safety.

Done this day, September 16th, 1970, at the Post Home, Hopewell, Virginia, in witness thereof I have hereunto set my signature and the official seal of my office.

ANDY W. AMBURGEY,
Post Commander.

HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Study Group Task Force on Food and Agriculture and on Consumer Affairs conducted 2 days of hearings here in Washington, D.C., on September 18 and 19 to give additional exposure to the problems of hunger and malnutrition in this country.

The House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, and the Senate Select Subcommittee on Nutrition and Human Needs had previously afforded food industry representatives the opportunity to address themselves to the Congress about their efforts in resolving the crisis.

The problem is one necessarily requiring the combined resources, efforts, and cooperation of the public and private sector.

Whatever can be said in the way of criticism of the industry, it cannot be said that it is refusing to cooperate in resolving the hunger and malnutrition problem.

In testimony of this fact I would like to place in the RECORD the statement submitted to the DSG panel by Mr. R. Hal Dean, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the Ralston Purina Co. Mr. Dean leaves no doubt that this leader in the field of animal nutrition is successfully translating its basic animal nutrition knowledge into workable, low-cost human food products and food systems which will meet people's protein needs and food preferences here and abroad. The company has products available for the USDA's school lunch and commodity distribution programs, is participating in the Rutgers University study, and is considering the production of a 50-percent protein, full-fat soy product in cooperation with one of the West African countries. Additionally, other high protein products are being perfected for human consumption. These are significant steps forward, and efforts such as these by responsible pri-

vate industry should be acknowledged and praised.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF R. HAL DEAN BEFORE THE HEARING OF THE DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP TASK FORCE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

My name is R. Hal Dean. I am chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Ralston Purina Company.

I welcome the opportunity to review Ralston Purina Company's interest and activity in the area of hunger and malnutrition. This statement will deal with our previous and current activities with the Federal government as well as an updating of our product development work.

In the last several years both the Congress, the Administration and the food industry have become increasingly mindful of the problem of hunger and malnutrition in this country. Accordingly, various representatives of the food industry have had the opportunity to report on their efforts to the Congress. In the last 18 months, we addressed ourselves to this very question on two separate occasions.

In April, 1969, I strongly testified before the House Committee on Agriculture and endorsed legislation (H.R. 7919) introduced by the Honorable Thomas S. Foley, Congressman from the State of Washington and Chairman of the DSG Task Force on Food & Agriculture. This legislation called for the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of Human Nutrition in the Department of Agriculture. Although the bill has not been enacted it has served, in my opinion, as one of the catalysts which prompted the Administration to establish a Food and Agriculture Nutrition Service in the USDA. This Service has significantly strengthened the Administration's efforts relating to human nutritional needs.

We are extremely pleased to have played a small part in this development. We share this Committee's deep interest in the Administration's positive action in this area and hope the Food and Nutrition Service will continue to sensitize our government's leadership in the fight against hunger and malnutrition.

On July 22, 1969, I testified before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

At that time, I outlined to the Chairman, Senator George S. McGovern and the members of his committee, our company's corporate interest and capabilities in the area of protein research and nutrition. While we have diversified considerably, the company today is the world's largest producer of formulated livestock and poultry feeds with plants and physical facilities in more than 40 states and 30 foreign countries. Our principal corporate objective has been the efficient production of meat, milk and eggs by the use of highly nutritious and balanced feed rations coupled with improved animal breeding, farm management and sanitation practices. Seventy-six years of experience in animal nutrition research has established our company as a leader in the field of animal nutrition.

As a broadly based, protein resourcing corporation our interests, experience and capabilities are tied directly to the subject of protein research and nutrition. In recent years, our research people have been working to translate our basic animal nutrition research knowledge into workable, low cost, human food products and food systems which will meet today's needs.

Although we are working closely with, and keeping abreast of developments in single cell and fish protein concentrate research, we feel soy protein sources hold the most realistic near term promise for solutions to today's protein hunger and malnutrition problems. Through this research, we have

developed isolated edible soy proteins for human consumption. However, research is continuing in order to improve flavor, texture and economic viability.

Recently significant breakthroughs have been achieved which have enabled us to overcome a number of these problems. As a result, we now have the capability of producing a substantial variety of "engineered" or structured food products. These products can serve effectively as vehicles for high impact nutrition as well as desired supplementation of vitamins and minerals. In other words, today, we can totally engineer the food product and "build" into it the specific nutrition required to meet a specific deficiency. I want to point out that Ralston Purina Company is not by any means the only company engaged in research in this important, exciting field.

Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that these new protein products have been and are being developed to meet specific dietary needs. They are not designed, nor intended, as replacements for food staples we know today.

Approximately one year ago we proposed specific nutritional programs in Phoenix, Arizona and East St. Louis, Illinois, in conjunction with local Office of Economic Opportunity personnel. In each case, we had submitted detailed specifications, cost data and guidelines to implement the nutritional feeding programs. Unfortunately, sufficient funding has not been forthcoming from OEO or USDA and the projects have been held in abeyance.

Before we discuss the current Ralston Purina Company activity and planning, I would preface my comments by referring to a recommendation of the November, 1969 White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. The following is a quote from the conferees of Panel Number 6 of the White House Conference:

"By even conservative estimates snack foods occupy a prominent position in the diet of American youth, being in many cases a significant source of young people's daily nourishment. This is also true of large segments of population below the poverty level, chiefly in U.S. urban centers.

"Industry has the freedom to add to the nutritive value of these products, as there are no standards of identification for them. Because the nutritional value of some snack foods is often negligible, it would be desirable for the food industry to consider the question of enriching the nutritional content of such foods. This would be especially pertinent in the development of new snack items intended for the adult market.

"It is recommended: That industry accelerate its efforts to make available nutritious snack foods."

It is extremely encouraging to those of us in the food industry that the report of this White House Conference has touched on several key issues inherent in the problems of supplying nutritious foods to the American public—specifically, those Americans, young and adult, who are in deepest need on the subject of nutrition.

Our research and experience in the market place has proven that products cannot be sold to the public solely on the basis of their nutritional content. People want nutrition . . . but most people are interested in taste, and other real or imagined benefits from food. In addition, we know that there is a great deal of confusion in the public's mind on the subject of nutrition.

Based on this accepted body of knowledge and the aforementioned admonition of the White House Conference, our company has actively pursued the necessary Research and Development to produce a highly nutritious snack food.

Again, building on our expertise in the vegetable protein field, we have produced, thoroughly researched and placed in selected

test markets, a high protein/low cost, culturally acceptable snack product. The test product carries the Ralston Purina brand name of "Potato Crispers." It was introduced in August, 1970, in test markets in Ft. Wayne and South Bend, Indiana. To date, consumer acceptance has been excellent. I have taken the liberty of having samples of the product available for your personal review.

The product looks and tastes like potato chips . . . but it has four times the protein and 30-40% less fat than potato chips. Ounce for ounce Potato Crispers contain as much protein as choice T-bone steak, 80% more protein than fresh eggs and five times as much protein as fresh milk.¹

We feel this product offers great promise not only for the needy or malnourished, but also for the average consumer.

Turning to additional specific activities, our company is working closely with the USDA to develop products for the School Lunch Program, the Commodity Distribution Program and the Rutgers University School Feeding Project. In addition, we are working with the Appalachian Regional Commission and are undertaking long-range planning concerning food habits and product preferences of ethnic groups.

We feel that application of edible protein products into workable public/private sector nutritional programs is of the utmost importance. Recent serious discussions regarding the private sector's role in solving the problems of malnutrition are extremely encouraging. We feel we have the resources, the expertise and the desire to make these programs work. However, if help is needed from the private sector, government must understand the need for proper funding and collateral cooperation.

In the area of the School Lunch Program, an activity where we feel we can make significant contributions, our management has been encouraged by several recent expressions directed to private industry by the USDA.

In a recent address to State School Lunch Directors and Supervisors, Mr. Edward J. Hekman, Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, said:

"The Department of Agriculture believes that a properly balanced diet of conventional foods can provide adequate nutrition. However, we are also aware of changes in dietary habits as well as changes in the nutritional quality of processed foods. Thus, we are interested in 'engineered foods' to the extent that such new foods can offer improved nutrition to the general public. Engineered foods are defined as those foods which are so prepared and processed that they:

- (A) Improve nutrition.
- (B) Reduce cost.
- (C) Offer greater convenience in meal preparation.
- (D) Improve acceptability.
- (E) Improve stability.

Mr. Hekman went on to say:

"But, we want to see the engineering of foods for nutritional improvement oriented toward acceptance by the general population through the commercial market—not solely for government purchase."

This type of language is indeed encouraging. It should be noted, however, that there is an area of concern in moving these new foods to the commercial markets. In establishing labeling regulations and product "Standards of Identity" it is important that the products be described in clear and straightforward language that informs the consumer without danger of prejudice.

The product we have introduced in test markets, Potato Crispers, meets the criteria as outlined by Mr. Hekman. Furthermore, other products, in various stages of Re-

search and Development are also designed to answer the requirements as outlined by the USDA. Some are designed as meal supplements, one in particular is designed as virtually a whole meal.

We are extremely hopeful that these products will be accepted and implemented immediately in nutritional study programs.

The contractual agreement between USDA, OEO and Rutgers University for school lunch feeding programs offers additional encouragement. Our company is currently preparing a proposal for high-protein products to be used in the Rutgers Study.

We are encouraged that this study is being undertaken to explore new ways to provide the necessary nutrition for school children on a Type A lunch . . . especially in schools with limited food handling facilities.

Again, referring to Mr. Hekman's speech, he reminded the School Lunch Directors and Supervisors of the following regulation, published in the Federal Register last January:

"The Child Nutrition Division of the Food and Nutrition Service may approve variations in the food components of the Type A lunch on an experimental or on a continuing basis in any school where there is evidence that such variations are nutritionally sound and are necessary to meet ethnic, religious, economic or physical needs."²

One of the products we are exploring for the Rutgers Study . . . when consumed with an 8 oz. glass of whole milk . . . meets the nutritional requirements for a Type A lunch.

This engineered food product is being designed to provide more nutrition for less tax dollars. In addition, of course, it offers: 1) extreme ease of handling, 2) lower cost, 3) high level of acceptability, 4) reduction of clean-up and waste, and 5) a variety in the basic menu (it will be available in three varieties).

Again, I might reiterate the need for intense cooperation which is needed between the public and private sector. We feel private industry in general and Ralston Purina Company specifically can make a sizeable contribution to nutritional development of our most important asset, our youth.

In closing I would like to mention that our company, due in part to our sizeable international operations, realizes that protein deficiencies exist in varying degrees around the world and the geographic boundaries of this, or any country, offer no special immunity to those who suffer from malnutrition and hunger.

During the past ten years we have been helping to translate our knowledge of animal agriculture and nutrition into developing nations to increase their productivity and reduce consumer prices of farm products. At present, we are discussing a joint venture with the government of a West African country to build a plant to process a full-fat, soy protein product.

This facility will produce a nutritious soy product yielding 50% protein. It will be used in school feeding programs, hospitals, military feeding and possibly consumer markets.

Solving the problems of hunger and malnutrition is a big job. However, a great deal is at stake. It will require the combined resources, efforts and cooperation of the public and private sector.

Our involvement in these projects, here and in the developing nations, demonstrates our sincere interest, enthusiasm and desire to make a meaningful contribution toward the elimination of the problems of hunger and malnutrition. Our proposals for the School Lunch Program, our active participation in the Rutgers University Study and

¹ Comparisons are based on data from USDA Agricultural Handbook #8.

² USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, National School Lunch Program, Title 7 Agriculture, 210.10 January 20, 1970, Federal Register (35 F.R. 753).

the introduction of our new protein snack product offer concrete evidence of Ralston Purina's affirmative and positive action. We ask only for the continued encouragement and cooperation that will be needed to solve the multitude of problems that are before us.

Thank you.

HOUSING AMERICANS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor has just completed an excellent in-depth analysis of the housing pinch being faced by most Americans today.

I commend the following five-part series to the attention of those of my colleagues seeking an understanding and a solution to what has been widely labeled as "the American housing crisis":

[From the Christian Science Monitor
Sept. 19-21, 1970]

SO YOU WANT A HOUSE?—FORGET IT

(NOTE.—Does the United States housing pinch really hurt as much as one hears? The poor have always been badly housed. But now that even middle-income Americans feel it, some see the housing crisis as a potentially hot political issue. First of five articles.)

(By Merelice Kundratiss)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Over half the Nation's population might as well forget about wanting to buy a house—or live in an apartment big enough to meet their needs.

The housing crisis is that bad.

If it hasn't hit you yet, hang on. At the rate things are going, it will—as soon as you want to make your next move. And this applies to people at all income levels.

Major business firms, because of the crisis, are transferring personnel less frequently. Families simply refuse to make the move. One young Texas family recently had to pay twice as much in California for a home that compared with the one they were leaving.

Residents in wealthy Wilmette, Ill., note that only a year ago, it was impossible to find a house. Now, an upper-income executive simply couldn't sell his high-cost home.

That is not to say there isn't plenty of demand for housing. But it's the people making between \$8,000 and \$12,000 a year who are especially in trouble.

Most homes are not being built for families making less than \$1,000 a month. Besides that, all of their bills—car, new furniture, etc.—must be paid off, says Lee Williams of Doelger Builders here.

APARTMENTS ALSO SHORT

Some 32,000 houses have been sold by Doelger, Mr. Williams explains. Ten years ago, he continues, the homes were in the range of \$21,000. Their cost has increased \$1,000 a year.

Buyers today might even have the down payment when they come in, but Mr. Williams still has to say, "I'm so sorry. We simply can't help you." Too low an income disqualifies them for financing.

President Nixon, in the "Second Annual Report on National Housing Goals," noted that the "median price of all conventionally built new homes now being offered for sale is about \$27,000." Nearly half of all American families, he further noted, cannot afford more than \$15,000.

So the swing is to apartments, where the shortage—for middle- as well as low-income levels—is equally acute.

Single careerists in New York who have progressed to maintaining their own apartments find they have to revert to dormitory days and double or triple up to pay today's rents.

Here in the cosmopolitan city of spectacular hills, residents gripe bitterly about skyrocketing rents. Their next complaint—a common one throughout the nation—landlord neglect.

Time after time, renters say: "My landlord doesn't have to worry about keeping my apartment nice and making repairs. He does not care whether I move. He could rent it again without any trouble."

Poor people are used to such neglect. But it is becoming almost as common among middle-income tenants. And the reaction is the same—little incentive to fix up a place. Says Sheila Datz, who came here from Boston:

"I was going to get carpeting for my apartment. But now I won't bother. I looked three months for my last apartment, lived there one month, the rent was raised, and I had to move. When my present lease is up, I might have to move again."

Sheila wouldn't want to return to Boston, however. Since she left a year ago, chaos has hit Boston rents—despite a recently formed rent-review board. Swamped by college students, that eastern city contends with tougher and tougher housing shortages each fall—and higher and higher rents.

One Boston secretary saw her rent climb 33 percent in the last two years.

In Chicago, Anne and David are gritting their teeth and looking at new high-rise, in-town apartments costing \$300 a month for one bedroom.

New Yorkers, in turn, must be willing to pay that much for just a studio apartment in downtown Manhattan.

EVEN REWARDS OFFERED

In housing, as in most big-city problems, New York sets pace—a dubious honor indeed as the city's vacancy rate hovers at a frighteningly low 1 percent and the race is on for ratholes.

Few large cities come near the 4 or 5 percent vacancy rate considered normal for the smooth movement of this nation's highly mobile population.

One young man in New York had a fairly firm idea of what he wanted in an apartment. He joined four other prospects that a real estate agent was taking around in a group. When they walked into one apartment, he quickly glanced around from the doorway and immediately blurted, "I'll take it," leaving the others with their jaws dropped. He got it, and was glad he did.

At another Manhattan—Manhattan, Kan. (adjacent to Fort Riley)—newspaper want ads include such wry remarks as "reward for information leading to the rental of an apartment."

Here in San Francisco, a Chinese shopkeeper talks about commuting 20 minutes to his business. With his large family, he cannot afford the \$150 monthly rent for cramped, rundown quarters in famed Chinatown.

And every city has its enclaves of the elderly struggling to make a home out of the cheap rooms they rent on fixed, limited incomes.

Here are some of the sobering statistics that are affecting these people:

Almost two years ago, the President's Committee on Urban Housing assessed the nation's need at a minimum of 26 million additional units in 10 years (by 1978). That means 2.6 million a year.

In 1969, the nation managed to produce only 1.49 million units—the largest number,

however, since 1963. And in 1970 it is doing only slightly better.

The 26-million goal does not include an additional 2 million units that should be rehabilitated without public assistance.

While the 10-year goal does cover replacing dilapidated housing with standard units, it does not attempt to solve the overcrowding that already exists in standard units.

Although the United States on an average outdoes other nations in providing comfort and space in housing, an overwhelming number of Americans are still ill-housed.

RURAL POOR ASK HELP

Naturally the poor are the hardest hit. And 6 million of the 26 million goal are chalked up as subsidized housing. That 6 million housing units—even though it is more than the country has ever tried to produce—is a bare minimum.

A hue and cry also is rising from the rural poor who live in areas where bad housing and unemployment conditions have driven people to the cities. Some 100 participants at a 1969 national rural-housing conference stressed the need to raise the level of government-assisted units from 6 to 13 million—with 7 million located in rural areas and small towns of less than 25,000 population.

Perhaps few problems have been as ignored, while at the same time being talked and legislated about, as housing. There have been plenty of programs—but little money and national commitment.

George Romney, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, stresses: "In my view, we face a full-scale national housing crisis."

"I consider it an emergency," he continues, "because of the important role housing plays in meeting the physical and social needs of people. After all, food, clothes, and shelter—those are the three fundamentals."

"In terms of a satisfactory environment for a family and the rearing of a family," Mr. Romney points out, "a good home is a very vital need."

MOBILIZATION STRESSED

A year ago, when Gov. Francis S. Sargent of Massachusetts similarly called attention to the housing crisis, one response came from the executive director of Boston's Urban League. Melvin H. King, a longtime advocate of better housing both in New England and in the South, wrote:

"If you say it is an emergency, then you would call out the National Guard and mobilize all the resources of the commonwealth to solve the problem. Now, if there really was a 'state of emergency,' you would 'draft' all the architects, engineers, building construction people, bankers, and insurance companies and mount a massive program that would have housing built on around-the-clock basis."

Mr. Romney contends the job could be done "if the nation is convinced it should be done." But he admits: "We have not made the commitment to meet the housing and urban needs that we made in the space program earlier. If we are going to get the job done, it's going to take that sort of a commitment."

Other housing experts note, as does Secretary Romney, that such a commitment becomes more likely as more and more Americans are hit by shortages and appalling costs. There's little doubt also among public officials that unless there is noticeable relief, housing is bound to become a powerful political issue.

\$421 BILLION NEEDED?

To meet the goal set for the remaining 8 years of the 10-year period will cost (excluding land) an estimated \$421 billion: \$20 billion for mobile homes, \$321 billion for private housing, and \$80 billion for government-subsidized units and rehabilitations.

Mobile homes, once dismissed as a real alternative to home-buying, are perhaps the best gauge of how severe the housing crunch has become. Business is booming in the mobile-home industry.

Typically, a mobile home sells for about \$6,000 including furnishings and drapes, though some more elegant units can total \$15,000 to \$20,000 or more. Even the 12x60 unit for \$6,000, however, is much homier than the camp trailers that used to characterize mobile living as gypsy living.

With sales over the 400,000 mark in 1969—and expected to top that this year—mobile homes made up 90 percent of all homes sold for under \$17,500. Future growth depends somewhat on developing more mobile-home parks which, in turn, depends largely on overcoming the sleazy reputation that parks have in some areas.

PARK IMPROVEMENT NOTED

Offensive parks, in fact, still exist. But new developments are much more likely to resemble the "Colonial Mobile Manor" of Olen and Carmen Dalton in San Jose, Calif.

To rate its five stars in Woodall's Mobile Home Park Directory, the manor abides by such requirements as having wide paved streets, curbs and landscaping, attractive entrance and recreation hall, modern homes with porches and foundation "skirts," and facilities like a swimming pool, shuffleboard, etc.

Communities also complain that parks do not pay taxes equal to the burdens they place on local services. Park owners hotly retallate by pointing out that although mobile homeowners pay only a personal-property tax rather than a real-estate tax, the park itself pays local taxes (collected by renting its lots).

"Parks pay more than their share," insists Mrs. Dalton. "Since the park is private property, the community does not have to worry about upkeep. Parks pave their own streets, put in their own fireplugs, provide their own police patrol."

In addition, most mobile-home residents are either young couples without children or with preschool children, or retirees. In neither case would they add to the burden of the local school system.

CLUBLIKE ATMOSPHERE

Mr. and Mrs. Dalton are complete converts to mobile-home living. They enjoy the country-clublike atmosphere which sets their park—and the park's rents—a notch above the average parks. Most of their plots, prepared for "double-wide" units, rent for \$77 to \$84 a month. Median monthly fee in the nation was between \$30 and \$39 in 1969, according to Woodall.

California alone has 4,800 mobile-home parks—about a fifth of the nation's total—with a heavy concentration in the San Jose area, which is also the fastest growing urban area in the United States. But there remains an acute need for family parks that provide playground and recreational facilities for children. So here, as in apartments, families feel the pinch more.

House-hunting for any individual has never been easy. When the hassle of moving is over, it's natural to sigh, "I've got mine," and then forget others.

Now that "others" are quickly becoming a majority of the nation's population, it remains to be seen whether fierce competition for limited and sometimes dreary living quarters will polarize the combatants—pitting against each other students, families, senior citizens, minority groups, and middle-class Americans—or whether the nation can rally support to tackle housing woes at all levels.

To date, the trend is toward polarization. And housing promises to explode as a divisive issue instead of the broad-based problem that it actually is.

70 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE ON 2 PERCENT OF LAND

(By Merelice Kundrat)

CHICAGO.—Out in Western Kansas, far from the flurry of urban chaos and in the midst of acres and acres of farmland, Paul V. Johnson lives 18 miles from the nearest town. The next farmhouse is 1½ miles down the road.

In the prairie, short, wiry Charles Todd raises cattle and grows wheat and soybeans on a farm settled in 1876 by his grandfather.

These men know what is meant when the United States is described as "land rich." The level of density—number of houses or people per acre—is not a problem where they live.

And yet, Mr. Todd and Mr. Johnson are part of this nation's housing crisis. They both have children (seven and three, respectively) who have left the farm. As college students, as new families, as new urban dwellers, many farm children illustrate the shifting national population.

With modern farm equipment, it takes fewer and fewer workers to run larger and larger farms. The average age of farmers gets higher while young people turn to the cities for jobs.

All Americans would have to group into an area the size of Texas and Oklahoma combined to match the density of West Germany or Britain, says the 1968 report of the President's Committee on Urban Housing. And anyone crossing this nation would certainly wonder why housing experts talk about land shortages, land demands, and the high cost of land.

POPULATION IMBALANCE

But housing gets built where the jobs are—in our near urban areas. About 70 percent of the population is piled on 2 percent of the land.

That makes the city land story different. Miles of new highways cut wide swaths through what used to be urban residential areas. City land that could help solve the housing crunch is turned into outdoor parking lots—again showing more deference for the car than for people.

And in city after city that has seen the ravages of urban "renewal," empty land stands idle while housing-development funds dry up because of rising construction costs, or red tape snarls people's hopes that better homes that they can afford will be built where their old ones were razed.

Los Angeles sprawls blankets with houses and highways whatever natural loveliness once existed. Land is used, misused, abused, and expensive.

As part of the soaring cost of an average single family house, land has leaped from 11 percent in 1950, to 18 percent in 1960, to 25 percent in 1970. In dollar amounts, that means an average house lot jumped from \$1,144 to \$2,808 to \$6,200 in those 10- and 20-year periods.

The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB), which compiles such statistics, explains that galloping increases are due in part to higher costs of land improvements—putting in streets, curbs, sewage pipes, and underground utility lines.

LAND-COST SPIRAL CITED

Some specific examples of the dizzy land-cost spiral during the last 10 years: a house lot in Boston up from \$3,694 to \$9,210; Dayton, Ohio, from \$3,589 to \$8,228; Beaumont, Texas, from \$2,309 to \$5,294; Lafayette, Calif., from \$5,090 to \$10,752; and metropolitan Washington from \$4,353 to \$9,268.

There are at least two aspects to land problems: finding land and then putting it to good use. In both aspects, people first need to be convinced there is in fact a problem.

"It has been said that the United States has no shortage of land," wrote Max S. Wehrly, former executive director of the Urban

Land Institute, in the Professional Builder. "I think the continuation of this notion—as it applies to urban areas especially—has been responsible for much of our wasteful and inefficient use of land for urban purposes. It's time we revised our thinking in this respect."

George Romney, secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) agrees: "People generally in this country don't think we have a land problem yet. The people who have to buy a lot to build a house—they do. But then they forget about it."

To reach the national goal set in 1968 of adding 26 million badly needed housing units by 1978, an estimated 8 million acres of land could be needed. If land costs continue to shoot up, that could be a major obstacle to a goal that already seems unlikely after only two years of the 10-year program.

TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Improved transportation networks—enabling people to go greater distances to their jobs—can open up land formerly too remote for housing. But that raises questions not only about the distances people are willing to commute daily, but also about community planning and how best to use the land.

Entire new towns complete with their own employment opportunities are on the drawing board. And little by little, planners no longer are cutting automatically an acre of land into four squares and stripping them bare to make room for four houses.

Scattered throughout this nation are imaginative examples of houses tastefully clustered together so residents can enjoy sweeping spaces and recreational facilities on land that otherwise would have been eaten up by housing sprawl.

But the nation still is a long way from being convinced that the American dream of a one-family house on its own quarter acre of land can be improved.

Inevitably tied in with the question of land use is the practice of zoning. Zoning regulations were devised mainly to protect residential areas from the intrusion of industry.

But they now protect certain kinds of residents from other kinds of residents—often in the name of the right to self-government.

Chicago attorney Richard F. Babcock, who wrote the book entitled "The Zoning Game," predicts zoning will become an even more complex issue in the courts than school desegregation.

"I am absolutely firmly convinced," says Mr. Babcock, "that there will be no major change in zoning locally until the court does take a stand." He further indicates the issue will be untidy and chaotic.

The power to regulate local zoning—which in turn has resulted in keeping out the elderly, young couples, and others who cannot afford housing limited to two-acre plots—is derived from the state. And Mr. Babcock confesses to being uncomfortable about letting people preserve their own way of life by using a government law meant to promote the "general welfare" of its citizens. He maintains that general welfare is broader than the private decision of a community arbitrarily to outlaw higher density on its land.

Though land costs account for the most inflationary portion of house prices (and are probably the most ignored portion), it is not the whole story. There also are the rising costs of construction materials and labor (sometimes lumped together as "structure"), overhead and profit for the developer, and financing (initially for the builder and then the buyer).

BUILDERS, LABOR INDIGNANT

Working with what statistics it can compile, NAHB has developed its "best estimates possible" for the breakdown of the cost of a single-family house. NAHB's data show that, while the dollar amounts of all aspects of

house prices have gone up, the structure and the overhead and profit have declined as a percent of the total cost.

In fact, both builders and organized labor are especially indignant when they are blamed for the high cost of housing.

"The actual cost of constructing a house," counters Louis R. Barba, president of NAHB, "has risen slower than the cost of living over the past 10 years." He insists that "money is by far the principal problem facing housing today."

Financing the construction of a house has in fact increased from \$1,070 in 1960 to \$2,900 in 1970, from 7 percent of total building cost to 12 percent, NAHB statistics show.

Echoing Mr. Barba are two labor leaders.

"Labor wages are not comparable to other factors creating the housing shortage," maintains John E. Evans, director of the AFL-CIO's department of urban affairs. He insists that high interest rates on mortgage loans inhibit housing production more than any other factor.

In addition to high interest rates, the increasing costs of land and construction materials also are to blame for the housing shortage, says Peter Terzick, general treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

HOUSING PRODUCTION

Still, average, hourly earnings and fringe benefits in the building trades have climbed in the last five years from \$5.40 to \$7.51. Mr. Evans emphasizes, however, that building tradesmen rarely work year-round. On the other hand, he does not point out that overtime work to make up for the very things that hold back year-round construction is not uncommon.

Both small builders and organized labor insist that when the problem of high interest rates is brought under control, conventional on-site construction will get into full gear again. There is no doubt that they are right—and that the housing-production will enjoy a much-needed upturn.

But if past experience is any indication, the upturn will not be enough. It might result in a surplus of certain kinds of houses (mainly those for upper-middle-income buyers). But many people in lower-income brackets still won't have decent places to live at prices they can afford.

Resistance to streamlining housing production in the factory crops up from a collection of fears. Small builders—the backbone of the housing industry—actually have done an exceptional job in the past and do not want to be driven out by the big corporations now entering the housing business.

ARCHAIC BUILDING CODES

Union construction workers—already wary of the vagaries of one-site jobs being dependent on weather, deliveries of construction materials, and a healthy building rate—view factory-built housing as still another threat rather than a way to stabilize their own jobs into year-round employment.

One way in which unions can exercise some influence against mass production is by supporting archaic building codes. Like zoning, building codes started out as a needed protection.

No one wants to move into a house that could collapse or is fire prone. But with some 5,000 different codes in the nation—each developed and administered by the local building inspector—new, cost-saving materials and building methods often don't get the chance to prove themselves. And union members with outdated skills lobby to preserve old materials and methods sometimes to the detriment of housing improvements.

Lou Chaffman, executive vice-president of the Builders Association of Greater Boston, suggests that codes should specify performance

rather than specific materials. Many building materials might accomplish the same strength and safety, he notes.

Mass production, of course, is hindered by variations of, for example, some 76 different codes for the towns and cities in Greater Boston and the 85 different codes in the Chicago area.

CONTRACTS SIGNED

Gradually, however, union resistance is being tempered somewhat as unions sign precedent-setting national contracts with industrialized housing manufacturers to provide union labor in the factory and at the site of assembly.

If this nation sets out in earnest to accomplish its goal of 26 million housing units, today's labor shortage—which already enables unions to bargain for sizable salary increases—will be mild compared to future need.

The housing industry, especially if it moves significantly into the factory, could be one of the nation's most promising fields for providing training and work to the unemployed.

Bringing together labor, big business, and local communities that are willing to study zoning and building codes is unlikely to bring about major reductions in the cost of housing. But such cooperation could deal with the other side of the housing-problem coin—simply, the drastic need for more of it. Eliminating some fears and restrictions could help spur the rate of housing production.

How Do Homes Become Just Plain Slums?

(By Merilee Kundratik)

WASHINGTON.—Jeremy was wading in the water on a sunny day, happily kicking up splashes.

His play area was the gutter in a slum section of this hot, teeming city. The water came from a fire hydrant. Jeremy's family lives in some of Washington's crowded, substandard slum housing.

The scene can be repeated across the United States. Tourists come to see San Francisco's cable-car hills, elegant shops at Ghirardelli Square, and bustling Fisherman's Wharf. But on a not-too-distant hill, with a magnificent view to rival any of the city's tourist hills, sits Hunters Point project, dreary and dilapidated World War II "temporary" housing, still in use.

Slum housing of itself isn't "news" in the sense of being a novel discovery. But out of the compaction of many people into small areas of this nation's cities comes news daily—news of crime, drug and alcohol abuse, of sickness and mortality rates, of poor race relations, and of poor job-training, education, and employment opportunities.

There is nothing particularly mysterious about how slum housing gets that way. But neither is the process as simple as some would like to believe.

MANY FACTORS INVOLVED

Slum housing cannot be blamed, for example, just on lazy, uneducated, or destructive residents. Nor simply on profit-milking, absentee landlords. Nor only on inadequate city services for overcrowded areas. Nor on insurance companies and banks that "red line" a neighborhood as a bad risk. Nor just on suburban "snob zoning" which prevents families of lower incomes from choosing to move to better housing.

They are all involved. They are all to blame. They all must be changed together for genuine progress.

Of this nation's 66 million housing units, more than 10 percent are substandard, four million lack indoor plumbing, and 2.7 million are in dilapidated condition. (A house is classified as substandard if it is: (a) sound but lacking full plumbing; (b) deteriorating and lacking full plumbing; (c) dilapidated.)

The 1960 census figures showed that the percentage of nonwhites occupying substandard housing was 58.9 in Pittsburgh, 56.9 in New Orleans, 51.6 in St. Louis, 45.9 in Dallas, 42.8 in Chicago, and 42.4 here in New York. The 1970 census will of course update these statistics.

New York's "refugees in residence"—more simply known as squatters—talk readily not only about struggles to find decent housing but also about overcrowding in standard units.

NOWHERE—TO GO

Samuel and Janice Jackson and their five-month-old son were living with Mr. Jackson's family—eight people in five rooms. For three months after the baby's birth, Mrs. Jackson looked for housing they could afford.

Then in July, they simply moved into a four-room, fifth floor walk-up which was being kept vacant on East 11th Street.

"I don't know of any apartments under \$300—unless you want junk," says Mrs. Jackson. "People are here because they have nowhere else to go—not because it's just something to do."

A five-year resident in the same building, Miss Susan Hirsch, says she is glad the squatters filled empty apartments.

"Empty apartments," she explains, "are vulnerable to derelicts and prostitutes. They encourage others to leave. This is a good building which shouldn't be deserted."

MANY FAMILIES WAITING

A "good building" by New York standards would shock visitors. It can be old, dark, crowded. But if it is still solid and clean, it is "good."

The neighborhood is being considered for higher density zoning. So this building's landlord is said to be leaving apartments vacant because he hopes to tear down the building and replace it with a high-rise—which his present tenants couldn't afford.

With 130,000 families on a waiting list for New York's public housing, the desperation of squatters is being viewed here with some toleration. Most squatters, furthermore, pay rent even before landlords request it.

Some suggestions proffered by Mrs. Frances Goldin, vice-chairman of the Metropolitan Council on Housing, apply equally to other cities where similar suggestions often are made:

Call a moratorium on housing demolition. Open up the 50,000 abandoned units in the city, most of which, she contends, are sound structures.

Build for low- and middle-income families on every piece of vacant or badly used land. Mrs. Goldin cites such examples of badly used land as abandoned warehouses and schools, parking lots, and "four corners with four gas stations at one intersection."

BUILDINGS DESERTED

Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington, and Boston are among other major cities suffering the scourge of abandoned buildings which—if they aren't already—quickly become rundown and a source of increasing neighborhood blight.

Such abandonment is most usually blamed on those landlords who have gotten what profits they want out of a building which they would then rather desert than fix up.

What is supposed to happen instead is a process known in the housing field as "filtering." As a house ages, its inhabitants move on to more expensive housing. Then the house passes down to the next economic level.

But for the filtering process to work to everyone's advantage, houses at all price levels must be available.

With today's housing crunch, the prices even of decaying houses are climbing. Moreover, if the transfer is from a white owner to a black, the price goes still higher since

housing shortage for a black is aggravated by discrimination outside ghetto areas. He often has no choice except to live in a ghetto.

URBAN RENEWAL INVOLVED

When poor families move into a changing neighborhood, they often must double up to afford the rents. Also, urban-renewal programs have torn down more units than have so far been replaced—forcing additional overcrowding in what remains.

Meanwhile such city services as street cleaning and garbage pickup usually remain at the same level for two to three times the number of dwellers.

Inadequate city services, aging houses going unrepaired, and poverty itself—having to choose between buying cleanser or food for the baby—can make cleanliness hard to come by in the slums, even for people who earn their living as domestics and custodians.

As recently as three years ago, it was impossible to obtain house insurance, mortgage insurance, or home-improvement financing in racially changing or deteriorating neighborhoods. While it is still a problem, some insurance companies and banks now are trying to reverse, instead of foster, this galloping pace toward squalor and abandonments.

ENDING RURAL SQUALOR

ELK GROVE, CALIF.—Farm worker Oscar Romero, his wife, Martha, and their seven children used to live crammed into four rundown, small rooms—till they came here to build their own house.

Without question, migrant farm workers are often the most wretchedly housed in the United States. They are among the 14 million rural Americans—including American Indians and Appalachian whites—living in shacks, hovels, tents, and car bodies.

While this series is focusing largely on urban-suburban housing needs, the lack of attention given shabby rural housing should be noted. Alleviation of rural squalor could stem some of the migration which substantially increases the city's burdens.

One modest program, however, looms as a major development in rural housing today. Small clusters of migrant workers from Florida to California are getting together to help each other build their own places to live.

MUCH TO LEARN

It's a long haul. There's a lot to learn about building, and much of the construction must be done by floodlight at night when workers are not out harvesting crops.

Women and children pitch in when they can during the long months of construction. Last New Year's, on a drizzly cold day here, migrants worked on their houses.

Is it worth it?

"Oh yes," smiles Mr. Romero without hesitation. His wife happily nods agreement.

Now it is a languid, hot August day. Mrs. Romero shows her visitor around the four-bedroom home which the family moved into just three weeks previously. She chats quietly, easily—about how she helped build, how much the bedroom space means to her and her children, how she'd like to fix the backyard, how she enjoys her modern kitchen.

When she returns to her family in the dining area, Mrs. Romero resumes speaking Spanish. They are Mexican-Americans.

Down the street, Antonio Guzman is still working on the finishing touches of his house—varnishing baseboard strips.

"If it were not for this self-help program," he stresses, "I would never own a home. A farm worker would never make that much."

Mr. Guzman was elected board member of the local nonprofit corporation set up to receive the funds that make self-help housing possible. There are some 26 such groups across the nation. A year ago there were only about 15 groups. Each group might sponsor several small developments such as

the 17 houses here in Sacramento Valley's Elk Grove. The houses must be built in communities with populations under 5,500.

The self-help program is funded by the federal government's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), mostly through its migrant division. In cooperation with the Farmers Home Administration of the Agriculture Department, OEO has been a major spur to helping the rural poor get housing.

TRAINING PROVIDED

The OEO provides community organizers to get interested and qualified families together. Then it provides technical, financial, and maintenance training and supervision of the 8 to 12 migrant families who want to build their houses.

The families work as a team. No one goes ahead on his house until each stage is completed on every house—with the workers moving as a group from foundation to foundation, flooring to flooring, erecting walls on one house then the next, etc.

Work by the migrants is called "sweat equity" and is accepted in lieu of a down payment. About 1,000 to 1,500 hours of labor are credited with \$2,000 to \$4,000 worth of sweat equity.

"They don't walk away from a home when they've put that much work into it," notes F. Mike Cardenas, energetic executive director of the housing corporation here.

Mortgage credit to pay for the land and building materials comes from the Farmers Home Administration. In California, a four-bedroom self-help house could cost just \$7,500 plus sweat equity.

Last year, Congress also appropriated \$2.125 million through the Farmers Home Administration for technical assistance, thus supplementing the OEO's work. But as desperately as the money is needed, it has yet to get spent. Critics charge that the Farmers Home Administration sets unrealistic and restrictive qualification guidelines not only for the technical-assistance funds, but sometimes also for the mortgage credit.

At the same time, there is general recognition that:

The Farmers Home Administration is grossly understaffed.

A single Farmers Home Administration county agent must administer 26 different loan programs.

Only one of these loan programs deals with the self-help, low-income housing program.

Cooperation from the Farmers Home Administration depends largely on the inclinations of local county agents, some of whom dislike working with poor and minority groups.

Other county agents place low priority on the program merely because, until recently, housing was a minuscule part of the Farmers Home Administration budget and they still are geared more to the farming and agricultural needs of farm owners.

With an estimated OEO funding since 1965 of some \$8 million, 1,146 self-help housing units have been built, 606 are under construction, and 612 mortgage applications are being processed.

But when one talks about 500,000 migrant workers—with more than half the nation's substandard housing in rural areas—2,000 new homes constitute just a start. Still, it exceeds in number the 1,600 units now slated for the Nixon administration's much-touted, technologically experimental "Operation Breakthrough."

PROGRAM CRITICIZED

In fact, over 100 participants at a 1969 national rural-housing conference called Breakthrough "an endless pursuit of some technological Holy Grail which it is hoped will enable us to house the poor without 'cost.'" They concluded:

"We remain convinced that housing the poor is more a political than technological problem. We are skeptical of the prospects

of any cost-cutting breakthroughs being as significant as an end to the moral inertia which prevents the public, the President, and the Congress from launching an adequate housing program."

In short, those committed to alleviating this nation's hideous rural housing feel as frustrated as those fighting for decent urban housing.

MANY A WOLF ON THE WAY TO GRANDMA'S HOUSE

(By Merelice Kundrat)is

WASHINGTON.—Tight money brought the housing crisis to the middle-class American. And the housing shortage could become an explosive political issue.

It is not surprising, therefore, that tight money is one of the first aspects of the housing crisis that the Nixon administration tackled with its recently signed Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. Of course the federal government has taken other steps to lessen the severity of the housing crisis. But the money question came first.

While many housing and economic observers say it is "too optimistic" to expect a significant drop in mortgage-interest rates—which in some areas are up to 9½ and 10 percent—even having more money available for home mortgages is an improvement.

A spokesman here at the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) described the administration's simultaneous bouts with inflation and the housing shortage.

LONG-TERM LOAN SOUGHT

When Mr. American home buyer wants a mortgage, he most often goes to a savings-and-loan institution or a mutual savings bank. He is looking for a long-term loan. The institutions, in turn, get their money through savings accounts that are short-term.

If the saving public can get a higher return elsewhere, for example on corporate bonds, the savings that ordinarily go into those savings institutions that provide mortgage money is sidetracked to better investments.

The demand for what mortgage money is left drives up interest rates. And, in fact, mortgage money can virtually run out regardless of what anyone is willing to pay for it.

When inflation hits, a government usually tightens money throughout the economy—cuts its flow and raises its prices. The first victim of a tight-money policy is housing. So while maintaining a generally strong anti-inflation stance, the administration also is channeling money into the home-mortgage market with emergency home-finance measures.

MONEY PUMPED INTO MARKET

Through three agencies—Fannie Mae, Ginnie Mae, and the Federal Home Loan Bank system—more than \$12 billion has been pumped into the mortgage market since the start of this administration in 1969, says the HUD financial spokesman. (Fannie Mae and Ginnie Mae are HUD's pet names for FNMA, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and GNMA, the Government National Mortgage Association.)

One of these three agencies might buy up old mortgages, thereby providing money to lending institutions for new mortgages. Or it might loan money directly to a savings institution, again providing another source of mortgage money besides savings accounts.

In addition to authorizing funds for these functions, the Emergency Home Financing Act expands the types of home mortgages that can be so bolstered. And in an unusual program the act also provides a three-year annual subsidy of \$105 million for middle-income families, bringing borrowing rates down to 7 percent in some cases.

Without question, however, curbing infla-

tion is priority No. 1. And George W. Romney, Secretary of HUD, concurs with President Nixon's Aug. 11 veto of the HUD bill (which the House subsequently sustained).

Congress had appropriated \$3.643 billion for housing programs—\$650 million more than the administration's requested \$2.993 billion.

While the administration's request had increased appropriations for certain subsidized housing programs over last year, it did not break the mold of according relatively low priority to this nation's acute housing need. During his term, the President has vetoed four bills as being inflationary—all of them for domestic programs.

Administration emphasis is largely on home-ownership programs and encouraging private builders in the housing field—even for public housing. As with former administrations, this one faces a congressional reluctance to fund programs for the poor.

Morton A. Baruch, director of HUD's low- and moderate-income housing division, notes that mortgaging and rent-supplement programs for moderate- or middle-income families have a history of getting funded. Low-income subsidies usually get sliced.

One housing program on which the administration's request was cut back by Congress is Operation Breakthrough. Most of the ballyhoo about Breakthrough is because the program encourages better technology to get houses built and promotes a big-business approach to developing a national market for industrialized housing.

When the nation can reach the moon, and industry can roll major items off a mass-production line, what's delaying housing? This is the question that challenges and excites industry.

But another aspect of Breakthrough could be even more crucial to this nation's housing health: planning.

PLANNING ESSENTIAL

Without planning, better technology and marketing could simply speed up past mistakes—hastening housing sprawl or piling the poor on top of each other more quickly.

Alfred A. Perry, national director of Operation Breakthrough, stresses that "good planning means a community provides for the entire life span of its citizens." It also allows, he says, "for people to live, work, and play in the same community."

Few argue against the logic of his statements. But when it comes to specific steps, such community planning would require a change of heart that would mean:

Suburbs like Newton, Mass., would fight for, instead of against, low-income housing for the elderly.

Posh towns like Lincoln, Mass., would zone for apartments that its own schoolteachers could afford instead of restricting building to expensive single-family houses on two-acre plots.

Communities like San Jose, Calif., would allow, rather than voting to block, public housing for poor Mexican-Americans who labor at nearby farms.

SHOWCASE EXAMPLES

By providing showcase examples for people to see, Mr. Perry maintains, Breakthrough will demonstrate that good planning is to a community's advantage. It is hoped this will enable communities to realize:

Industrialized (factory-produced) housing is safe, attractive, and no more expensive than conventional housing.

This housing can be built swiftly and efficiently, and on a year-round basis.

Land for such sports as riding, golfing, and hiking could be available nearby if housing were clustered rather than sprawled in "cookie cutter" fashion.

Various types of housing can blend well and that a community can provide housing for all its citizens—laborers as well as law-

yers—families, single careerists, young couples, and retirees.

Some states—such as California, New York, Michigan, and Massachusetts—are taking significant steps toward housing breakthroughs by legislating statewide building codes that preempt local codes, charging suburban communities to help provide low- and moderate-income housing, and by floating sizable bond issues to finance home building.

While housing and urban experts generally admit there is some good legislation on the books, they still contend that the commitment and funding fall woefully short of the crying need.

PIONEERING BUILDERS FIND PIONEERING BUYERS

(By Merelice Kundrat)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Mrs. Carey contends that prefab housing is cheap and temporary.

Mr. Morgan thinks trailer parks consist of transient campers who ruin a community.

Mr. and Mrs. Jennings are afraid that the federal government's Operation Breakthrough housing program will dump poor people on their doorstep.

Misconceptions like these make innovations hard to come by in the housing industry. And housing innovators—in the face of such criticism—have become defensive.

Manufacturers of factory-produced housing, for example, shy away from the word "prefab" and its negative connotation of ugly, postwar housing. Instead, they talk about "industrialized" housing.

Olen and Carmen Dalton in San Jose, Calif.—and other owner-managers like them—resent having their attractive mobile-home park called a trailer park. Some mobile-home fanciers refer to their homes as "relocatable" rather than "mobile."

City, state, and federal officials of Operation Breakthrough stress the benefits of the program for the whole community—not just for low-income residents.

SKEPTICS ON HAND

Changes that capture attention (and controversy) in housing production today most often are linked with technological advances—updating "horse and buggy" techniques. But like the early days of the car, many skeptics of factory-built housing are hooting the equivalent of, "Get a horse!"

In housing terms, that could include: Leave building codes alone! Make mine single-family with an acre of grass around it! Don't use any new kinds of building materials! Work carefully! (that means slowly).

David Stirling Jr. of Stirling Homex Corporation (a major modular-housing producer) puts it this way: "There must be pioneer consumers for pioneering industries."

Mobile homes were unquestionably the forerunner of "boxes," modules, or sections, as the factory-produced units are variously called.

There are other, in fact more flexible types of industrialized housing such as component parts with columns, frames, floors, and wall panels.

But finding a lot of buyers for industrialized housing—enough to make mass-production profitable—must be preceded by widespread education and promotion. That's only one of the aims of Operation Breakthrough, the administration's program to encourage factory-built housing by setting up showcase sites, evaluating and certifying them, and developing new markets for them.

Almost from the start, Operation Breakthrough ran into trouble on its showcase sites—even though it was thought the 11 sites chosen from among 218 proposals would be bursting their buttons with pride. But local ire percolated over misconceptions that the housing would be "cheap" and that it was exclusively for low-income residents (some of it is).

In fact, perhaps one of the more disappointing conclusions drawn so far about industrialized housing is that it might not save money at all. Often what is gained by bulk purchases of materials is lost by transportation costs to the site of assembly.

So the speed with which housing is produced in the factory could be its most valuable contribution.

In a recent interview, George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), insisted that local resistance to Operation Breakthrough diminished when "we gave them the facts."

OBJECTIONS VOICED

Still, when Congress cut HUD's budget for research and technology (President Nixon then later vetoed, for further cuts, what Congress passed), the two most angry communities were the first Operation Breakthrough sites to go—sites near Wilmington, Del., and Houston.

Showcase sites that remain will demonstrate multifamily and single-family units; low-rise, medium-rise, and high-rise housing; garden apartments; and town houses. The sites are in Jersey City, N.J.; Memphis, Tenn.; St. Louis, Mo.; Seattle, Wash. (two sites); Kalamazoo, Mich.; Macon, Ga.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and here in Sacramento, Calif.

Walter J. Slupe, Sacramento's assistant city manager, explained—while driving around the site—why he thought the former state fairground was acceptable to both HUD and the local neighbors. Out the car window—behind a high wire fence—stretched flat, unkempt land with overgrown weeds, a dead tree grove, and unfinished demolition.

Mr. Slupe noted that the site is: Rundown enough so that the community looks forward to its being upgraded.

Not so rundown that it is beyond hope.

In the city with utilities, medical facilities, sewage lines, and transportation already available.

Open land which the state was willing to sell and which will not involve any displacement of people.

For all Operation Breakthrough's limitations, including dwindling of production from 3,000 to 1,600 units, the program still draws praise from its participating housing producers. Homex's Mr. Stirling says Operation Breakthrough attacks "tremendous attention to housing and identifying the need for changes."

Stirling Homex Corporation has already successfully identified its paying market—multi-family town houses—and its major consumer, government-assisted programs. The company has projects in 10 states and recently shipped modules by rail all the way to Corinth, Miss., from its Avon, N.Y., plant.

But Homex actually has stuck with traditional materials and styles so that its units abide by local building codes. In Rochester, N.Y., people living in Homex town houses didn't realize (and didn't mind when they found out) that their homes were factory built.

Mrs. Annie Floyd simply said about her home: "I'm crazy about it. I couldn't ask for more." She and her three children moved into their five-room Homex town house from what she described as a "filthy," two-room apartment where they had had to share the bath in the hallway.

Acceptance of building methods that are more out of the ordinary is slower in coming as Neil B. Mitchell Jr. of Neil Mitchell Associates in Cambridge, Mass., can attest. His time-consuming experience of meeting obstacles in a Detroit housing plan showed that an open market for different—although tested—building procedures was not around the corner.

PRODUCTS PROVED

However, in Lancaster, Pa., Mr. Mitchell found what Homex found in Akron, Ohio, "pioneer consumers for pioneering indus-

tries." And this enabled them to prove their products.

Hartford, Conn., is running a kind of mini-Breakthrough project of its own by comparing four types of industrialized housing with conventional housing. From its 10 scattered sites, the city expects to learn about costs, materials, labor, and length of construction time.

HUD correctly hopes that industrialized housing will double this nation's present housing production very soon. The need is at least that great to begin to catch up with the nation's stated goal of 26 million units added by 1978.

For all the promise the factory holds, however, the President's Committee on Urban Housing noted less than two years ago: "We only caution that such systems do not offer a broad and universal cure for housing ills in a free society."

Slow acceptance of new ideas is discouraging. But even more discouraging is the limited scope of those innovations which do exist. Few people, compared with the total overwhelming need, are touched by them.

Meanwhile, conventional builders point out that they, too, are always updating their onsite procedures—including using prebuilt parts. Small-volume builders are still the back-bone of housing construction—65 percent of all builders in 1969 each built less than 25 single-family houses.

ROOM FOR BOTH

Major companies now involved in housing—companies like General Electric, U.S. Steel, Westinghouse, Alcoa—bring new elements to the housing industry. These include ability to tap new financing available to such corporations (outside the traditional mortgage market), management techniques and efficiency not found in smaller builders, and large-scale marketing experience.

It is too soon to tell whether housing will be taken over by big business. So far, the trend has not been strong. And in fact, given the nation's acute housing shortage, there is room—and need—for both conventional and industrialized builders.

One can assume the administration will continue to emphasize the necessity to put a lid on inflation, the steps it is taking to ease the tight money situation in home mortgages, and the role of private enterprise and big business in housing.

If so, the nation can anticipate construction of more middle-income housing and a stabilization of costs. But with the majority of Americans then settled once again, there could still remain no broad-based commitment to:

Develop rural areas sufficiently to stem migration.

Halt unplanned suburban sprawl (unless the ecologists discover housing and land planning as they have detergents, automobile exhaust, and dirty furnaces).

Rid the cities of rotting decay and overcrowding.

Put decent housing within economic grasp of all the poor.

Encourage use of new materials and building methods.

In short, recognize—and make politically popular—the concept that the accessibility of well-planned, varied housing in rural areas, the suburbs, and the cities is a goal worth spending for.

GROWING TREES FOR AN EXPANDING POPULATION

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I marvel over the flexibility of America's

rural people and their ability to meet changing conditions with new ideas and new directions. In my State of Arkansas, these traits, reminiscent of pioneer ingenuity, are reflected by the agricultural families who are keeping pace with demands placed upon them by a changing economy and society. Planning and management reveals the kind of thinking that will meet their needs and that of the country today and in the years ahead.

As an example, a lot of Arkansas farmers have moved into production of timber in an unprecedented number, indicating their long view of the future both from an economic and an environmental outlook. This is a crop which was given scant attention until after World War II, but today is a booming reality that will help maintain many rural communities as the timber matures and enters the national market. In 1950 only 251 tree farms were counted in Arkansas, and as of this year the 2,000th Arkansas tree farm is being commemorated.

Tree farms not only provide income to the landowner, but develop the industries and communities which are required to process and distribute the wood products. With this type of resource development rural America, particularly in my State, is going to have a better chance to grow and take its place within the improving decade of the 1970's.

This comparatively new endeavor is a result of individual private initiative combined with State and Federal cooperation—an outstanding instance of what the future can hold for the country in other phases of our national life.

Dedication of the 2,000th tree farm in Cleveland County, Ark., on September 16 was indeed a milestone to which we can all offer our jubilant applause. Other States may well follow the example of my State because the demand for timber by the year 2000 will be enormous. Nearly 70 percent more softwood and 40 percent more hardwood will be needed only a generation and a half from now, compared with the 1968 output.

I was pleased to note that executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture Fritz Behrens was present at the 2,000th tree farm dedication and delivered the address that spelled out the unprecedented development which is receiving the commendations of not only State and Federal officials but private industry and the American Forest Institute as well.

For the information of my colleagues and rural development officials in other regions I call attention to the report presented by Mr. Behrens at the dedication which I submit herewith for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GROWING TREES FOR AN EXPANDING POPULATION

Many with us today are tree farmers and foresters; many of you are land owners; and most of you, I'm sure, are more than a little concerned about the future of our land and our environment.

I hope that what I have to say may be of interest to all of you.

That all of us are here—tree farmers, foresters, land owners, farmers, businessmen, government officials like Virgil Cothren, your own State Forester, and myself, from the Federal level, is, I think, worth noting because the forests are important to all of us.

When many Americans think of forests today, they think of some place far off, miles away from their homes where the air is clear, where streams run clean and hillsides are softened with a deep green blanket.

Americans today are concerned about environment and there is concern that our forests may soon disappear, that our forest land will take on the appearance of an ill animal's mangy coat, and that there will soon be little land left where one can hear the constant movement of air thru pine trees, hear the rustle of leaves, or enjoy the brilliant hues of fall.

We must be concerned for our forests—just as we must be concerned for the rest of our environment; but we must not make the mistake of thinking that the only way to have our forests is to rope them off from man's use.

America's demands on her forests are greater today than at any time in her past—and our requirement for forest products and other values and uses continues to grow rapidly. But I don't think this need spell doom for our forests and I would like to tell you some of the reasons why I feel this way.

Let me begin by repeating a bit of history. Soon after he landed in the new world in 1607, Captain John Smith wrote home asking for permission to explore the vast commercial possibilities he saw in the forests.

Smith's request was granted and a few months later Polish and Dutch millwrights were hard at work in a crude sawmill at Jamestown; thus, America's first industry was born as logs for stockades, ships' hulls, decks and masts, furniture and wood for homes began to meet men's needs in the new world, not only in Virginia, but back in England.

It is an interesting comment on wood's versatility and universal appeal to man that many of these same needs are being fulfilled from our forests even today.

This forest, America's first forest, did much to stimulate the industrial revolution during the early 1800's when sawmills sprang up throughout the south to make lumber for churches, schools, roads, homes, factories and farms. Many of these buildings, now part of a proud heritage, are standing today.

But by 1909, a few years as history goes, Gifford Pinchot, the head of the United States Forest Service, predicted that America's forests were facing extinction. The end, he said, would come "by 1930 at the very latest."

Of course we know that despite the doom-sayers of the day, our forests have not vanished.

That they have not disappeared from the face of our nation is in great measure due to a farsighted young lumberman named Henry Hardtner, who with other men of vision, between 1910 and 1915, introduced the practice of forestry in the South and other parts of the Nation.

Hardtner's first forestry efforts began to turn the hillsides green again as men began to apply common sense to harvesting, reforestation, and as they learned that it would be profitable to grow trees.

So, contrary to earlier predictions, there was no funeral for the Southern Forest in 1930. By the 1930's, lumber production began to inch up and then soared to meet the requirements of World War II.

Heavy wartime demands were not a setback for the South's Second Forest because the tree farm movement, with the support of State Foresters and the Forest Service, promoted the practice of forestry by private landowners and aided them in obtaining technical assistance. In 1942, Arkansas, along with three other states, became the cornerstones of the American Tree Farm System.

By 1947, Col. W. B. Greeley, former chief of the United States Forest Service, was able to report after a tour of southern forest lands that "the southern forests are now

supplying a greater volume—and a greater value—of forest products than they ever yielded in the heyday of virgin timber."

Since Col. Greeley's report in 1947, production of pulpwood in the South has quadrupled, and production of southern pine lumber which declined in the 1950's began to rise.

I think the growth of the tree farm program here in Arkansas speaks rather well for the South. From 251 tree farms in 1950, the program expanded nearly four times to include 856 tree farms in 1960. Today, of course, we commemorate the 2,000th Arkansas Tree Farm.

In this February 10, 1970, message on Environmental Quality to Congress and the American people, President Nixon said:

"At the turn of the century, our chief environmental concern was to conserve what we had—and out of this concern grew the often embattled, but always determined, 'conservation' movement. Today, 'conservation' is as important as ever—but no longer is it enough to conserve what we have; we must also restore what we have lost."

The American tree farm movement is indeed a great step toward this goal.

The third Forest concept developed by the forest products industry of the South anticipated some of the goals set out by the President and the industry is indeed to be commended for its farsightedness—a tradition begun by Quincy Hardtner and carried forward by those who followed him.

The objective of the Third Forest is to increase growth of southern forests to meet year 2000 needs. Annual growth will have to total 13-billion cubic feet—nearly 70 percent more softwood and 40 percent more hardwood growth than in 1968. This must be achieved on a shrinking land base; in the face of increasing demands for clean air, clean water, beauty, wildlife, and recreation; and within a highly competitive labor market.

But the efforts by industry, by states, and by the Federal Government to meet the goals within this framework can't be emphasized too much. In the South, particularly, forest resource development and full use is of paramount importance, both for its own welfare and that of the Nation. It is the key to rural development and employment opportunities which can reverse the tide of migration to beleaguered cities.

However, the surface of full forest development and use has barely been scratched. So we must get on with the job now.

I would like to sketch a very brief picture of what we can expect in the way of demand for forest products in the years to come—from today through the next thirty years.

Our own United States Forest Service estimates project an 80 percent increase in the demand for forest products by the year 2000. Demands for pulpwood, plywood and veneer are expected to increase more than two-and-a-half times the 1962 level. And demands for lumber are expected to rise about 47 percent during this period.

When you look at where our timber comes from today, you learn that one-half of the wood harvested nationally comes from small, non-industrial private ownerships—owned by some 4 million people from all walks of life, including many absentee owners.

Some of these individuals—among the nearly four million of them—realize what all of us must learn if we are to meet tomorrow's forest products needs; that our forests can benefit all the people best when they support a wide range of multiple uses, including hunting and fishing, camping, wildlife management, watershed management and, of course, production of timber on a sustained yield basis to provide employment in local communities, and to produce the raw material to meet the housing needs of an expanding population.

We can enjoy all these things in our forests and have an adequate timber supply for future needs, but we must do two very important things.

We must bring additional land into managed timber production, and this means, for the most part, additional medium and small-sized tracts of privately owned land. It is in the area of privately owned land that we have the greatest opportunity to benefit from reforestation and scientific management.

Next, we must learn to manage all the forest land we have in the most efficient way possible—through genetic research, planting and harvesting techniques, and through more effective means of disease and insect control.

In the Department of Agriculture and other areas within the Federal Government we are at work on several fronts.

We have proposed a program of incentives to insure higher levels of forest production, management and environmental quality on non-industry, private lands.

This program would provide federally funded financial assistance to individuals who install certain timber production, wildlife, and environment enhancement projects.

The program is somewhat different from some of our other Departmental programs in that it is designed to increase production instead of reduce a surplus.

In the areas of genetic research, we have developed a cottonwood which matures in about one-third the time formerly required. This tree can be expected to flourish on about thirty percent of the forest land here in Arkansas. The results in terms of greater profitability and increased production are obvious.

The Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 provides funds to the states to provide forest management assistance, but the workload is too great and additional efforts must be devised to broaden this assistance. Also to be remembered is the fact that public initiative is meaningful only in terms of private enterprise. It is individual interests, responsibility, and anticipation of future forests that truly motivate our national interests.

Through its Tree Farm System, the American Forest Institute is working to provide programs for tree farmers in the areas of harvesting assistance, marketing assistance, and forest management.

I hope that I have made clear that while the Department of Agriculture shares the concern for our forests and environment, I feel that common sense by all of us, and wise forest management by those of us involved in timber production, can meet our physical needs while still providing us with the forest beauty it is our nature to enjoy—and which we have a right to expect.

Our forests, both public and private, with their trees and wildlife, are our one renewable resource. With care they can go on providing us with material for homes and wood products, as well as recreation benefits forever. No other raw material can make this claim!

We will continue to have communities of men on this earth and they will continue to need the wood of our forests for homes, for paper, for chemicals, and other wood products. The world's society consists of communities of people. Many of these communities produce trees. All of them depend on the simple wood fibre from the forests for the newspapers they read and the homes they live in.

Experience has shown us we need not rope off our land for one single use; we need to manage it well, for many uses. The dedication of this 2000th tree farm in Arkansas is evidence that we know there can be achieved a balance in the demands on and the production of the forests of America.

THE PASSING SHOW THE TRUTH ABOUT THE GREAT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, John Dienhart, the editor of the Economist Newspapers is a veteran journalist who has always kept news coverage in historical perspective. This is reflected in his column of Wednesday, September 23 in the Suburbanite Economist in which he reports on the interesting traits of a number of renown individuals:

THE PASSING SHOW—THE TRUTH ABOUT THE GREAT

(By John W. Dienhart)

Some idiosyncrasies of the great and near great:

While talking with a member of his cabinet, President Woodrow Wilson used to write limericks. He said his doing so enabled him to concentrate on the subject of their conversation.

President Herbert Hoover was a doodler. He scrawled geometric and other designs with a pencil while talking on the telephone.

President Theodore Roosevelt was so sensitive to criticism that when he had decided to propose a policy or project to Congress he first would invite a trusted Washington newspaper correspondent to listen to his ideas while he shaved. The correspondent would reveal the details in his dispatch to his paper, but he would attribute the authority to a "source close to the White House". If the proposal encountered Congressional or editorial opposition, Roosevelt would disclaim any knowledge of it. His scheme was called "a trial balloon".

Presidents Harry Truman and Warren G. Harding were avid poker players. They would invite poker-playing senators and congressmen to spend an evening in the White House and play until long after midnight. Congressman John Kluczynski was one of them.

President John F. Kennedy was a cigar smoker, but he never smoked in public. He was fearful a photographer would catch him with a long cheroot between his lips and that it would make him appear undignified. But in his Oval office in the White House he practised no such restraint.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower liked to cook vegetable soup and Brunswick stew. On fishing trips he would prepare a kettle of either, let it stand overnight and feed it to his companions the following day. Ike contended the taste was improved by allowing the mixture to marry overnight. Ike also invariably ate steak for breakfast.

President William Howard Taft had a huge bathtub installed in the White House to accommodate his 300 pounds. President Wilson, his successor, had it yanked out.

President Richard M. Nixon is an avid sports fan and enjoys visiting with athletes in their locker room.

President Lyndon Baines Johnson thrilled in throwing barbecues for scores at his Texas ranch. He also likes Mexican food, and when President Kennedy's French chef turned up his nose at preparing chile, tamales and such, Johnson let him go and brought to the White House kitchen a woman chef from Texas.

William Randolph Hearst, who owned a string of 21 newspapers, dozen * * * luxury fit for a king. His dining room seated more than a hundred, and between the huge solid silver candelabra were bottles of catsup

mustard and other condiments in their original containers. He said the reason he did not use silverware for the stuff was to constantly remind himself and his guests that they could someday suffer financial reverses.

Walter Winchell, the columnist who coined such words as whoopee, which became common usage, wore a tattered dressing gown and had a pencil stuck between two fingers of his right hand when he wrote his daily output.

Winston Churchill consumed a fifth of Napoleon brandy a day, and he burned half a dozen long, Havana cigars rolled especially for him.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt liked Irish whiskey, and when he took his frequent trips on a navy cruiser, a case of his favorite brand was sent abroad. During Roosevelt's record tenure of the White House, Sunday evening meals always were scrambled eggs and bacon prepared by Mrs. Roosevelt in a chafing dish at the table.

CONSERVATION AGENCIES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an admirable speech by the Honorable Ralph A. MacMullan, Director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, entitled "Conservation Agencies' Views on Agricultural Chemicals."

This fine address, given before the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners in New York City recently merits the careful consideration of everyone concerned with a decent and wholesome environment:

CONSERVATION AGENCIES' VIEWS ON AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹

(By Ralph A. MacMullan, Director Michigan Department of Natural Resources)

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak for the conservation agencies on what is still one of the most troublesome problems of wildlife management. I have been speaking out against the "hard" or persistent insecticides for several years now. We launched the attack in Michigan in January, 1968, with publications of "The Case Against Hard Pesticides," an article which has been re-issued and reprinted widely—perhaps more than half a million copies. And much has been written and done since then in Michigan and elsewhere. Consequently, I will not burden you with what I now consider a foregone conclusion—that the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides must and will go!

I am going to devote myself this afternoon to other aspects of the problems posed by agricultural chemicals, and to propose some solutions. I regret we have to be tough again, and perhaps appear unorthodox, as we have in the past. But the conventional has not worked and will not work. Witness where we are today.

First let me outline some of the factors which work to inhibit a solution of the problems posed by pesticides. Foremost among these is the pitfall of calling them "agricultural chemicals" a trap into which we all fall, including your program committee in labeling the topic now before this two-man panel. The adjective "agricultural" seems to

convey a righteous, holy, "American," and therefore thoroughly justifiable basis for acceptance.

"Agricultural chemicals" they may have once been. Today they are equally "urban chemicals" and "silvicultural chemicals." Today they are "environmental chemicals." So agriculture may be unfairly blamed for the unsavory attributes of certain of the pesticides, as when dieldrin used to mothproof rugs and clothing in dry-cleaning is allowed to escape into rivers. Let's be frank about it and identify these chemicals in legal parlance—they are "economic poisons."

Now to another problem. When pesticides were used mainly on the farm, it was entirely reasonable to have their control delegated by legislatures and the Congress to Departments of Agriculture. With heavy urban and forest use and knowledge of the global mobility of the hard pesticides, it is now no more reasonable for control of pesticides to rest within a Department of Agriculture than it is to have a U.S. Forest Service within a Department of Agriculture.

When pesticides were used mainly on the farm and were thought to stay there, and to affect only the applicator and the consumer, it was perfectly reasonable to have use of pesticides regulated by Departments of Agriculture with some control over residues by the Food and Drug people. Later, when volume of pesticide use increased and the mobility of pesticides and their effects on wildlife became clear, advice of wildlife biologists was solicited. However, control was slight, and the biologists' advice was rarely heeded by a Department of Agriculture with an ear attuned to increased farm production, and apparently deaf and blind to the rest of the environment.

Under the sanctity of "agricultural need," it was only natural that substantial protection to the pesticide chemical industry was built into the laws authorizing the use of these chemicals. As the market and hence production grew, the agency registering these chemicals developed a thoroughly understandable "protective" attitude and resisted any efforts toward restricting the "miracle" chemicals. Even now when some of the less toothsome attributes of certain pesticides have become evident, the built-in protection of notices, appeals, committee review, and more appeals ad infinitum, ad nauseam, prevents or delays the withdrawal of uses of many of the noxious hard pesticides.

Developing parallel with the "pesticide protective" philosophy of the law and within the regulating agencies, is an understandably similar attitude in the land-grant and other state agricultural colleges. Students were being trained as farmers, or for positions in the pesticide industry, or in the cooperative extension service, or as professors teaching entomology or farm crop management, all with liberal overtones of chemical insect and weed control. Thus students become professors and then administrators—deans and/or directors of experiment stations—who perpetuate the attitudes and system. This condition is not being improved by personnel interchange between pesticide companies and the colleges. Even worse has been the muzzling of biology or wildlife professors in universities with powerful agriculture colleges. Only since biologists have labelled themselves "ecologists" has a breakthrough been possible.

I have alluded to the role of the pesticide industry in these processes. The chemical industry is the wool that crosses the warp, and colors the combined fabric of farmer, government agency, and agricultural college. After all, pesticide manufacturers exist only to see pesticides. Everything they can do to maintain or increase sales will be done. Anything that would decrease sales will be resisted in the fang and claw melee for survival in the market place. They will not hesitate to employ Madison Avenue sales tactics of half-

truths which ignore unpleasant realities so long as the glowing claims made are also true. They are not immune to another Madison Avenue failing of over-selling, over-recommending. Not so long ago a two-page advertisement in national magazines urged farmers to broadcast dieldrin for corn root insects every year. Chemical industry "scientists" have impeccable credentials, but they must still earn their pay.

Another problem related to the pesticide industry is the manner in which pesticide salesmen become advisors to the farmer. Aided by attractive, effective sales brochures and primed with ready answers, they perpetuate the "we gotta spray" syndrome. In a survey of farmers in a Midwestern cornbelt state, they far outranked the cooperative extension service as a source of information on pesticides.

All of this sounds very discouraging and it would be if it were not for a growing number of courageous college professors, biologists, and ecologists; lawyers and Congressmen and legislators; natural resource agency heads; environmental action councils; and just ordinary John Q. Citizens, following the lead of Clarence Cottam and George Wallace, who question the platitudes and steamroller tactics of the agro-chemico-business behemoth. They are now sufficiently "fed up," numerous, and vocal to make their voices heard in state legislatures and the halls of Congress, in the courts, and in offices of government officials.

Significant beginnings are being made. Our President has proposed a new Environmental Protection Agency which would take over the pesticide regulation function of the Department of Agriculture. Our host state, New York, has established an Environmental Conservation Department which has been given responsibility for pesticide regulation. In the upper Great Lakes region the governors of five states have set up a Cooperative Interdisciplinary Pesticide Committee for more rational use of pesticides. Environmental Quality Councils are blossoming out in state after state and reviewing the problem of agricultural chemicals. In others, pesticide review boards involving several disciplines, are placed in departments other than agriculture, or act independently of any department.

Some states and provinces, notably Wisconsin, Michigan, Washington, Florida, California, Arizona, and Ontario, have grown weary of waiting for federal action and have made great strides toward eliminating or reducing use of the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon biocides. We hear much of the new accord in Washington, D.C., whereby the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and HEW will put the federal pesticide house in order. But all we seem to note in the press is the continued determination of the Department of Agriculture to maintain the same overcautions, foot-dragging system of notices, appeals, committee meetings, more appeals, cancellation of pesticide registrations which permits continual sale on appeal, rather than suspension.

I have been talking very generally about agricultural chemicals and pesticides and complaining loudly about the system which sustains them. It may seem that I eschew all such materials. Nothing could be farther from the fact. I recognize that many agricultural chemicals are necessary tools of the farmer, home owner, and public agency. Many, by virtue of their quick and effective action and short life, will be useful public servants. What I am pleading for is change in a system which enables continuation of ecologically undesirable blemishes on the environment of my state, my country, and the North American continent, if not the entire Space Ship Earth.

Changing the system will require the hard work of many, combined, concerned conservation and environmentally oriented persons and groups. Changing the system will

¹ Presented at the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners Annual Meeting, New York City, September 17, 1970.

require an overhauling of legislation to require a thoroughly ecological approach to registration of new pesticides and to permit prompt review and withdrawal without interminable delays of those already registered whenever their ecological unacceptability is demonstrated. We must have legislation to prohibit use, as well as sale, of pesticides which are not registered or for which registration has been withdrawn. Changing the system will mean admitting the ecologist to the discussion table at each and every step of deliberations on the acceptability of a pesticide.

Changing the system means adopting the premise that we cannot risk admitting a new pesticide into the environment without full knowledge of its ecological impact. We must know more about many pesticides now in use. We must know more than which bugs they will kill, or how they affect the applicator, or how they affect a few laboratory animals. Simply put, it means that contrary to the precepts of common law, some pesticides must be presumed guilty until proven innocent. We have no other choice. The risk is too great.

Changing the system will not destroy agriculture and the chemical industry. Changing the system will mean the continued use of pesticides, but with sharp shooting, rifle-like chemicals, not with shotgun, blunderbuss or bludgeon bioicides. Changing the system will mean a careful, calculated integration of biological, cultural, and physical means of pest control with the conventional, all-too-frequent, chemicals-only attack. Changing the system will mean the training of a new breed of pest control educator, agency administrator, and sales organization. May the agriculture colleges of this country rise to the occasion and provide the sensitive, ecological training that will make this possible. Changing the system must mean a cleaner and more viable environment for wildlife and man alike.

Not until we capitalize on the combined know-how and concern of the total scientific community, will there be relief. So in the Conservationist's view I see the agricultural chemicals as both a threat and a promise, a millstone and an opportunity, the former if we permit present day progress to wither away, the latter if we use these useful tools with discretion, moderation, and only when needed. The choice, fellow administrators of natural resources, may well be yours. Most of us have accepted the challenge and have actively entered the fight for a cleaner environment. Here is one significant way you can exert your influence to assure posterity of a world worth living in, with the diversity of wildlife we have come to prize. We who have chosen to act on pesticides invite your support.

REVENUE SHARING IS ESSENTIAL TO SOLVE THE URBAN PROBLEMS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from the mayor of Los Angeles, the Honorable Sam Yorty, regarding appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mayor Yorty, an experienced administrator of the Nation's second most populous city, feels that increased Federal funds are needed, in order "to solve the urban problems" in our country.

CXVI—2159—Part 25

Mr. Speaker, our cities need financial help. The property tax cannot be increased—the local taxpayer cannot shoulder a greater burden. Thus, the cities, in order to continue necessary services, must come to the Federal Government for help.

We can help by approving a revenue sharing bill, and we can help by increasing the Federal financial share to our troubled cities.

Local officials know the problems; they are optimistic about solving the problems if they have the funds, and a greater portion of those funds must come from the Federal Government.

At this point, I place Mayor Yorty's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,

Los Angeles, Calif., September 15, 1970.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GLENN: I want to express appreciation for your position and vote on the HUD Appropriation Bill.

It is extremely important to the City of Los Angeles and other cities that the Congress express a positive commitment to solve the urban problems in this great nation.

Many of the fine accomplishments of our urban development programs would be in jeopardy should the Federal Government fail to maintain its commitment to the cities. Los Angeles asked for \$14.8 million in Neighborhood Development Program funds which was slashed \$7.3 million. This meant that, instead of a planned 1,032 units of inner-city low and moderate income housing, for example, only 732 will be started. Relocation plans have been scaled down from 670 families to 467.

For this reason, I urge you to oppose any reduction in the HUD portion of the Independent Offices and HUD Appropriation Bill, especially the \$1.35 billion urban renewal portion. Other less essential and low priority areas could be reduced.

Your support of the cities and local governments is respectfully and urgently requested.

Sincerely,

SAM YORTY,
Mayor.

OATHING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a precedent in degradation of everything sacred has now occurred in Washington, D.C. Last Thursday, a so-called community leader was purported to be sworn in as a trustee of the District of Columbia Library Board, using in lieu of a Bible, the autobiography of Malcolm X.

President Nixon's appointed Commissioner of the District of Columbia, affectionately called "the Mayor" by the liberal news media, and other executives of our Nation's Capital were present and participated in this sacrilegious "swear-in" service. By their willing presence, we must assume that they condone such disgraceful activity. Some may wonder how they can provide leadership for the crime problem which blights the seat of our Government? If these are the kind of

leaders the people of the District of Columbia must look to, no wonder they have lost their way and gone astray.

Following the "new oathing" ceremony the affiant is quoted as having said, "For the life of Malcolm—right on."

The revolting mockery was even carried as news by NBC on channel 4 television.

This woman is a member of the Library Board which receives Federal grants? Is she a de jure appointee or is her position now de facto?

And, to think that these recipients of the American people's tax dollars are to be the beneficiary of home rule for the District.

Will the new nonvoting delegate for Congress be allowed to refuse taking his oath of office in the traditional manner and choose to use a like mockery?

A newscipping follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1970]

APPOINTEE "RIGHT ON" THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIBRARY BOARD

Lola Singleterry, a Southeast Washington community leader, was sworn in as a member of the D.C. board of library trustees yesterday, using a copy of the autobiography of Malcolm X instead of a Bible.

At the end of the oath of office, administered by Martin Schaller, executive secretary to Mayor Walter E. Washington, Mrs. Singleterry said, "For the life of Malcolm—right on!"

Mrs. Singleterry, 35, was appointed to the nine-member board by Mayor Washington to replace Dr. Albert W. Atwood, the 91-year old chairman who retired this year. Her appointment followed complaints that the library board did not reflect a cross-section of the community.

DRUG ABUSE AND YOUTH

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and valued colleague, Representative RICHARD HANNA, has been a leader in the House on the problems of drug addiction. His concern in this area is reflected in his contributions to Federal legislation dealing with drug abuse.

Just recently, Representative HANNA has continued his attack on the proliferation of drugs by sending his constituents an informative pamphlet outlining the effects of drugs. This pamphlet is a valuable addition to the search for an adequate drug education program.

I feel that my colleagues should be fully informed of this effort and I am enclosing for their information Representative HANNA's letter and summary of the pamphlet:

A SPECIAL REPORT: DRUG ABUSE AND YOUTH

DEAR FRIEND: I know you share my concern over the alarming abuse of drugs by many young people. Many of you have asked me what you, as a concerned citizen, can do to help solve this problem.

The first and most important thing you can do is become as familiar as possible with the means, methods, and symptoms of drug use, and its effect upon our young.

With this in mind I am providing you with

this booklet which is designed to provide vital and understandable information on the drugs, narcotics and chemicals that are being most frequently abused and which are easily available to young people on the illegal "street market"; also how the user will look, act, and then detailing some of the harm done.

Everything said in this summary brochure is substantiated by both medical and law enforcement authorities. No longer do we have to rely on speculation, scare campaign or dubious personal opinions. There is now enough factual data available to make the "Case Against Drug Abuse" uncontested.

We as concerned citizens have long told our young "Don't use Drugs." But now we can authoritatively say with the aid of this brochure, why drugs should not be used and the irreparable harms that can result if they use them.

The increase in juvenile drug-related arrests is staggering, with almost every urban and suburban community acknowledging 'a drug problem.' This problem should not be the sole responsibility of governmental officials, teachers, administrators, doctors, counselors and enforcement personnel. Given correct information we can all be a powerful force in intelligently and effectively advising young people on the technical subject of drug abuse.

RICHARD T. HANNA,
U.S. Congressman,
34th Congressional District.

A SUMMARY FOR PARENTS AND STUDENTS ON THE SUBJECT OF TEENAGE DRUG ABUSE

(In outline form, some of the dangerous drugs, narcotics and volatile chemicals that are being used by some of our teenagers and sub-teenagers—also, briefly detailing some of the harm that results.)

There is an alarming increase in the abuse of drugs by some of our young people. Yet there is a real lack of practical knowledge by parents on the dangerous drugs, narcotics and volatile chemicals that are being used.

This brochure is designed to provide vital and understandable information on the drugs, narcotics and chemicals that are being most frequently abused and which are easily available to our children on the illegal 'street market'; also how the user will look, act, and then detailing some of the harm done.

Everything said in this summary brochure is substantiated by both medical and law enforcement authorities. No longer do we have to rely on speculation, scare campaign or dubious personal opinions. There is now enough factual data available to make "the Case Against Drug Abuse" uncontested to any reasonable mind.

We as parents have long told our children "Don't use Drugs." But now we can authoritatively say with the aid of this brochure, why drugs should not be used and the irreparable harms that can result if they use them.

This brochure outlines and diagrams some of the stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens. It is the first in a series of five non-profit summaries providing parents with current, correct, and understandable information on drug abuse.

The increase in juvenile drug-related arrests is staggering with almost every urban and suburban community acknowledging 'a drug problem.' This problem should not be the sole responsibility of governmental officials, teachers, administrators, doctors, counselors and enforcement personnel. Given correct information, parents can and must be a powerful force in intelligently and effectively advising their children on the technical subject of drug abuse.

HORTON COMMENDS MR. AND MRS. ALEX SAPERSTONE FOR THEIR HELP TO OTHERS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I imagine we all are familiar with the adage that it is more blessed to give than to receive. It is always inspiring, however, to learn of that adage proving its truthfulness to individuals who have found exceptionally great joy in giving of themselves to the cause of helping others.

Mr. and Mrs. Alex Saperstone of Irondequoit, in the Rochester area, are such people. A little more than a year ago they got involved in volunteer work at the Jewish Home and Infirmary and have learned to their great satisfaction that their lives have changed because of their good deeds. They honestly feel that the efforts they put into the work are small compared to the great satisfaction and reward they get in return.

The Rochester Democrat and Chronicle recently saluted Mr. and Mrs. Saperstone in the "Nanci Spotlights the Doers" column. It was brought out that their involvement with volunteer work came about by chance.

While attending the formal opening of a new wing at the home, they were both impressed by the great opportunities the home offered for volunteers to assist in making life more interesting and fruitful for the aged living there. Simultaneously, they realized that here was an opportunity for them to give of themselves and their talents, and they acted upon the inspiration.

Since reaching their decision, the Saperstones devote their Tuesday afternoons to work at the home. Being an amateur barber, Mr. Saperstone gives haircuts to the bedridden patients while Mrs. Saperstone uses her skills with bookkeeping and other clerical work.

For others who might want to do volunteer work, Alex Saperstone has this thought.

I'm sure people would do more if they had any idea of the great amount of satisfaction that comes from giving a little of yourself. There are times I'm tired and don't especially want to get off the couch. But then I see how thankful the old folks are. That's the reward that makes it worthwhile.

The Jewish Home and Infirmary is a beautiful and efficiently operated place. I have visited it many times, Mr. Speaker, and it is a real inspiration to see the aged men and women there being encouraged to live continuing interesting and full lives. With the additional help of good people like Mr. and Mrs. Alex Saperstone, even more joy is being brought into the lives of the patients.

I commend the Saperstones for their fine work and I feel that my colleagues in the Congress join me in wishing them continued happiness in their own lives as they add to the pleasures in the lives of others.

I would like to share the Democrat and

Chronicle's salute to the Saperstones with my fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

The newspaper article follows:

THERE'S JOY IN GIVING

"We both suddenly reflected on all the people who have helped us throughout the years and decided it was about time we did something in return."

The "we" is Mr. and Mrs. Alex Saperstone, 76 Northfield Road, Irondequoit, who devote time each week to work at the Jewish Home and Infirmary, 1180 St. Paul St. The Saperstones have been doing volunteer work there for a year and it's changed their lives.

"It's the feeling we have gotten from giving of ourselves-together," Mrs. Saperstone says.

They got involved in volunteer work quite by chance.

"We went to the opening of the new wing at the Home about a year ago. Suddenly we just looked at each other and knew we wanted to get involved in helping people there in any way we could."

Mrs. Saperstone says the timing was right. "Our children were grown, my husband was semiretired and we found ourselves with extra time on our hands."

Saperstone, 58, is semi-retired from his frozen food business and has been an amateur barber for years, giving free haircuts to friends and neighbors. Mrs. Saperstone did bookkeeping before she was married and kept her husband's books for his business while raising their family.

Every Tuesday for three hours in the afternoon, he gives haircuts to bedridden patients, and she helps out with bookkeeping and other clerical work.

"Sometimes if I get done early, I go up to the ward and sit and talk with some of the patients, help feed them, do anything I can," she says.

The Saperstones agree that the hardest part of volunteer work "is just getting started."

"So many people feel they have to devote a lot of time, or they just don't know where to get information to begin."

"I'm sure people would do more if they had any idea of the great amount of satisfaction that comes from giving a little of yourself. There are times I'm tired and don't especially want to get off the couch. But then I see how thankful the old folks are. That's the reward that makes it worthwhile," Saperstone said.

They feel that working with older persons "makes you think a lot about yourself and your life."

"You have to think, maybe someday I'll be in that position, and you realize how dependent they are on others for the very basic things. I feel very grateful that I'm in the position to do something for someone else."

Says Mrs. Saperstone, "There's a woman there whose room is loaded with plants she cares for, she crochets, and she's always smiling and doing for others. Then there are other older persons who sit, doing nothing for hours on end, taking no interest in anything."

"I feel it's a lesson that we're all going to grow old. We can either be constructive about it or retreat into ourselves and make no one happy."

For the Saperstones, volunteer work is turning out to be a "great pleasure and a joy of giving."

"We didn't know what would happen when we started, but after a year we can say that what we put into it is small compared to the great satisfaction and reward we get in return."

The Saperstones have been married 29 years. They are avid square dancers, belong to the Echo Squares and dance twice a week. They also play bridge and love to fish.

RESULTS OF FIRST DISTRICT
QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have tabulated the results of my annual questionnaire which was distributed throughout my district earlier this year. I feel that these results give a true indication of the sentiments of the residents of western Montana. I would like to share them with my colleagues along with my thoughts on many of the vital issues facing the country today. I ask permission to include my Washington Report containing both my letter and the questionnaire results immediately following these remarks:

ARNOLD OLSEN'S WASHINGTON REPORT—1970
POLL RESULTSADMINISTRATION POLICIES ADD RECESSION TO
INFLATION

(By Arnold Olsen)

Early last year I predicted the Nixon Administration's policy of high-interest and tight money would benefit only the big Eastern banks and would bring growing inflation, unemployment and recession. Unfortunately, that prediction is now reality.

The Administration itself has fallen victim to the economic tailspin. First the President predicted a \$1.3 billion surplus this fiscal year. Now the Administration admits a \$4 billion miscalculation and expects a deficit of \$2.91 billion.

Take a look at what is happening. Increased interest rates resulting from turning the fiscal reins over to the big banks have added more than a billion dollars to the taxpayers' load in fiscal 1970, and it will probably be twice that much next year. More than half a billion dollars more was laid out by our government for unemployment compensation in 1970 due to rising joblessness under the President's policies, and Administration spokesmen say unemployment will continue to skyrocket.

The recession is here, whether or not the Administration admits it. As a result, tax revenue for this year is down approximately \$1 billion. Next year it will likely drop \$2 billion. Unemployed workers and unprofitable businesses don't pay taxes.

My efforts in the Congress have been directed at achieving a reversal of the inflationary, recessionary spiral. I have worked hard in support of efforts to:

Reduce spending for wasteful, unnecessary defense programs and "overkill" supplies of war tools.

Reduce spending for foreign aid, especially military-type assistance.

Withdraw American troops from Southeast Asia, sharply reduce troop numbers in Western Europe, and reduce the possibility of additional military involvements abroad.

Set in motion federal machinery to make more money available at lower interest rates for home building. (Emergency Home Finance Act).

Contrary to Administration efforts to blame big spending on the Congress, the record proves that Republicans and Democrats in the Congress were effective in trimming nearly \$7 billion from the President's own appropriations budget last year. We hope to reduce spending still further this year.

The Congress has provided more for education, health, housing and Social Security than the President wanted, but it more than offset these increases by reducing appropriations in such areas as foreign aid and Pentagon spending.

The records of the Administration and the Congress demonstrate the contrast between the President's emphasis on defense and big business and the Congress' emphasis on the real needs of the people.

I was pleased, for example, that we were able to reject an all-out effort on the part of the Administration to provide nearly \$1 billion in federal funds to bail out the big banks holding notes and debts against the Penn Central conglomerate. Such action would have repaid the big banks but it wouldn't have solved the bankrupt railroad's problems.

OLSEN NEWS NOTES

VETO OVERRIDE

Arnold Olsen joined forces with a bipartisan group of Congressmen to over-ride the President's veto of hospital construction appropriations. Olsen called the over-ride "a most encouraging sign. Such domestic programs as health research, hospitals and education must be top priority items. They cannot take a back seat to massive and wasteful defense spending on such things as missiles, useless military aircraft and other tools of war."

SEEKS STOP TO DRUG FLOW

Arnold Olsen has introduced legislation authorizing the President to suspend economic and military aid to countries which refuse to act to halt the flow of drugs into the U.S.

LEADS BATTLE FOR INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY

Arnold Olsen was among leaders in recent House action to improve Social Security benefits. Key features of the bill are a five per cent increase in monthly benefits, an automatic cost-of-living increase provision, and an increase in retirement exemptions. Olsen pledged to continue his fight to have restrictions on outside income eased or eliminated.

INTRODUCES EMERGENCY HOME FINANCE ACT

Arnold Olsen joined in the introduction of the Emergency Home Finance Act to make more mortgage credit available for housing. "One of the first victims of the Administration's high-interest and tight-money economic policy was the housing industry," Olsen asserted. "The Congress can and must act to get badly needed housing construction under way."

URGES TIGHTER AUTO-EXHAUST CONTROLS

Arnold Olsen is sponsor of legislation to control auto exhaust and establish enforcement procedures. The measure calls for the creation of national emission control standards and the designation of penalties for violations.

WAR STATISTICS SUPPORT 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

Defense Department figures show that half of American fatalities in Vietnam were 21 years of age or younger. "25,916 young men have been killed in Vietnam who never had the opportunity to vote," Olsen said. "Young people who are being asked to put their lives on the line for their country should have an active voice in electing government officials who formulate our policies relative to war and peace."

OPPOSES BILL TO INCREASE TIMBER HARVEST

Arnold Olsen opposed House consideration of the National Forests Conservation and Management Act and was successful in having it sent back to the Agriculture Committee for further deliberation. Charging that the bill was misnamed, Olsen said on the House floor that the legislation was "timber harvest oriented," and insisted that revised legislation provide clear safeguards for conservation and other multiple use interests. "What we desperately need now is a tree-planting bill, not a tree-cutting bill," he said.

SUPPORTS MEAL PROGRAM FOR ELDERLY

Arnold Olsen is sponsor of a bill "to provide for establishment of a low-cost meal

program for senior citizens in a social setting."

The Congressman said demonstration projects under the Older Americans Act and other local projects now operating demonstrate the potential for such a program. The legislation would combine federal and state funds to establish a wholesome, low-cost meal program for persons 65 and over at strategically located community centers. He cited government studies revealing that lack of mobility, skill, knowledge or desire causes frequent cases of inadequate nourishment among the elderly.

MY 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

[Results in percent]

1. Do you support President Nixon's approach to achieving peace in Viet Nam?

Yes 58.3
No 41.7

2. If U.S. troop level has not been substantially reduced by the end of 1970 do you favor:

a. Continuing military operations at present level while pursuing further negotiations 5
b. Immediate withdrawal, the only consideration being the safety of our troops 46.2
c. Increased offensive operations 13.5
d. Phased withdrawal of U.S. troops with transfer of responsibility for the war to the South Vietnamese, regardless how long it takes 35.3

3. Tax cuts may create a budget deficit which could have an inflationary effect. In which of these areas of federal spending would you make cuts?

a. Space program 70.7
b. Education 11
c. Aid to cities 24.1
d. Welfare 42.1
e. Health research 6.3
f. Military spending 69.4
g. Pollution programs 7.1
h. Highway construction 21.1

4. Interest rates have spiraled to the highest level since the Civil War and the housing industry has been brought to its knees. Should the President:

a. Relax credit restrictions to avoid possible recession 45.9
b. Maintain credit restrictions until inflation is halted 54.1

5. Some experts insist inflation cannot be controlled without applying price and wage controls. Would you favor such controls?

a. Now 48.7
b. As a last resort 39.2
c. Never 12.1

6. Regarding foreign aid, do you favor:

a. Its complete elimination 27
b. Continuation only of self-help aid for developing countries 65.9
c. Continuation of self-help as well as military tools for developing nations 7.1

Answer only if you selected "b" in question number six. If the only foreign aid bill to come before the Congress included some military assistance, would you vote to

a. Reject the entire bill 54.1
b. Accept a bill with some military assistance 45.9

7. Assuming the need of continuing the Armed Forces in some form, would you favor

a. Continuation and improvement of the existing lottery draft system 41.4
b. Elimination of the draft and establishment of an all-volunteer Army 58.6

8. Do you favor

a. Emphasizing increased Federal expenditure to control pollution? 18.9

- b. Emphasizing laws requiring polluting industries to install controls at their own expense?----- 81.1
(Many respondents checked both boxes.)

9. Do you favor

- a. Extension and improvement of the existing farm program with firm price support loans?----- 37.2
b. The administration's proposal to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to set price support loans on a sliding scale from zero to 90 percent of parity?----- 19.1
c. Elimination of all farm programs?----- 43.7
10. Are you engaged in farming?
Yes----- 18.5
No----- 81.5

11. The proposal to lower the Montana voting age to 19 will be on the ballot this November. Do you favor extending the voting privilege to those over 19?

- Yes----- 60.9
No----- 39.1

12. The present U.S. troop level in Western Europe is approximately 310,000. Do you believe this force should be

- a. Maintained----- 18.3
b. Slightly reduced----- 23.7
c. Sharply reduced----- 58

13. Freight rates are traditionally lower in areas where water transportation facilities compete for freight shipments. Water routes to the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean serving Montana are engineeringly feasible. Do you favor their development?

- Yes----- 46.5
No----- 53.5

14. In your opinion, what are the three greatest problems facing our nation today?

- Problems cited related to
Vietnam----- 41.4
Pollution----- 40.7
Economy----- 36.6
Crime and violence----- 21.8
Civil Rights----- 11.3
Student unrest----- 10.6
Welfare----- 8.3
Militarism and Defense waste----- 7.8
Communism----- 7.3
Taxes----- 6.4
Poverty----- 5.7
Congress----- 5.6
Drugs----- 5.6
Education----- 5.2
Moral decay----- 5.1

(The preceding figures represent the percentage of the total questionnaires returned which cited each category.)

OLD-FASHIONED FUN AND FRIENDLINESS AND GENEROSITY

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a couple of Saturdays ago some residents of my hometown, Boulder, Colo., got together to show what can be accomplished in an atmosphere of unity and amity. The Mapleton Hill area of Boulder is one characterized by lovely old homes and stately shade trees. Unfortunately, many of the trees have been damaged through disease and last year's unusually harsh winter. As the editorial from the Boulder Daily Camera which follows notes, more than \$3,000 was

raised by the various activities held in conjunction with a festival, and a city took advantage of its excellent opportunity to get together and work for a common good:

MAGNIFICENT SUCCESS

It was one of the most heart-warming events seen in a long time in Boulder. The Mapleton Hill festival Saturday brought thousands of people together in old-fashioned fun and friendliness—and generosity.

Purpose was to raise funds to replant trees along the historic parkway, where many old maples have disappeared or are deteriorating because of disease and storms. More than \$3,000 came in during the six-hour festivities that included folk dancing, singers, band and other music, kids' carnival, book and art displays, ice cream social, sales of a wide variety of items—and many other activities.

The financial success of the affair was gratifying. But perhaps more important was its effect on the people. Almost without exception they sparkled with smiles and enthusiasm. Many renewed old acquaintances. Many strangers became friends. There was a light-hearted spirit in the air and a general feeling that something precious had been recaptured—something that tends to be lost in the bustle of pressures of daily affairs.

One of the volunteer workers, who spent the entire six hours "on the job" without a break, commented, "Instead of feeling fatigued, I felt refreshed." Numerous people said Boulder needs more of this kind of thing.

In this era of demonstrations, here was one that made a lot of sense. What a difference there is between a group of protesters making demands and a group of citizens pitching in to solve a neighborhood problem. The one tends to divide people and ruffle tempers; the other unites them in amity and constructive action.

We do indeed need more of this sort of initiative.

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 or 3 weeks there have been repeated and heartening signs that the economic condition of the Nation is not nearly so bad as some would like the American people to believe, now that November elections are just around the corner. I think that the following article, taken from yesterday's Wall Street Journal, presents both the optimistic and pessimistic points of view regarding the state of the economy, and is, all in all, a fair analysis of where we stand. I request permission that the article be inserted into the RECORD so that my colleagues can read it and judge for themselves. The article follows:

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

A professor who has advised U.S. Presidents on economic matters set forth the deeply pessimistic scenario he envisages for the U.S. economy in the years just ahead. There will be bouts of inflation, he forecast, followed by half-hearted attempts to restrain the inflation, followed by worse inflation, followed by more half-hearted attempts at restraint, followed by still worse inflation.

Where will it all end? a visitor asked. It will end, the professor said, when the inflation becomes so painful that the country will be willing to suffer a severe recession, possibly even a depression, in order to stop it.

The interview took place a year ago. At the time, the Government was attempting to restrain the worst bout of inflation in the post-World War II era. The Federal Reserve was keeping a tight lid on the nation's money supply, usually defined as currency in circulation plus private checking accounts. And the Administration was trimming defense spending in an effort to hold down overall Government expenditures and balance the budget.

The restraint clearly has had an impact. Prices still rise briskly and interest rates still are high. But price increases are smaller and interest rates lower than in the recent past. It's true that unemployment has risen. But the jobless rate remains low for a period when inflation appears on the wane; the rate is lower than in the early years of the long economic expansion of the 1960s.

In many respects, things seem to be looking up—despite strikes, troubles abroad, pollution and other worries. Most forecasters believe that inflation will continue to diminish, general economic activity will gradually pick up and unemployment will soon begin to decline. A recent survey of 194 members of the Nation Association of Business Economists, mostly men who advise corporations about the outlook, came up with this consensus for 1971: A 2.8% rise in gross national product, adjusted for price changes, a steady slowing in the annual rate of consumer price increase and 4.8% unemployment by year's end.

If anything like this materializes—and the association's track record is good—it would represent a happy development. Price-adjusted GNP declined in late 1969 and early 1970. Consumer prices, on the average, are expected to increase at an annual rate of nearly 6% over the course of this year. The unemployment rate has recently been above the 5% mark.

It is only when one recalls the scenario suggested by the economics professor that doubts about the outlook creep in. His pessimism was based mainly on a conviction that no Administration and no Congress—Republican or Democratic—would possess the political courage to apply economic brakes hard enough and long enough to allow prices to become close to stable.

At first glance, recent activities of economic policy makers hardly contradict this view. Last fall's exercise in restraint has ended. The money supply, so rigidly contained a year ago, has soared in some recent weeks. The Federal budget, far from being in balance, is in deepening deficit. Alan Greenspan, a New York economist who occasionally advises the Nixon team on budgetary matters, recently estimated that the deficit would top \$12 billion in the current fiscal year and could exceed \$15 billion in fiscal 1972.

Is another half-hearted attempt at restraint concluded and another bout of inflation, possibly worse than the last, about to get under way?

Some economists are beginning to voice concern. Raymond J. Saulnier, an economics professor at Barnard College in New York, recently stated that although a full-blown recession has apparently been avoided, "success in the war against inflation is quite another thing." After being sluggish early in the year, general business activity has begun to pick up, he said, yet prices continue to climb at a troublesome pace. In such circumstances, he warned, "it will be all too easy" for the price rise to accelerate in coming months.

A still more concerned view comes from Elliot Janeway, a New York economist who, unlike many of his colleagues, correctly forecast the recent stock market slide. Much

easier monetary policy at the Federal Reserve and deepening budget deficits add up to "an explosive inflationary combination," Mr. Janeway recently warned in a letter to his clients.

A more widely shared opinion, however, is that we are not off to the races again.

Wage-price controls, it should be noted, play no part in this optimism. Nearly 96% of the business economists who forecast diminishing inflation in 1971 also voted against wage-price controls. Their general view was expressed in a recent economic letter of New York's First National City Bank: "Controls are a tranquilizer at best, dispensed to dull the symptoms of the inflationary disease rather than to eliminate the cause."

The belief that inflation will continue to diminish is based instead on the fact that the economy has been operating far below its potential for a considerable time. Government estimates show that output of goods and services can grow at about 4.5% per year without placing undue strain on resources of labor and material. They further show that even before the General Motors strike, economic output was running at an annual rate about \$40 billion below capacity. Accordingly it may be premature to fear that inflation is about to get worse.

Henry C. Wallich, the Yale economics professor, is among those who share this view. "The economy has been slowed to the point of suffering a slight contraction," he recently stated. Now with "a substantial margin of excess capacity in the economy," he added, "resumption of economic expansion need not interfere with the subsidence of inflation."

To be sure, highly expansionary economic policies, if carried on indefinitely, would lead eventually to worse inflation. But there are reasons to doubt this would happen. For one thing, present efforts of policy makers to speed up the economy partly reflect concern about the November elections. Once the elections are over, there should be less pressure to expand business at an excessive rate.

ALFRED L. MALABRE, JR.

THE IMPENDING COMMUNIST TAKEOVER IN CHILE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the impending Communist takeover in Chile is the subject of one of my recent weekly newsletters, which I include at this point for the RECORD:

THE IMPENDING COMMUNIST TAKEOVER IN CHILE

"Ours is the only road for the country to take and not fall to the Communists."—President Eduardo Frei of Chile, 1964.

With these words the first Christian Democrat Party ever to rule in Latin America came to power in Chile in 1964. Six years later the Communists are on the verge of coming to power through the electoral process in the person of Salvador Allende, an outspoken Castroite who won a plurality in the recently held presidential elections. Why did the Christian Democrat road, welcomed so enthusiastically by U.S. policy makers at the time as the real answer to Communism in Latin America, turn into a runway for Red power?

The Christian Democrats did everything a good "liberal" regime is theoretically supposed to do effectively undercut the Communist movement in their country. They be-

gan radical land reform programs which took the land away from the local "exploiters" and gave it to the government in the name of the peasants. They immediately embarked on a program of "bridge building for peace" with the Communist bloc nations, by establishing diplomatic relations with Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union.

They conducted an extended dialogue with the Communist Party of Chile and waged a continuous campaign of vilification against the Right, which was pictured as the real danger to the country. They "eased tensions" with Cuba by giving refuge to the remnants of "Che" Guevara's beaten guerrilla band fleeing from Bolivia, and allowing the Latin American branch of the Cuba-based Tricontinental Organization (OLAS) to set up branch headquarters in Chile. They "reformed" everything they could get their hands on.

How could the Communists be so crass as to win the next election? How could the people of Chile be so ungrateful as to vote the Christian Democrat candidate, picked to succeed Frei, third in a field of three? According to all good "liberal" theory, things are not supposed to work out this way.

If this turn of events in Chile is illustrative of anything, it shows that Twentieth Century liberalism, sometimes known as the socialism of the mentally unkempt, is not the answer to the Communist threat. In fact, it is nearer to the answer to the Communists' dreams. The electoral victory of the Communist-Organized, directed, and dominated coalition candidate in Chile should once and for all put the lie to the shibboleth that a government can undercut Communist programs by being "responsive"—the new favorite word—to the demands of various groups of leftist agitators. It should vividly bring forth the truth that compromises with Communists are compromises towards Communism. The Communist victory in Chile once more reveals the "liberal" incapacity to deal with the Reds and get anything but the worst of the bargain for the people they are representing.

It is not too late, however, for Chile to bring itself back from the brink on which it totters. Since none of the three candidates received a majority, the Chilean Congress must vote, October 24, on who shall become President. This is a saving grace which those who wish to do away with the Electoral College in the United States might well ponder. The Chileans and the United States, in its position of possible influence, must recognize several points.

The first point is that, although Allende received a slight plurality, his total vote represents something less than one-ninth of the total population of Chile. He does not represent anywhere near a popular majority or reflect the desires of a major portion of Chile's citizenry. But if the Chilean Congress regrets his plurality as a mandate and elects him president, there will in all probability be no more free elections in Chile. The wave of the future can already be seen in the recent statement by the Inter-American Press Association, headed by such distinguished men as James S. Copley of the Copley newspapers, that "Freedom of the press in Chile is being strangled by Communist and Marxist forces and their allies."

The second point to be stressed is that the hope for avoiding violence by allowing the Communists to take over is baseless. If the Communists do take over, there will be a tremendous amount of violence against all groups posing a present or potential danger to the totalitarian system which is Communism. The Communist policy of liquidate and rule is basically the same everywhere not, then Peru, which already has a far-left and always.

The third point we must understand is that if Chile falls to the Reds, peacefully or not, then Peru, which already has a far-left

government, and Bolivia, which has a blossoming guerrilla war underway, will be ripe for Red domination. Although the sound of dominoes falling in South East Asia may not worry some, a collapse in Latin America should worry everyone.

Allende does not represent a majority of the people of Chile. His regime will usher in a wave of violence and directly threaten other nations in Latin America. The Chilean Congress should vote no on Allende, no on slavery and the national purge, and should know that it will have the support of the United States in doing so.

UNDER SECRETARY VENEMAN ADDRESSES CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION AT UNIVERSITY OF IOWA'S COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of listening to an outstanding address by the Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John G. Veneman. The occasion for his address was the 100th anniversary of the founding of the University of Iowa's College of Medicine. His comments on the challenges and the opportunities facing the medical profession are most thought-provoking, and I commend them to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY UNDER SECRETARY JOHN G. VENEMAN

I would like to wish the College of Medicine a very happy hundredth birthday!

You have witnessed a number of trends in medicine come and go over the past 100 years. Medical education has had to keep up with these trends, and you at the University of Iowa have never failed to recognize your responsibilities. At the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have welcomed the opportunity to cooperate with you, and we look forward to an equally pleasant relationship in the future.

The struggle to develop a great medical institution such as this one is almost unimaginable. When one considers the progress of medicine over the past 100 years—from the traveling remedy salesman and country doctor to monitoring the blood pressure of a man on the moon—only a fool would speculate on where we will be 100 years from now.

But one thing is apparent to all of us: The current morass of problems facing the country's health industry could constitute the greatest challenge with which we have ever had to contend.

We spend more than \$60 billion a year for health in the United States, yet tens of millions of Americans are not getting the care they need because they can't afford it.

We pride ourselves on having the finest biomedical research establishment in the world, yet we are tragically inept at running research knowledge into improved health care.

We operate more than a hundred schools of medicine, yet we do not have enough doctors to care for the sick and keep the healthy well.

We have added hundreds of thousands of hospital beds in the last quarter century, yet vast areas of this country and the people in them are without adequate health care facilities.

These are but a few of the challenges we face. We are past the stage when an aspirin

and a band-aid will help. We need what I think you in the healing arts call "heroic measures".

In the health field, the call for change has been loud and clear. It is finally being heard in governmental circles—and for a good reason.

The stake of government in this enterprise is reflected in the fact that it is currently purchasing more than 37% of the total output of the health care system. This figure indicates that the use of its purchasing power is probably the government's primary source of leverage to initiate changes in the organization and delivery of health care.

For example, only four years ago, nearly 70% of health expenses for the elderly were privately paid. Today, Medicare and Medicaid, are paying 72% of the health bill for the Nation's aged.

Medicare, Medicaid, and private health insurance now finance health care for 85% of our population. These economic entrees to the health care system have been seized upon by a public that knows the value of good health. These same economic entrees have forced us to face a critical and worsening imbalance in supply and demand.

These programs have placed demands on our resources that cannot be satisfied. Unless we in the United States are able to make better use of what we have in the way of health manpower, facilities, and funds, we will—without a doubt—see some emergency scheme develop that will serve neither the people of this country nor the health industry in any acceptable way.

But I don't plan to give you an essay on the nature and scope of this country's health problems. For me to do that in this distinguished company would be superfluous.

I would, however, like to give you an idea of the thinking behind some steps we are proposing to help gain control of the problems that confront us all in the area of health care.

To overcome our problems will require some very substantial changes in the health system of this country. But it need not require a radical change in the basic structure of the American health enterprise. What we have to do is correct the defects in the system, while building on its proven strengths. I believe firmly that we now have an excellent opportunity to do precisely that.

These are among the major objectives of the Social Security Amendments of 1970 that have passed the House of Representatives and are now before the Senate Finance Committee.

We have asked the Congress to amend the Social Security Act so that the health programs carried out under it can directly work toward improving the delivery of health care.

For example, we are seeking the authority to limit reimbursement to providers of health services for capital costs that are not in accord with an approved state or local health facility plan.

We have talked for years in this country about the need for comprehensive health planning, regional planning, and rational expansion and replacement of health facilities. But the truth is we are only beginning to make progress toward this objective.

This legislation would put teeth into the comprehensive planning concept by requiring prior approval of major capital expenditures as a condition of full reimbursement.

We have also asked the Congress to authorize what has come to be known as the health maintenance organization option. Under this option, Medicare beneficiaries would be able to choose to obtain comprehensive health care from a single source for an annual fee paid in advance.

We envision that a wide variety of organizations could be established to provide a form of pre-paid health care. Under Medicare, hospitals, medical societies, university

medical centers and other health organizations might well organize themselves as health maintenance organizations and establish group plans. As in the most successful of pre-paid practices, health maintenance organizations would aim at keeping patients out of the hospital unless they absolutely had to be there—keeping people well, not just caring for them when they are ill.

Let me say, at this point, that reform of our system of health care is not the exclusive responsibility of government, it depends upon all of us.

We recognize that medical schools have their problems, especially with finances. But I believe it is time the medical schools began to search their consciences to determine whether their dollars are being used to the greatest benefit of the people of this country.

While we in the government attempt to change our priorities, you in the colleges should do the same.

Last year, we attempted to cut back certain medical research funds that were going into grants which, in our view, served no useful and relevant purpose. But the lobby effort by the medical community was a vigorous one—and those research funds were reinstated.

I ask you now if you have not honestly seen a great deal of money—which should have been used to implement policies which would help people—spent to conduct irrelevant research projects?

For example, an application came into the National Institutes of Mental Health and was approved for over \$23,000 to a particular hospital for research into the toilet training of exceptional and normal children.

Changing these priorities is not the sole responsibility of universities or of the government.

The private doctor, cloistered in his private office, lobbying through the traditional institutions, is no longer in step with the times.

For some time, consumers and providers of services have been urging us to reform our delivery system.

Now an additional voice is being heard. Many of our young doctors and medical students are no longer satisfied with a system of health care delivery which does not serve the people as it should.

I had the opportunity last year to meet with a group of medical students at Harvard. I saw first-hand that they were no longer talking among themselves about where they would practice, where their residency would take place and ultimately how much money they would make. They were asking questions instead about health services in the ghettos, how they might work to cut the cost of health care, how they might work to increase health services in rural areas, how medical schools might increase their output of doctors to meet our crucial health manpower needs. This attitude is encouraging and I came away with the feeling that those of us in government who are trying to alter the health care delivery system had found a new ally.

But medical students and young doctors are at a disadvantage in the medical community. They face the barriers of age, experience and power that characterize the "establishment" in every occupational group.

They will have to work within those institutions, which have always lobbied and represented the medical community so well and so aggressively. But they will have to up-date the awareness and concern of those groups of contemporary health problems—with both the patients and their own financial well-being in mind.

The institutions and organizations of the medical community must respond to the challenge of the times. If they refuse, their punishment will be to live under the judgment of men less knowledgeable than themselves. Indifference to the social issues of

medicine will ultimately guarantee governmental intervention. The price of freedom from intervention is responsible action in the public interest.

This is not a threat, but a realistic assessment of current trends.

Many people are very skeptical about this kind of approach to dealing with defects in the American system of health care. Some individuals insist that the system is sound and should be left alone. Others demand that we throw out the baby with the bath water and replace our pluralistic health enterprise with some monolithic scheme in which the Federal Government controls everything.

I think both points of view are wrong. The deep troubles of the health care enterprise have been nurtured by many factors, not the least of which is past failure to plan and prepare for the soaring demand that many thoughtful and observant people knew was coming. But I do not believe that past neglect means that we now have to start over and pursue some course of action that would be entirely alien to the traditions that this College of Medicine has helped to shape.

I simply cannot subscribe to the idea that we must now break—utterly and totally—with the past. If that were the case, the history of this institution would be meaningless. The men and women whom it prepared for careers in the field of health would be all but useless at a time when we need them most.

I cannot tell you whether the next hundred years of growth at this College of Medicine will be harder than the last. In a Century, medicine has moved from an infant science to one of the most powerful forces affecting life on this planet. To train men and women in the wise and humane use of that force is an awesome responsibility.

But to bring the achievements of medical science into the lives of people who have lived and suffered without them is perhaps an even greater responsibility. The medical colleges of this country, along with the rest of us who labor in the field of health, have to help bear that burden. But it is the students and young people who will determine whether we succeed or fail.

If the American health enterprise fails, it will not fall through lack of discovery but through lack of will.

Medical students . . . and all students . . . in every field of endeavor have shown they do not lack for will.

From what I have seen of their knowledge and compassion, I am convinced that we will succeed, and that long before you celebrate your two hundredth birthday, health will be secure among the basic rights of all Americans.

VICTIM OF DDT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the West Side, Detroit, Mich., Courier of Thursday, September 10, 1970.

That excellent editorial points out the perils, hazards and evil of unwise and often unnecessary use of DDT.

What a shame.

VICTIM OF DDT

Recent carefully documented research has proven that the widespread use of the insecticide DDT has wiped out the free-flying peregrine falcon in most of the nation, leav-

ing only a few dozen in the western mountains, also threatened with extinction.

The cause of the birds' demise was not discovered in time to save them and experts believe there is enough DDT residue left in the nation's fields and streams to doom the remaining birds. Thus only in islands far from these shores, or in Alaska, is this magnificent falcon likely to survive.

The disappearance of the duck hawk, as this bird is known in some areas, shows what science can do when care is not taken in the application of new poisons and insecticides. How many Americans have become sick from overdoses of sprays and poisons? How many fish have been killed? How many other animals and birds have been poisoned to death? The experts estimate their number in the millions.

ALCOHOLISM AND SST

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful editorial, "Alcoholism and SST" that appeared in the September 20, 1970, issue of the Arkansas Gazette. Alcoholism is a disease which afflicts 5 million persons in the United States and which for entirely too long has been the subject of neglect. I wholeheartedly endorse the bill S. 3835 adopted on August 10, 1970, by the Senate authorizing an appropriation of \$395 million over a 3-year period to combat this disease.

It would seem to me that if the Congress can vote a Government subsidy of \$290 million to develop a supersonic transport plane which, according to a Cabinet task force report, may produce unacceptable noise levels and environmental pollution and which would contribute only meagerly to both our technological development and our international prestige, we can certainly approve an adequate appropriation to wage a vigorous fight against alcoholism. For 2 years, I have opposed the SST appropriation. I have found it difficult to subscribe to the view that such a funding item should occupy a high place on our national priority list during this time of severe inflation and swollen Federal budgets.

I feel that we should give serious consideration to supporting a high level of funding to reduce alcoholism which, as pointed out in this timely editorial, costs industry, business, government, and households billions of dollars a year.

Recognizing the seriousness of the problem of alcoholism, the South Arkansas Mental Health Center in El Dorado, Ark., submitted an application several months ago to the National Institute of Mental Health for a staffing grant for the treatment of alcoholism as well as drug addiction. The proposed program of the center represents a highly innovative and creative approach to tackling this grave national problem. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the staff of the South Arkansas Mental Health Center for having come up with

such an imaginative proposal which I hope will be funded in the near future.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the Arkansas Gazette editorial:

ALCOHOLISM AND SST

Alcoholism by all accounts costs industry, business, government and households billions of dollars a year in this country. Indeed, the loss of taxes on lost income because of the disease surely must cost government many millions of dollars.

Even so, relatively little attention is given at the federal level to reducing the incidence of alcoholism as a disease that affects millions of Americans. This year, finally, the Senate has moved vigorously to help create what the president of the National Council on Alcoholism calls "an adequate federal, state and local mechanism for the treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism." The bill passed by the Senate would provide \$395 million over a three-year period to finance various steps combating the disease.

Nixon administration officials, however, are engaged in trying to get even that amount reduced in the cause of reducing the federal budget. An administration spokesman has supported in testimony before a House subcommittee the idea behind the Senate bill, but he has not supported the level of spending set by the Senate.

The same administration is supporting the spending this year alone of \$290 million on further development of the supersonic transport, which is costing a total of well over \$1 billion, despite the shaky justification that has been offered by federal involvement in the SST.

One argument cited for the SST is that eventually it will return in revenues all the federal money spent in its development and therefore is a good long-range investment. Many economists have questioned that argument. What we can be a good deal more sure about, however, is that money spent on reducing alcoholism clearly will eventually be returned to the federal government in the form of taxes on regained income and productive capacity. The bonus in that case will be for many Americans freedom from a disease that they might still have without the federally financed programs that offered them the opportunity for a cure.

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON SPEAKS IN MISSISSIPPI

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 22 last, at the dedication of the new submarine overhaul facility of the Ingalls East-Division's Shipyard in my hometown of Pascagoula, Miss., the Honorable WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, of Tennessee, made a splendid, instructive, and appropriate speech. We were also honored on that occasion by the presence of my able and distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, the senior democrat on the House Appropriations Committee. Mr. WHITTEN has, on many occasions, not only demonstrated his interests in national defense but also in the continued growth of Mississippi's greatest industry, Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp.

Mr. WHITTEN spoke in his usual effective manner without manuscript or notes

and, he too, was well received by his fellow Mississippians.

I was delighted that Congressman ANDERSON was our principal speaker on that occasion, not only because he is a learned and valuable member of the important Rules Committee which channels all important and appropriate legislation from other committees of the House for floor consideration, but also because of his knowledge and expertise in the operation of nuclear submarines. It will be remembered that Congressman ANDERSON, although a comparatively young man, is a retired captain of the U.S. Navy. It will also be recalled that it was Captain ANDERSON to whom the Secretary of the Navy entrusted the important as well as perilous mission of steering the Navy's atomic powered submarine, the *Nautilus*, under the icecap of the North Pole. Incidentally, to the best of my knowledge, this mission, successfully performed by the former Captain ANDERSON, is the only one of its nature in the history of the world.

Because of my high respect for my colleague and because of the informative and important contents of Congressman ANDERSON's speech on that occasion, I take pride and pleasure in submitting it to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for posterity.

The speech follows:

DEDICATION OF INGALLS EAST DIVISION'S NEW SUBMARINE OVERHAUL FACILITY, PASCAGOULA, MISS., AUGUST 22, 1970

I am honored to participate in this occasion and to stand in the presence of three men who have made vast contributions to our nation.

Congressman Jamie Whitten, the distinguished Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, has withstood broadside after broadside from the big metropolitan Congressional delegations in Congress in his work to enhance the vitality and economic prospects of our farmers, small towns and cities. Despite increasingly heavy odds, he has come out the victor. His victories are all the more noteworthy because he has accurately foreseen that a revitalized rural America is the best answer to the problems which plague our overcrowded cities. Thus, he has served our entire nation, and served it well.

As a Tennessean, I am acutely aware of the contribution of inexpensive TVA-produced public power to the development of the Tennessee Valley region. Recently, TVA announced an earth shaking 25 percent increase in power rates. Most of the reason for the huge rate increase is the fact that the cost of coal for TVA's numerous coal fired generating plants has virtually doubled in the short span of one year. This means that nuclear power for commercial, industrial and home consumption has, almost overnight, become cheaper than electricity produced from coal. Three years ago no one even dreamed this would be the case. Because of cost factors and the grave air pollution problems inherent in coal fired plants, this nation needs vast nuclear generating facilities, not in the 1980's or '90's as projected a few years ago, but right now—in 1970.

Admiral Rickover is known as the Father of the Nuclear Submarine. History will record his remarkable contributions to his country in a much larger context. He is, in fact, Father not only of nuclear propelled naval ships, but Father of nuclear power for peaceful purposes as well. It all started with his studies at Oak Ridge more than two decades ago when the only cooperation he received was from the atom itself. In making prac-

ticable the Polaris deterrent force he has made the most significant contribution of this age to our national security; we will soon recognize the equally important contribution to our domestic economic security and well-being derived from his pioneering work in nuclear power generating plants.

You will recall Judge Howard Smith of Virginia, long a Member of the House, long the famous Chairman of the Committee on Rules. Bill Colmer, your own distinguished Representative, succeeded Judge Smith three and one-half years ago. For quite a few years Mr. Colmer sat on Judge Smith's right—the ranking Democrat—next in line of succession. If any one man knows another man well, Judge Smith knows Bill Colmer. I want to share with you what Judge Smith told me this past week.

He said, "I love Bill Colmer. I think so highly of him I can hardly express it in words. From my long and close affiliation with him, both on the Rules Committee and in the House, I saw him as one of those rare public men who put sound principle before political maneuvering. He is a man who stands up for what he believes in. What he believes in, he sticks to. He will stand up to the lobbyists; he will stand up to other Members; he will stand up to the Speaker—yes, even the President of the United States. He is a man of great courage—great convictions—great strength."

All of us in the House, and especially those of us privileged to serve on the Rules Committee under Bill Colmer, share fully Judge Smith's love and high esteem of your Congressman.

We are here today to dedicate facilities which add to the capability of this shipyard to contribute to our national defense.

Ingalls has made a notable record in the shipbuilding industry since its beginning in 1938. During World War II they made a major contribution to the war effort by building over 60 naval vessels. After the War, Ingalls concentrated on commercial shipbuilding but in 1952 resumed naval construction. In 1955 Ingalls established its Nuclear Power Division and subsequently entered the important field of nuclear powered submarine construction. To date they have built eight nuclear powered attack submarines and have contracts to build four more.

Today we are observing a new landmark in Ingalls development—the introduction of facilities with which the shipyard can overhaul and refuel nuclear submarines. These include the new graving dock which is already being used, and several highly specialized service and shop facilities. With these modern tools Ingalls will participate in the highly demanding but very vital task of repairing and maintaining our nuclear submarine fleet.

Nuclear power has given these ships almost unlimited range and endurance and, speaking from personal experience, there are no ships anywhere that are run harder. Operating throughout the oceans of the world for months at a time these ships need highly expert attention when they are taken off the line for their infrequent overhauls. The task may not be as appealing as building a ship from keel up but in many ways it is far more demanding. Certainly it is a vital task if these first line ships are to continue to serve our nation in peace or war. It is certainly appropriate that we give recognition to this new capability at Ingalls and to the part it will play in our defense efforts.

Looking more broadly at the U.S. submarine program, I am deeply concerned that our present efforts are not sufficient to meet the challenge from the Soviet Union. In unmistakable terms the Soviets have mounted a naval program that is overtaking the U.S. in almost every area. They are doing this even though the Soviet Union already is the world's foremost land power and does not need a world-wide navy for her defense pur-

poses. Her naval buildup is solely for the purpose of projecting Soviet influence abroad and neutralizing the presence of western navies primarily that of the United States.

As demonstrated during two world wars, the United States depends upon free use of the seas for our very survival as a nation. Without a navy capable of maintaining this freedom against all threats we cannot hope to be invincible in time of war. Thus the efforts of the Soviet Union to counter our naval strength strike at the heart of our defense posture. The challenge is particularly acute in the field of submarines. The Soviets since World War II have placed great emphasis on submarines. They have produced more than 570 new ones in the 25 years through 1969, while the United States produced only 105.

Currently the Soviet Union has a total of some 355 modern submarines, more than 75 of which are nuclear powered. All of their units have been built since World War II. In comparison, the U.S. total is 147, 88 of which are nuclear powered. Most of the remaining U.S. Diesel units are of World War II vintage. Russia has scrapped or sent to reserve status submarines more modern than ones the U.S. is still operating.

The Soviets have invested tremendous resources in facilities to build and overhaul submarines. They have the largest and most up-to-date submarine construction yards in the world with a capacity well above that available in the United States. They are estimated to be capable of producing 20 nuclear powered submarines a year while working only eight hours a day. Obviously, this construction rate could be greatly expanded by simply working additional hours.

Since we were the first nation to have nuclear powered submarines, we have come to expect a lead in this area. In fact, this has always been used as a major reason why we did not have to compete with the Russians in total numbers of submarines. Yet, because of our lagging building program in past years we are now faced with the loss of our nuclear submarine lead by the end of this year. The momentum of the current Soviet effort means that we will be increasingly outnumbered in the years to come.

While we are losing our superiority in numbers of nuclear submarines, we are also losing our lead in almost all aspects of submarine technology. The United States has only produced one new nuclear submarine design in a decade; the Soviets have put out a number of new nuclear designs in just the last two years.

Today, our technological lead has been reduced in almost all aspects of submarine performance characteristics, submarine sensors, and submarine weapons. Take, for example, speed. For many years our submarines were assumed to have a marked speed advantage over the Soviets. Today this is no longer true. Every submariner knows that speed advantage can be all-important.

Another area of real concern is submarine weapons. The Soviets have wide-spread deployment of the long range anti-ship cruise missile which represents one of the most serious threats to our surface naval and maritime ships. This unique weapon is installed in some 65 submarines all capable of sitting astride our vital sea lanes and interdicting our ocean commerce. The United States has no comparable weapon. Rather, we continue to put all our eggs in one basket, relying almost exclusively on torpedoes as our principal tactical submarine weapon. Even now we are unable to give our fleet the modern torpedo it needs. Our current designs do not have the speed, range, acquisition or depth capability required to counter the modern, fast, deep-diving Soviet submarines. Further, our inventory of these weapons is also woefully inadequate. The Mark 48 torpedo program was supposed to remedy this

but has encountered continuing delays. The failure of this one program seriously impairs the effectiveness of our entire submarine fleet.

In other key aspects of submarine technology, such as reliability, sonar and quietness of operation, the Soviets are well on their way to attaining equality with us, and in some cases may already be superior.

Last year, Soviet submarines stretched their operations for longer periods and at greater distances than ever before. They have now established mobile task forces in which their submarines are repaired and maintained from large tenders while underway, thus greatly expanding their operating capability and range. This is a new and unique contribution to the art of submarine warfare. With this system, the Soviets can now move a naval task force into the Indian Ocean, the South Atlantic, the South Pacific, or any other area they wish.

Most importantly, the Soviet Union has developed an awesome technical and industrial capacity to continue the expansion and improvement of their submarine fleet and extend their advantage over us in the coming decade. They have developed a huge technical force of trained engineers to support their naval program. They have from six to seven times the number of students studying naval architecture and marine engineering as we do in the United States.

In summary, these facts mean that the balance of world naval power is swinging rapidly in favor of the Soviet Union. It is critically important that the Administration, the people of America, that we all recognize the seriousness of this threat, and that we begin at once to structure our own submarine program to meet it.

Admiral Rickover has repeatedly and eloquently testified regarding our urgent needs along these lines.

The Congress has continued to urge a greater effort to build a modern U.S. submarine force and to keep it strong, but the Defense Department has often ignored this advice and has allowed much of the vital lead we once had in this field to be lost. Apparently, the lesson still has not been learned, for just this fiscal year the Department of Defense submitted only a minimal request for three high speed submarines. The House of Representatives has increased that number to four. But this is only a small part of a much bigger task. If we in this country are going to prevent the Soviet Union from becoming the dominant naval power in the world, it is clear much more will need to be done. If we do not face up to the task, peace will continue to be an increasingly elusive goal.

COAL EXPORTS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to urge the President and the administration to exercise authority under the Export Control Act to limit the exportation of low-sulfur coal which is currently being shipped in huge quantities to Japan. Last year, we exported over 20 million tons of low-sulfur coal to Japan. This year we are exporting low-sulfur coal to Japan at a rate approximating 28 million tons per year, an increase of 40 percent.

The skyrocketing increase in the export of quality coal has created acute shortages in this country resulting in

prices which have almost doubled. These export policies have forced domestic utilities into the use of high-polluting, high-sulfur fuels. This will result in higher utility bills and dirtier air in the urban areas of America.

Under the terms of the Export Control Act, it is the policy of the United States to exercise controls to such extent as is necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. These conditions presently exist with respect to low-sulfur fuel and warrant the exercise of controls.

Unless export controls are immediately applied to low-sulfur coal, the fuel crisis in America will be out of control and the pollution problem will be critically compounded.

EPA AND NOAA—OR CEQ?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the October 1970 issue of the *Environmental Journal*, the National Parks and Conservation magazine, carries an article entitled "EPA & NOAA—or CEQ?" The article presents in considered terms a discussion of the proposals to create an Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—and a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—and contrasts these proposals "to the central need" for enhancing the role of the Council on Environmental Quality—CEQ.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read this article, I insert its text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EPA AND NOAA—OR CEQ?

Government reorganization is a chronic affliction in the nation's capital. The Earth movement, triggered by a chain reaction of environmental crises, has renewed concern about federal coordination of more than 80 environmental programs. Jurisdictional confusion in key areas severely handicaps federal programs.

Who is responsible, for instance, for balancing promotion and protection within a department or agency? For protecting estuaries and coastal waters? For avoiding future oil spills? For controlling pollution of the open sea? For dealing with regional air pollution? For the environmental damage done by federal highways? For making the Army Corps of Engineers enforce the 1899 Refuse Act? For the damage done by development-thirsty giants such as the Corps, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of Mines? For regulating the dumping of waste at sea and underground? For determining tolerable noise levels? For the adequacy of reforestation efforts? The first annual report of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) takes up 326 pages to raise these questions and many others.

In July President Nixon announced a reorganization of environmental programs by executive orders. Many programs would remain scattered among the departments. Others would be transferred to a new agency in the Department of Commerce, or to a new independent agency. Executive Reorganization Plan No. 3 would create the Environ-

mental Protection Agency (EPA). Plan No. 4 would create the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in the Department of Commerce. Both plans will become effective automatically on October 3 unless Congress votes disapproval, in which case there would be no deadline for further discussion and action.

EPA would be an independent agency whose administrator would be of sub-cabinet rank. It would have 5,650 personnel and an estimated budget of \$1.4 billion in fiscal 1971. The following would be moved to the new agency: the Federal Water Quality Administration, Interior Department pesticide studies, the National Air Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Solid Waste Management, the Bureau of Water Hygiene, some functions of the Bureau of Radiological Health, certain pesticide programs of the Food and Drug Administration, authority to study ecosystems (from the new Council on Environmental Quality), certain functions of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Radiation Council governing radiation criteria, and pesticide registration functions and related activities of the Agricultural Research Service. The President sees EPA and the Council on Environmental Quality as complementary, not competing.

NOAA is supposed to bring together in a single administration (the Department of Commerce) the major federal programs dealing with the seas and atmosphere. These programs presently exist in four departments and one agency. NOAA would have over 12,000 personnel and an estimated budget of about \$270 million in fiscal 1971. It would be made up of the following parts of the federal corpus: the Environmental Science Services Administration (already a major prestige unit of the Department of Commerce), most of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Marine Minerals Technology Program, the marine sports fishing program of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, the Office of Sea Grant Programs, elements of the United States Lake Survey, the National Oceanographic Data and Instrumentation Centers, and the National Data Buoy Program.

The Presidential initiative is to be commended. Conservationists are deeply concerned, however, that further jurisdictional confusion may result from the Administration's two plans. EPA and NOAA merely transfer some existing environmental programs. Jurisdictional conflicts remain unsettled and should be resolved by the Council on Environmental Quality.

The President listed as contributors to the plans the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization (the Ash Council); the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources (the Stratton Commission, appointed by President Johnson); the President's special task force on oceanography headed by Dr. James Wakelin; and "the information developed during both House and Senate hearings on proposed NOAA legislation."

But in House and Senate subcommittee hearings considering EPA and NOAA, it was revealed that neither committee had been asked for an opinion by the White House before fixing the final form of Plans 3 and 4. Furthermore, Roy Ash and CEQ chairman Russell Train admitted that neither adviser had influenced or been briefed on the final plans.

However, the president of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, Parke C. Brinkley, expressed satisfaction in his role regarding EPA's formulation. "When this plan [EPA] was first brought to our attention, our reaction was negative," Brinkley candidly stated. "After careful reflection, however, we accept the plan. We say that though there have been instances where pesticides have contributed to environmental problems, pesticides have done far more to clean the environment than to despoil it . . .

The emotion stems from the discovery of pesticide residues in nontarget species but without regard to the benefits achieved when these calculated risks are taken.

"We then look forward to the opportunity to deal principally with one agency where there will be an opportunity for prompt communication between the regulators and the regulated . . . The Agency must accept a premise that is not particularly popular at the moment and that is that there is a desperate need to continue pesticide use for the protection of food, the protection of the public health, and for the improvement in the quality of the environment."

What caused the pesticide industry's lobby organization to change its position on EPA? Why does it now seem confident that the new agency will accept the industry's premise that pesticide use is vital to food supplies, public health, and "the quality of the environment"? (This latter phrase is meaningless in such a context.)

Dr. Spencer Smith, a registered conservation lobbyist for over 15 years, pointed out the major issues: "The basic problem . . . is what functions do you include [in EPA] and what functions do you exclude and what are your criteria for doing either . . . We understand that EPA is neither perfect nor immutable, but . . . we wish the program were more perfect and less immutable than the proposal the committee is now considering."

What troubles most conservationists is that only 10 environmental programs out of nearly 80 throughout the federal government are being transferred to EPA. And even these few will have to defend themselves from the budget knife without a spokesman in the cabinet. The feared results will be an 18-month delay in research findings and effective regulation while EPA gets organized and functioning. Increased fragmentation of environmental research, standard-setting, and enforcement will result from many closely related programs remaining behind in other agencies and departments. Congressman John Blatnik of Minnesota, who favors an independent research-enforcement agency, argued, "All we are asking [of EPA] is a reasonably good start, a strong foundation to build upon." He fears that under the existing plan many programs will be "lost between the administrative cracks." Blatnik is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization.

Not included in EPA are many key environmental programs such as the water and sewer grant program in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, DOT's noise pollution program, the environmental effects of the mining research program in the Bureau of Mines, HEW's consumer protection and occupational protection programs, the highway beautification program, the Army Corps of Engineers, and HEW's National Institute of Health Sciences. Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal (D-NY), a member of Blatnik's subcommittee points out that the HEW 1969 Annual Report clearly states: "The mission of the National Institute of Health Sciences is to identify the chemical, physical, and biological factors in the environment that can adversely affect man, to learn how these operate, and to provide scientific bases for the development of control measures by other agencies." Yet this important unit is not to be transferred to EPA.

NOAA's creation presents a different host of problems. Dr. Smith calls Reorganization Plan No. 4 "completely irrational and without justification by the Administration's own criteria." The Department of Commerce has always made its major mission one of promotion and development of natural resources, not protection and regulation of these resources. Locating NOAA in the Department of Commerce, Smith thinks, would place these objectives in direct conflict. "It involves promoting a particular resource use and concomitantly being held

responsible for regulating the environmental effects of such activity." History seems to have made clear that executive branch agencies have extreme difficulty balancing promotion and regulation of a specific resource.

Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), while supporting the basic concept of EPA, has introduced a resolution to disapprove Plan 4 pending thorough congressional consideration of alternatives. He took exception to remarks by CEQ's Russell Train and Under Secretary of Commerce Rocco Siciliano at the July 9 press conference announcing the plans. Train, when asked why NOAA was not put in EPA, replied: "Because the new EPA is intended to focus on the control of pollution... ocean programs, obviously, go far beyond that, development efforts of all sorts." To a similar question Siciliano replied: "As far as NOAA is concerned, let's make a comparison. One is a standard-setting enforcement-type agency which needs independence and this is your EPA. The other is a research, development, protection, and conservation function which we are doing already in the Commerce Department...."

Senator Nelson is concerned that NOAA does not unscramble the jurisdictional tangle of federal agencies having marine responsibilities. "The Corps of Engineers lets all kinds of waste dumping go on beyond the 3-mile limit off our coasts, because it is unsure of its authority in this area, and for in-shore waters, the Corps recently did not even know how many permits it had issued. Plan Number 4 does not deal with this serious inadequacy in federal policy."

Senator Nelson, who has introduced two bills to protect the environmental integrity of the oceans, feels that it would be far better to reorganize and strengthen the Department of Interior or to build on the foundation of EPA than to place NOAA in the Department of Commerce.

Maine's Senator Edmund Muskie, chairman of the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, is concerned about the money and manpower commitment behind the Administration's Reorganization Plans 3 and 4. Muskie is troubled by the President's remarks on July 9. "It is not practical, however, to itemize or aggregate the exact expenditure reductions which will result from this action," Nixon said. Muskie argues that "We should not expect expenditures for these already underfunded, undermanned programs to decrease."

An alternative approach to Senator Nelson's resolution to place NOAA in EPA was introduced by Congressman John D. Dingell (D-Mich.). Dingell, who is chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, introduced two resolutions recommending House disapproval of Reorganization Plans 3 and 4. He favors subsequent legislative action to coordinate environmental programs and jurisdictions.

Reorganization Plans 3 and 4 bear further implications. At present, environmental programs are represented at the cabinet level, although the cabinet members in question often have to serve both promotion and protection interests of their clientele. EPA would be headed by an administrator below

cabinet rank, similar to the directors of NASA and the AEC. Both these agencies, however, have been essentially promotional, not regulatory, agencies. They have received almost undivided support and significant funds because promotion usually means spending federal money in one or more congressional districts. Promotion-prone agencies reap political support. But this tends not to be the case with regulatory agencies when their performance is effective. The EPA director would be unlikely to possess clout equivalent to that of the NASA and AEC directors.

Coordination of all environmental programs, as opposed to transfer of several programs to a new agency, should be the key-stone of an urgently needed environmental executive reorganization. Not needed is another congregation of an incomplete list of existing federal programs to be transferred to an umbrella agency possessing no new coordination authority. Needed is more strength within the newly created President's Council on Environmental Quality. This enhanced authority of the CEQ should range from coordination of operating environmental programs to stop-order authority against environmentally destructive construction projects or programs to more sophisticated research capabilities that would better assist the CEQ in exercising its enhanced authority. The CEQ should and could become the focus of environmental research, planning, and coordination at the Presidential level, with review and stop-order authority. Executive reorganization is tangential to the central need for SEQ policy coordination and enforcement authority.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 30, 1970

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might.—Deuteronomy 6: 5.

Almighty and ever-living God, by whose mercy we have come with our Hebrew brethren to the beginning of another year, grant that we may enter it together with humble and grateful hearts. Confirm our resolutions, we pray Thee, to walk more closely with Thee and to labor more faithfully for the good of our fellow men according to the teaching of our law and the example of our Lord.

We invoke Thy blessing upon our country, Enlighten with Thy wisdom and sustain with Thy power those whom the people have set in authority, our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who are entrusted with our safety and our freedom. May peace and good will live in the lives of our citizens and may religion spread its blessings among us, exalting our Nation in righteousness.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3558) entitled "An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17604. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17255) entitled "An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. SPONG, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. DOLE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17604) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the

House with an amendment to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3479. An act to amend section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORT ON S. 30, THE ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL BILL

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 30) relating to the control of organized crime in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and if I may have the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey, I assume this has been cleared with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have every reason to believe so.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman under these circumstances will withhold his request briefly?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold briefly his unanimous-consent request until he is able to contact the ranking member on the minority side and the Republican leadership?

Mr. RODINO. I shall be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.