

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER SPEAKS
AT THE OLDER AMERICAN WHITE
HOUSE FORUM

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on September 23, the New York State Office for the Aging officially launched our State's preparations for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging with 10 Regional Older American White House Forums which were attended by nearly 10,000 senior citizens.

It was appropriate that the State's first official function in connection with this conference began by allowing older people themselves to speak out on their actual day-to-day needs and concerns. And it is this philosophy which will direct all of the subsequent activities in New York State; namely, that older people will be vitally involved in every phase of these preparations, for it is they who best know their own needs.

At this first series of meetings, each older person had the opportunity to complete the national needs questionnaire. I know that the results of these questionnaires will provide us with a tremendous starting point in our work to bring more and better services to the aging.

New York State has a population of more than 3 million persons who are 60 years of age and over—2.1 million of whom are 65 or over. In New York City, alone, the more than 1 million senior citizens constitute a population larger than that of most of the Nation's larger cities.

The older New Yorker has more programs and services—at the public, private, and voluntary level—than any senior citizen in the country. Nonetheless, it has never been New York State's policy to rest on past accomplishments. Rather, we see our responsibility as continuing to pioneer and to experiment so that we can insure that older people are able to lead productive and useful lives.

There will be many recommendations coming to the national White House Conference on Aging in November of 1971, but I think New York's Governor Rockefeller has outlined, very succinctly, the most grievous areas of concern to our older people in the address which he delivered at the September 23 forums. The Governor's remarks were carried to each of the 10 regional forums by a special telephone hookup. I feel his speech is of sufficient importance to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER AT THE OLDER AMERICAN WHITE HOUSE FORUM, HUNTER COLLEGE

Today, I'm not just addressing one audience, I'm addressing ten.

Around this State there are nine other meetings of this conference; and my voice is going out to each meeting over a special telephone hookup.

I want all of you out there and here to know that what you tell me is just as important as what I'm going to tell you; because this is your conference.

What you say will determine the shape of this State's recommendations at next year's White House Conference on Aging. But it all begins here and now.

So my real job today is not so much to talk.

It's to listen to you.

And one way we'll be listening is by going through those questionnaires you'll be filling out.

They will tell us all kinds of things.

They'll tell us whether you're satisfied with where you live—if you live with others or alone; whether you think you're getting enough companionship and recreation; whether you have a chance to participate in the life of your community.

We began working on problems like these nine years ago in this State.

That's when I created a State Office for the Aging. I put that office right in the Executive Department, close to the Governor; because I have a deep personal concern for your problems.

I named a marvelous lady, Marcelle Levy, as Director of the Office for the Aging and Marcelle has done a magnificent job.

Mrs. Levy doesn't see citizens of maturity and experience as a burden; but as a valuable resource to the community.

She doesn't think of older people as problems.

She sees them as people with special needs; and there's a world of difference, as you well know.

We have two million people in our State who are 65 and over; and while the kind of problems they have are special, their aspirations are the same as everyone else's.

They want to help others when they can. Retired people have time to do volunteer work and they have a life-time of skills to offer.

So we passed legislation this year that makes it easier for older people to work as volunteers.

This law allows local governments to reimburse older persons for any expenses they incur while they're doing volunteer work.

Older people want to be able to get along on their usually fixed incomes.

That's terribly important. It means peace of mind—independence—security.

But with prices going up, getting along can be pretty tough on a fixed income.

So four years ago the Legislature passed a recommendation of mine to give communities the opportunity to grant property tax relief to older home owners.

This year, we raised the income eligibility level for that tax relief from the original \$3,000 to \$5,000.

Some 45,000 older home owners are paying lower property taxes as a result of these administrative measures.

Something else older people deserve is good medical care—especially since they have the greatest medical needs.

That's why this Administration has loan and grant programs to get hospitals and nursing homes built.

But we need a better system for financing medical care, too.

Medicare has been good, as far as it goes. But when coverage runs out during long stages of illness, the only recourse is Medicaid.

And Medicaid isn't the final answer either.

We need a unified system for financing medical care, like Universal Health Insurance.

I've tried to get it in our State, I'll keep trying.

But, Universal Health Insurance would work better on a national basis.

I hope that the State and regional committees that will be working on recommendations for the White House Conference on Aging will give Universal Health Insurance a strong recommendation.

Another thing some older people want to do or need to do is work.

Yet, the Federal Social Security law penalizes work, in a sense.

A person getting Social Security loses \$1 for every 2 he earns between \$140 and \$240 a month.

On earnings over \$240, he loses a dollar of social security for every dollar of earnings; unless the worker is over age 72.

This amounts to a harsh tax against the elderly—the very people least able to afford it.

I say that's wrong, and should be changed.

Why should we penalize people for working? That's what this country is trying to get away from.

Another thing that older citizens want are places where they can go to get all the special services they need under one roof; without having to trot all over town.

Senior citizen centers make sense to me.

That's why I signed a law this year that authorizes low-cost State loans so that a community can build a one-stop service center for its older people.

And now that New York State has taken the lead, I would like to see the Federal Government start giving financial aid to help operate these centers.

That's something else I hope you'll include when you draw up those recommendations for the White House Conference.

These are some of the things that I think we ought to be doing to make life better for our older citizens.

We've done a lot in New York State—and we'll do more. But the Federal Government needs to do more too. I believe in Senior Power. I've seen it work. Older citizens are among the most valuable human resources we have.

Many of you are still at work—in government, in volunteer activities and in commerce and industry.

You do great work, too; —because you have the wisdom and the experience to get a job done right.

There's no substitute for that.

So I hope that this conference will, above all, consider ways we can make better use of all the Senior Power around us.

And when you come to think of it, this conference is making use of Senior Power right now.

And I, for one, am looking forward to your recommendations.

A DIFFERENCE IN STANDARDS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, most of us know the rigid requirements for meat inspection and sanitation in this country. Not so many realize the very strict

standards of cleanliness, inspection, and refrigeration that is required for our dairy products.

However, for imports coming into this country and competing with our highly inspected and rigidly controlled products, there seems not to be the same standards.

Cor Bos of Lake Wilson, in southwest Minnesota, was recently in Europe and made some interesting observations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to insert Mr. Bos' observations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so they may be read by all of my colleagues:

STANDARDS FOR IMPORTS

A recent trip and a 60-day stay at different farms and dairies in Europe produced my following conclusions:

We do not need quotas on dairy and meat imports from other countries. All we need is the requirement, very reasonable at that, of the same standards of inspection for both domestic and imported meat and milk products. That would stop—and quick—all imports of these products.

To wit: At different farms where I stayed the milk produced at 5 o'clock in the evening without any cooling—not even water cooling—was poured into 10-gallon cans and set down at the end of the driveway until the truck would pick it up at 4 o'clock in the morning. The banging of the cans awakened me at that early hour. This was in Holland.

In France the same thing. The only difference was 5-gallon cans instead of 10-gallon. There seems to be a difference between the ambitious Dutch and the more easygoing French.

Though their milk barns were fairly clean, as were their cows, this lack of refrigeration is something the American farmer would not dream of getting by with.

The same for meat. In Montfort, Holland, we went for a walk through the town at 9 o'clock at night. Stopping at a slaughterhouse, we found the doors standing wide open. Just inside was hanging the day's kill of several hundred lambs—no refrigeration—just waiting for the trucks to take them to Paris.

A few days later, in Paris, we visited a couple of butcher shops and found several lamb carcasses, a couple of beef quarters, and a side of pork hanging out in the open. The meat looked kind of reddish and dehydrated.

Is that the kind of meat we want to eat? The milk products we want to consume?

Cor Bos.

Minnesota.

CONSUMER RELATIONS CODE—VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce has adopted a consumer relations code which is a model statement of business' responsibility to its customers. Increasingly, the business community is coming to recognize its self-interest in better consumer relations and I am pleased that Virginia businessmen are leading the way in this regard.

I ask unanimous consent that the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce's

Consumer Code be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BUSINESS-CONSUMER RELATIONS CODE

Consumers and business are mutually dependent in the competitive market place—consumers, for the freedom to choose among products and services; business, for the freedom to offer goods and services.

The consumer has had, and must continue to have, certain basic and undeniable rights in the competitive market place—the right to safety, the right to be heard, the right to choose, the right to be informed and the right to quality and integrity.

We, therefore, reaffirm our continuing responsibility to affect, in our daily business operations, the following business-consumer relations code:

(1) TO protect the health and safety of the consumer in the design and manufacture of products; including positive actions against harmful side effects on the quality of life and the environment.

(2) TO utilize technical progress to produce goods of high standards and quality at the lowest reasonable price.

(3) TO be cognizant of the views of consumers in the earliest stages of product planning to help assure customer satisfaction.

(4) TO simplify, clarify and honor product warranties and guarantees.

(5) TO maximize the quality of product servicing and repairs and encourage their fair pricing.

(6) TO eliminate deceptive advertising and marketing practices from the market place to the end that our ultimate goal is not only strict legality, but honesty in all transactions.

(7) TO properly educate sales personnel so that they are familiar with product capabilities and limitations and are able to respond adequately to customer questions.

(8) TO provide customers with objective information about products, services and the workings of the market place.

(9) TO facilitate the use of value comparisons between various products.

(10) TO provide effective channels for receiving and acting upon consumer complaints and suggestions.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, July 10, 1970.

NEW YORK STATE COMBATS DRUG ABUSE

HON. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, the rapid spread of drug abuse, particularly among the Nation's youth, is one of the most serious and tragic problems facing our society. We are all aware, I am sure, of the gravity of the drug dilemma: that a growing number of young Americans are seeking the answers to their perplexing frustrations in a bottle of pep pills, that marihuana is as readily available on many college campuses as a package of cigarettes, and, most tragic of all, that on the average, four people die each day in New York City from overdoses of heroin. We are well acquainted with the gruesome statistics of drug addiction. The problem is well publicized—and rightfully so.

What is not as well known, however,

are the measures being taken by government—at the local, State, and national levels—as well as in the private sector of the country to combat the rise in drug abuse. Since last December at the White House Governors' Conference when President Nixon addressed himself directly to the seriousness of drug dependence and set the tempo of the struggle to be waged in the 1970's, the State of New York has been in the forefront of the fight against this gnawing menace of narcotic addiction. This is partly because of the immediacy of the problem in New York, but it is also due in large part to the dedicated efforts of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

The all-out attack on drug abuse in New York State includes law enforcement to end trafficking of drugs, a vast public information and education program, and the provision of treatment for the drug abuser.

Treatment involves counseling, rehabilitation, and aftercare as well as such special approaches as the methadone maintenance program currently being undertaken by New York State.

The most recent product of Governor Rockefeller's crash campaign against drug abuse is a publication entitled, "Desk Reference on Drug Abuse." This booklet is designed as a guide to assist physicians and others engaged in emergency care to better diagnose and give initial treatment to patients with acute drug intoxications and the acute complications of drug dependence. Copies are being distributed free of charge by the New York Department of Health to all physicians, osteopaths, and health-care professionals in the State.

I commend Governor Rockefeller on his efforts to combat the rising wave of drug addiction in New York State, and I urge him to continue in his endeavors to rid this "monkey from our backs."

DISASTROUS ADMINISTRATION ECONOMIC POLICIES

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the latest economic statistics show a continuation of an economic phenomenon unparalleled in our history. Despite the shrill arguments to the contrary—from the President and the Vice President on down through the ranks of the administration's bureaucracy to its lowliest junior economist—the clear reading of the cold statistical facts is just this—our economy is in trouble. We have an "inflationary recession." It is a seeming contradiction in conventional terms, as any economist would say. Yet, for some strange reason this is precisely how it must be described because both the cost of living and unemployment are rising and show little, if any, signs of subsiding.

But we cannot deny the evidence, Mr. Speaker, that the Nixon administration policies have resulted in disastrous shrinking of the buying power of the

wage-earner. These policies have sharply cut our national growth rate, crippled our housing construction industry, reduced our industrial output, and curtailed corporate profits—which, in turn, has reduced Federal and State tax revenues so desperately needed in such essential areas as education, health services, job training, welfare, slum clearance and public housing and similar urban programs.

These administration policies have caused wide-spread hardships among our people as a whole, but they have been most severely felt by those at the middle and lower income levels. America's senior citizens and those living on pensions and other types of fixed income have been particularly hard hit. The disadvantaged among our citizens, desperately seeking a way to share in America's economic affluence of the 1960's, have been the victims of false hope and promises of equal opportunity and a better life. The administration's set of national priorities continues to put arms, machines and weapons systems above food, housing, equal job opportunities, and health services that our people so badly need.

Mr. Speaker, economic policies of the Nixon-Agnew administration have caused the greatest increase in unemployment in this country in more than a decade. The rate of unemployment has almost doubled. The number of unemployed has risen from 2.6 million, 3.3 percent, when President Nixon took office to more than 4.2 million, 5.2 percent. If we consider those who are no longer seeking employment because of long periods of frustration and discouragement at ever finding a job, the figure is much higher. It is also four to six times higher than the national average among young people of minority groups in my own city of Philadelphia and in other cities throughout the Nation.

During the first 18 months of the Nixon-Agnew administration, the Department of Labor's Consumer Price Index rose by 11.1 points—almost double the increase during the preceding 18 months. Interest rates have reached their highest levels in more than a hundred years. The average worker's pay check will buy less today than it did 5 years ago, despite "paper increases" in hourly wages. Food prices have skyrocketed, as any housewife can testify. Hamburger has gone up 15 percent during the past year and a half; pork has increased in price by 17 percent; instant coffee has risen 15 percent, and fresh fruits and vegetables have gone up by some 8 percent; bread and dairy products—essentials in any home—have risen by 6 percent.

This is not political rhetoric, Mr. Speaker. These are harsh realisms of the marketplace with which every family must deal every day. It is also a harsh reality that the Nixon-Agnew administration has failed the American people by its refusal to use the legal tools provided by Congress to place restraints on interest rates, wages, and prices. It has also failed to use the Executive influence to seek wage and price guidelines that were used during the Kennedy and John-

son administrations to hold down the cost of living and to stabilize the economy. The President's refusal to use even the moral power of his office to curb inflation was literally an invitation for big price increases in consumer goods, raw materials, and durable goods such as steel and other basic metals, automobiles, appliances, and other products. Big industry took full advantage of the President's invitation.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats in Congress are under attack from administration political spokesmen with an eye toward the November elections as being big spenders. This is not a new charge; and, as in previous cases, the charge is false. It ignores the uncontested fact that this Democratically controlled Congress actually cut the Nixon-Agnew administration budget requests by over \$6 billion in last year's session and is continuing that record this session. Congress, not the President, imposed a spending ceiling on the Federal budget in 1969—despite objections of the administration. At the same time, this Democratic Congress has rejected administration efforts to cut back essential funds for education, clean water, housing, and health programs, and have forced reductions in wasteful defense spending in an effort to accomplish a much needed reordering of our critical domestic spending priorities. Yet, the administration's political spokesmen continue to repeat the big-spender charge and continue the false allegation that somehow Federal spending for schools, pollution control, hospitals, health, housing, and other essential services is inflationary and must be cut. At the same time the administration proposes that we spend hundreds of millions of tax dollars to develop for private exploitation the supersonic transport—SST—plane and to bail out private companies such as Lockheed for their bungling of the C-5A cargo plane contract with the Air Force, or the Penn Central Railroad for its mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will not be fooled by the obvious attempt of the Nixon-Agnew administration to cover up its economic failures and its callous disregard of the public interest. It will not be fooled by the smokescreen of disunity being spread over the land by the Vice President, who, at a time when all Americans need and want unity of purpose in this troubled world, seeks to divide and disrupt us. He seeks to pit one economic group against another; one race against another; the hawks against the doves; the hard hats against the student radicals; and suburbanites against the city dwellers. Nothing could be more un-American, I submit, Mr. Speaker, than this systematic effort to destroy the unity of America. Nothing could be more destructive of our national interest. Nothing could be further from President Nixon's campaign pledge of 2 years ago "to bring us together."

I have confidence in the judgment of the American people to see through this smokescreen of desperation that is polluting the political atmosphere as we draw closer to the November election. When the American people speak

through the media of the ballot boxes and voting booths throughout the land on November 3, I am confident that they will reject both the smokescreen of disunity and the Nixon-Agnew administration failures that this smokescreen seeks to hide from our citizens.

CREATING DEFICITS NO SOLUTION

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, for a long time we, as a Nation, have been on a big spending spree, creating budget deficits right and left.

Our problems still remain, and we have inherited the whirlwind of inflation, and it is quite apparent that we cannot spend our problems to death. An article written by Mr. Casper W. Weinberger, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, gives cogent consideration to this truth and appeared in the October 5, 1970, issue of the Washington Post. Because of its appropriateness, I introduce this article in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CREATING DEFICITS NO SOLUTION

(By Casper W. Weinberger)

Recently, many proposals have been made in the Congress and elsewhere which involve substantial expenditures by the federal government, far in excess of the administration's budget requests and also far in excess of any reasonable estimate of even the revenues that would be produced if we were at full employment in the current year.

Those making these proposals have been strongly encouraged by certain theorists who have insisted that a substantial deficit in the federal budget is desirable.

While this short-term fiscal policy may yield some immediate benefits, I would like to suggest some dangers involved in proposals that will raise the already high level of government spending in an attempt to produce a deficit . . .

Obviously, there may be times of severe depression, or war, when it is necessary, either to prevent human suffering, to create employment, or to survive as a country, for the national government to spend large sums of money—even more than it receives. However, because of the serious implications of increases in government spending programs, it seems to me that those who have the responsibility for the federal budget should make every effort to try to keep expenditures down and avoid courting deficits for fiscal reasons except in rare cases.

Without the exercise of the most severe restraints, we would have unlimited government spending and a deficit every year. Nothing is easier to produce than a government deficit . . . But in doing so, we should bear in mind the following considerations:

First, government spending above the revenues that would come in if we were at full employment causes deficits which produce inflation. We had three years of such deficits on a vastly increasing scale under President Johnson, culminating in a \$25 billion monster in 1968. It is apparent that those three years of total lack of fiscal restraint are the principal cause of the inflation that is only now finally being reversed . . .

Secondly, because under the big spending theory only spending matters, no one worries

much about what the spending is for. If you think that the rate of spending, not the object, is the key factor, the chances are you will not get much for your money except deficits. A careful assessment of national priorities is discouraged, and many programs of questionable merit are introduced.

And once started, the flow of federal expenditures, like a river breaking its levees, is virtually impossible to stop. A pilot project normally turns into an essential program in three years; it becomes an urgent priority in three years more. The distance from an urgent priority to an untouchable sacred cow is usually no more than five fiscal years. . . .

That programs of value only to special interests may become permanent parts of the budget is bad enough in itself. It is worse still when the funding of these programs results in a lack of flexibility in the budget so that bold, imaginative, new programs, like the Family Assistance Plan, which require money to overcome problems newly perceived, cannot be adequately financed.

In short, big spending and creating a deficit for the purposes of short-term fiscal policy determines in practice the funding levels of real programs for years to come. The result is not only useless, perhaps harmful, expenditures in future years, but also a substantial loss of control over fiscal policy itself. If a surplus should ever be fiscally desirable, it may be impossible to produce.

But the worst of all the effects produced by encouraging deficits through the institution of expensive programs is the steady growth of government with its consequent increase of government power, and its equally consequent decrease in individual freedom.

Since 1960, tax receipts for all levels of government have increased from about \$70 billion to over \$300 billion. The percentage of the net (not the gross) national product going to government at all levels has increased from about 24 per cent to 35 per cent. In other words, all of us, on the average, are devoting more than one-third of our productive efforts to paying for government. By the year 2000 we may be spending more than half our time paying for government. Is this necessary or desirable?

The more government spends, the more power and authority it has to have to enable it to carry out its expanding role. But as governmental power grows, individual freedom, the power of each individual to make significant decisions concerning his own present and future, necessarily is narrowed.

And that is why I believe those in charge of government budgets should exert every effort to keep government spending down, and thus to diminish the need for more and higher taxes, with the goal of freeing all of us to exercise more of our abilities for productive efforts of our own choosing, and to make more of our own decisions, and thus guide our own lives more nearly as we desire them to be.

JUDGING THE SOUTH

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial entitled "Judging the South," the Wall Street Journal refers to the delicate balance sought by the Nixon administration regarding integration of Southern schools as "sensible and even courageous" and states that the "peaceful start suggests that for all the complaints the administration may have judged pretty well."

As I believe my colleagues would be interested in the Wall Street Journal's analysis of school integration in the

South, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

JUDGING THE SOUTH

The preponderantly peaceful spread of school integration across the South last week was a tribute to the often maligned people of that section and to some degree a vindication of the Administration's often maligned policies. It would be foolish to expect that the school integration question will now disappear from the national agenda, but there is at least some hope it can now be approached with a greater measure of good will on all sides.

We were rather disturbed a few weeks ago to receive a mailing from a prestigious Southern newspaper, opposing an integration plan that went beyond freedom of choice. The editors talked of "Appomattox," and said the Supreme Court has wrought "Orwellian changes in pupil assignments in the past 16 years."

Now we find, in that very same city and under that very same plan, Virginia Governor Linwood Holton Jr. bringing his 13-year-old daughter to her first day at a largely black school. This splendid example, from a family that could certainly flee integration if it desired, set the tone in that city as other responsible leaders set it throughout the region. Regardless of occasional emotional outbursts, the white people of the South have in fact come a long way toward recognizing the principle the Court enunciated 16 years ago.

This is true even though a realistic observer will expect setbacks in the newly integrated schools. No doubt some of them will be desegregated by white flight, and no doubt some of them are more integrated in name than in fact. Violence could still erupt as more districts are integrated this week. Certainly problems remain, especially in large Southern cities where segregated schools reflect housing patterns just as they do in Northern cities.

The Supreme Court will start hearings in October on cases that will shed some light on the legal states of the massive busing that would be required to integrate schools in such districts. We think the question cannot be satisfactorily resolved by either a fiat that integration must occur no matter how much busing it takes, or by a fiat that no child will ever be bused to further integration. A rough scale seems necessary, and we worry because Court decisions often do not lend themselves to that kind of resolution, but we hope that greater clarity will result.

In its executive policies, the Nixon Administration has been seeking a type of balance that would allow integration to proceed without punitive overtones toward the white South. In certain particulars we think it has been a little too far to soothe Southerners and eventually win their votes. Generally it has readjusted these particulars, though, and on the whole its delicate balancing act is sensible and even courageous. It will please no one completely.

The Administration's policies have been attacked by civil rights leaders impatient at the always slow pace of human change, by those who sincerely believe racial quotas are the only solution, and by those who want to punish the white South in the name of their own virtue. On the other side, it is by no means clear Southerners will now give Mr. Nixon their moral and electoral support in return for policies that do not hold the South to higher standards than the rest of the nation.

Still, the Nixon approach has been based on a calculation that despite the years of foot-dragging the white South is not without a meaningful reservoir of good will, and at this point removing the punitive overtones would tip the balance toward rather than away from acceptance of integration. Last week's peaceful start suggests that for all the complaints the Administration may have judged pretty well.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON.
MAURICE T. WEBB

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of personal loss that I pay tribute to the memory of a devoted personal friend and dedicated fellow member of the American Legion, Hon. Maurice T. Webb, who died September 20, 1970.

"Spider" Webb's diligent work in Legion activities at all levels, beginning at Post 57, Newnan, Ga., and throughout his service as director of the National Americanism Division in Indianapolis, Ind., exemplified a dedication of his genuine and sincere belief in the principles upon which this country was founded. He was most particularly interested in young people, and to that end exercised every given opportunity to contribute his energies and talents to Legion programs benefiting our American youth.

Patty joins me and the members of my staff in extending our sympathy to his wife, Frances, to their son, Marty, to his mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Webb, and to other members of his family who survive him. "Spider" will long remain in our memory and the memory of all who have known him as a very proud American who did more than his part to make our United States a better place in which to live.

I am confident the personal loss I feel is shared by his multitude of friends throughout the United States who came to know "Spider" through American Legion activities. The feeling of loss by his fellow Georgia Legionnaires is most appropriately expressed in the September 1970 issue of the Georgia Legionnaire and follows:

MAURICE T. WEBB DIES AT NEWNAN

Maurice T. "Spider" Webb, one of The American Legion's most dedicated workers, passed away suddenly at his home in Newnan on Sunday, September 20.

Spider's dedication to the Legion is almost legendary and his efforts made a lasting impression on many facets of the Legion. He served in many official capacities but his day to day support of the basic programs was his outstanding attribute.

Joining Newnan Post 57 soon after discharge from World War II military service, he served that post in many offices including post Commander. He then moved up through the chairs in the old Fourth District and served most capably as District Commander. He then served as Department Jr. Vice Commander. He was most active in Child Welfare work during this time. He served several years as Department Child Welfare Chairman. He then served as Area "C" chairman. The area is composed of the 14 southern states. Later he became National Child Welfare Chairman. He served as Department Adjutant from 1958 to 1960.

In 1963 he was named Director of the National Americanism Division in Indianapolis, Indiana. He served in that capacity until this year when he resigned due to health reasons. He had recently been employed as State Field Representative for the U.S. Brewers Association, with his office in Atlanta.

Survivors include the wife, Mrs. Frances McWaters Webb, son and daughter-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Martin (Marty) Webb, and grandson, Michael Thomas Webb, of East Point; parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Webb,

Madras, Ga.; and sister, Mrs. A. G. Arrowood, Sharpsburg.

Funeral services were held from the chapel of the McKoon Funeral Home, Newnan, on September 22, at 11:00 a.m. with a multitude of friends in attendance. In addition to many fellow members of Post 57 and the Sixth District, many other Legion members from over the state, as well as out of state, were in attendance. Department Commander C. B. Burke headed the Legion group from Georgia and Past National Commander Jimmie Powers represented the National organization, in addition to his role as a close personal friend.

Pallbearers were David Stripling, Larry Coggin, W. D. Harrell, George Osborne, G. W. Coggin and Aaron Keheley. Legionnaires served as honorary pallbearers. Interment was in Oak Hill Cemetery.

Deepest sympathy is extended to the family of this outstanding American.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD BOLLING ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON REGIONAL PLANNING ISSUES BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee is continuing its studies concerning economic and social problems affecting our urban communities. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have scheduled public hearings on regional planning October 13, 14, 15, beginning at 10 a.m., to hear nine experts in the fields of economics and political science discuss issues and alternatives involved in regional planning efforts.

Detailed information is contained in the following news release announcing the hearings:

CHAIRMAN RICHARD BOLLING ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON REGIONAL PLANNING ISSUES BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

Representative Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, today announced that the Subcommittee will hold public hearings on regional planning issues on October 13-14-15. In announcing the hearings Chairman Bolling said:

"All studies of the critical economic and social problems affecting our urban communities—and rural ones as well as far as that goes—reveal that measures to deal with these problems almost invariably require actions cutting across the boundaries of numerous local political jurisdictions. In the last century the major solution to this problem was to incorporate adjacent suburban areas into the central city. An alternative was to organize multi-jurisdictional authorities. Recently other devices have been tried. It is important that we reach an understanding of how we can adapt our political structures to facilitate planning to solve economic and social problems on whatever regional basis proves desirable in a particular case, but at the same time retain a maximum of local and even neighborhood political power. Grass roots democracy is essential to all good planning—particularly successful implementation of plans after they have been formulated and approved."

For these reasons the Subcommittee has

asked a number of experts in economics and political science to discuss with this subcommittee the various issues and alternatives involved in such regional planning efforts.

Members of the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs Subcommittee are:

REPRESENTATIVES

Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), Chairman.
Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.).
Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.).
William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.).
William B. Widnall (R-N.J.).
W. E. Brock III (R-Tenn.).
Clarence J. Brown (R-Ohio).

SENATORS

Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.).
William Proxmire (D-Wis.).
Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.).
Charles H. Percy (R-Ill.).

Schedule of hearings on regional planning issues—October 13-15, 1970:

Tuesday, October 13

Alan Altshuler, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Alan Campbell, Dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

Victor Jones, Professor of Political Science, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, California.

Wednesday, October 14

Victor Fisher, Director, Institute for Social, Economic and Government Research, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Daniel R. Grant, President, Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, Arkansas.

Selma Mushkin, Director of Public Services, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Thursday, October 15

James Alexander, Director, Office of Community Services, District of Columbia Government.

Richard Burton, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

John Bebout, Professor, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.

All sessions will begin at 10:00 a.m. in the Atomic Energy Committee Hearing Room (S-407) in the Capitol.

BIG UNIONS DO NOT STRIKE IF THINGS ARE REALLY IN A DOWNTURN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I note that there is much discussion in the public prints by union bosses and the Democratic Party about the unemployment rate. Despite their public utterances I am certain that the leaders of organized labor must have great faith that our economy is on the way up to go ahead with massive strikes. The union bosses know their economics. The fact that they have chosen to go ahead with a strike which throws thousands out of work, is in fact a vote of confidence in the Nixon administration's economic policies.

If they really thought the economy was in trouble, they wouldn't risk the jobs of thousands of union workers by calling them out on a strike that could cause permanent shutdowns. They know that the Nixon polities are working. They

know that our economy is strong and resilient. And they know that their public utterances are being done for political effect. Although to some it might appear to be ironic that those who order men to quit work are complaining about unemployment, that is the nature of the political game today, and these union leaders are just following the party line.

So, the American public should take with a grain of salt all the gloom and doom talk going on across the aisle and remember that big unions don't strike if things are really in a downturn.

FIGHTING BOMB THREATS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current concern with bombing, the following article from the Christian Science Monitor offers some assistance:

FIGHTING BOMB THREATS

(By a staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor)

What do you do in case of a bomb threat?

This is a question to which an increasing number of businesses, hospitals, educational institutions, industries, and governments are having to find answers.

In the 15 months from January, 1969, to April, 1970, recorded bomb threats totaled 35,000 in the United States. At least one well-known company experienced 18 threats in a one-year period.

Assembled in Boston were more than 1,000 of the nation's top security supervisors to discuss the mounting concern about "law and order" and the latest problems and advancements in the security field.

Speaking in a panel on "Bomb Threats and Personnel Safety," Jervis P. Fox Jr., chief of the Industrial Defense Branch, Office of the Provost Marshal General of the Army, outlined considerations and steps to be taken in case of an actual bomb threat.

In advance, people in charge of a company or building should know whether the local police or fire department has a bomb-disposal unit. A number do not. An alternative would be to check with the nearest military ordnance disposal unit.

COMMAND CENTER SUGGESTED

Another important measure, the military chief advised, is to have some place designated as a command center from which all orders would be issued in an emergency. This is normally where the switchboard is located.

The security specialists recommended that officials check with local telephone companies on the availability of inexpensive recorder-connector equipment. Such devices can be activated by switchboard operators to record every word of threatening calls. Alertness and preparedness on the operator's part also may help in tracing the call.

If a bomb threat should be received, someone will have to weigh the alternatives and decide whether to evacuate or not.

Once a company or concern has set a precedent by evacuation, Mr. Fox warned, "it opens the way to being constantly harassed by threatening calls, which will cut down on work time and cost money. You are the establishment—and they will harass you any way they can," he stressed.

"Government buildings receive bomb threats like going out to lunch," Mr. Fox

asserted. "But there is not too much evacuating."

LIABILITY INVOLVED

What is important, he added, is to know the legal liabilities in case of injuries. The search for bombs generally has to be conducted by the company itself. The police or fire department, in most cases, will not be responsible for the search of private buildings.

"Start with the most critical areas first, those which if destroyed would put you out of business," Mr. Fox advised. "Use supervisors or people who work in that area in the search, they know it better than anyone else."

As for search techniques:

Be on the lookout for common objects—thermos bottles or lunch buckets—where they don't normally appear. Search wastebaskets.

Don't touch suspicious objects. Set up sandbags or mattresses around it, if they are available, but not metal shields or objects that could shatter in an explosion.

Notify employees to evacuate the building by some prearranged signal, preferably different from a fire alarm. (Closing windows and doors as for a fire drill only increases the impact of an explosion.)

PROCEDURE OUTLINED

Evacuate employees on upper stories first (all floors at once if there are no egress problems) because the structure above the explosion will receive more damage.

Use stairs instead of elevators.

Have employees stay well clear of the buildings.

Simple security measures may well prevent the need to ever evacuate a building, Mr. Fox suggested.

Access to the company by photo-identity cards, strict supervision of keys to entrances, and secure padlocking of openings like man-hole coverings and utility wall panelings were a few of the preventative procedures he recommended.

"Don't forget, if a company evacuates once—and sends everyone home—it is liable to have a bomb threat every Friday noon from someone who wants a long weekend."

NEEDED—THE GUTS TO SAY NO

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest single problem the United States faces is fiscal. Unless this country confines its spending to its revenues it will be only a matter of time until nobody's dollars will be worth the paper they are printed on.

I believe it is a basic responsibility of the Congress of the United States to require this by law in the absence of declared war. It is a simple thing to do—like most great things—but it requires the determination, the will to do it, and the guts to say no to a lot of pork, as well as to many worthwhile things that must be deferred until we have the revenue coming in to pay for them.

Warner & Swasey Co., as usual, have put their finger on the problem with an excellent message in this week's U.S. News & World Report. I commend this message to the thoughtful consideration of every American:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Write your Congressman and tell him what not to do for you, what not to give you. Tell him all you want of him is a solvent America which lives within its income, whatever that may be. Make sure he knows you mean it. And tell him there isn't much time.

NIXON REMINDS THE NATION EVERYONE LOSES IN RULE OF JUNGLE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial, the Sacramento, Calif., Bee has commended the President for his speech at Kansas State University. Terming Mr. Nixon's statement "moderate and reasoned," the Bee said it dealt with the heart of the democratic system which provides for change through peaceful means.

As the Bee is often critical of the President, I believe my colleagues would particularly appreciate reading "Nixon Reminds the Nation Everyone Loses in Rule of Jungle."

The editorial follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Sept. 18, 1970]

NIXON REMINDS THE NATION EVERYONE LOSES IN RULE OF JUNGLE

President Richard Nixon's speech at Kansas State University, denouncing the swelling tides of terror and violence in the United States, was a needed reminder of the fundamental basis of a democratic society. That basis is a system which embraces peaceful change.

It was a moderate and reasoned statement, threaded through with historical perspective as to the purpose of a free, self-governing people. It is the very point of democracy that it replaces the rule of a tyrannical or dictatorial minority, a minority rule which from the time of the caves and jungle and the feudal barons imposed its will on the majority by force or violence.

The heart of the democratic system is to provide the means for change without the imposition of violence. Hence, as the President suggested, terror and violence lead only to the jungle tyranny of the minority.

Nixon told his audience:

"The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change."

The President emphasized he did not wish to stifle peaceful dissent, that he would not "for one moment call for a dull, passive conformity." But he reminded advocates of change:

"There are those who protest that if the verdict of democracy goes against them democracy itself is at fault—who say that if they don't get their way the answer is to burn a bus or bomb a building. . . . No one can have his own way all the time; and no one is right all the time."

The President's message offered timely leadership in directions for a nation caught in the turmoil of change, change which has been swift and has stirred unprecedented problems.

It was a critically needed reminder to all segments of American society that terror and violence defeat every hope for reasoned

change, that they lead to an anarchy which carries man backward through the centuries to the rule of fang and claw.

Should that happen, all is lost, including most tragically those just causes for change which can be effected by peaceful means.

STALLING ON JOB SAFETY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post in an editorial on October 3 perceptively commented upon the reasons for the unfortunate delay in the House consideration of occupational health and safety legislation.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many in the House have read with interest the articles by Morton Mintz of the Post on this subject, and I urge everyone to carefully review the Post editorial which I have included at the end of my remarks.

The editorial and the Mintz articles are particularly revealing with regard to the behind the scenes politics which have taken place to try to delay or prevent the House from voting on the substitute bill, H.R. 19200, which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) and I have offered to the DANIELS' bill, H.R. 16785. To their credit both the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. PERKINS, and the chairman of the Select Labor Subcommittee and main sponsor of H.R. 16785, Mr. DANIELS, requested an open rule, making our Substitute in order on the floor, and the Rules Committee granted this. Other forces at work, however, have done their best from the markup sessions to the present to stall House consideration of this matter.

It is regrettable, in fact tragic, that power politics are being played to stall an equitable, strong, effective proposal from being considered by this body. The President has requested action time after time and the death and accident rates in our Nation's workplaces demand action. I sincerely hope that this body will act as soon as possible.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1970]

STALLING ON JOB SAFETY

You would not expect even the most callous doctors fitter away time arguing over the best way to save a dying patient while the blood drains from his veins. Yet politicians and labor lobbies are doing just that in the case of the crucial job safety bill. Each year, by low estimate, 14,500 Americans are killed by work-related accidents, 2.2 million are disabled. No politician or labor leader would ever say that he favors death and injuries among the nation's 80 million workers. Yet the stalling and pettiness of a few of them say exactly that. Far from the scenes of gore that are loudly decied, it appears that the parties in the dispute are so deadlocked that the legislation may not pass at all.

The position of the AFL-CIO, which does not even have an industrial safety department, is mulishly firm: unless the Secretary of Labor has final power to set and enforce safety standards, then no law should be passed. The House and Senate bills—pro-

posed by Rep. Daniels and Sen. Harrison Williams—are largely agreeable to the AFL-CIO. But compromise legislation was devised to gain Republican support. It would empower an independent board to set and enforce standards, rather than the Labor Department. For the workers, the compromise meant a hope that the killing and maiming would be decreased. What does it mean if the standards are set and enforced by the Labor Department or by a President-appointed board?

The AFL-CIO, always touchy when its power seems remotely threatened, knows it could more easily pressure the Labor Department than the board. To its credit, the Nixon administration has been flexible and fair in accepting compromises. The high hopes of Democrats and Republicans in getting out a bill, however, are now blocked by the AFL-CIO, the one group that should be most concerned about worker safety.

It is another story for another time as to why the AFL-CIO can tie up the United States Congress in this manner. Perhaps it is asking too much, but nothing would help more than for the involved Democrats to politely tell the AFL-CIO to stick to running the unions, not the Congress.

REV. RAYMOND FRANCIS
COPELAND, S.J.

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay my respects to an outstanding teacher and community leader, The Reverend Raymond Francis Copeland, S.J., of the University of Santa Clara, who celebrated his 50th year in the Jesuit Order in September.

Father Copeland began his long association with the University of Santa Clara as a student in 1919. The following year, he entered the Society of Jesus at the Novitiate in Los Gatos, Calif., and in 1934 he was ordained to the priesthood.

An Army chaplain during World War II, he served with the 45th Thunderbird Division and Gen. William F. Dean's 44th Division through six campaigns in the European theater between 1942 and 1945. From 1945 to 1948, he was a reserve chaplain and from 1948-54, he served as chaplain for the California National Guard, 49th Infantry Division. In 1955, he was appointed State chaplain of the American Legion, and State chaplain of the California National Guard. He continued in the latter post until he returned to fulltime teaching at Santa Clara in 1959.

Father Copeland's teaching years at Santa Clara have been completed in four periods, from 1927 to 1929; 1936 to 1942; 1945 to 1954 and 1959 to the present. In 1964, he was named religious superior of the Jesuit community at the university, a post he continued in until 1969.

In addition to teaching, Father Copeland served 2 years as director of the university summer session, 1960 and 1961, and is the moderator of the university's award winning debate team.

It is comforting to know that our country has produced so fine an educator as Father Copeland. His unselfish interest in the education of young people reassures me that our future is secure.

FAVORABLE REPORTS ON NIXON'S RECENT SPEECH AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MYERS, Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have commented favorably on President Nixon's recent speech at Kansas State University. The subject of campus unrest is one of national concern, and I commend the President for speaking out forcefully on this issue.

I think perhaps the Indianapolis Star summed it up as well as anyone when, in commenting on the President's remarks on the results not only of violence but also of the condoning of violence, it editorialized that—

The response of decent Americans should be nation-wide and highly personal. They should use all of the moral force and legal means they can muster to maintain, where it exists, and restore, where it is lacking, the rule of reason in family life, in private circles, in neighborhood, church, school, community and university. The time to do it is now.

Along with the editorial from the Indianapolis Star, I include for the RECORD a representative selection of editorials of other reputable newspapers in our Nation.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Sept. 21, 1970]

FED UP WITH VIOLENCE

President Richard M. Nixon was voicing the thoughts and feelings of most Americans, we are confident, when he called for "an uncompromising stand against those who reject the rules of civilized conduct."

We wholeheartedly agree with him that "The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause."

It was typical of our distempered times that on the very day Mr. Nixon delivered his speech at Manhattan, Kan., an armed man who reportedly had threatened to kill Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew was arrested at Grand Rapids, Mich., across the street from a hotel where the Vice-President was scheduled to address a dinner.

Violence has become an obsession on the American scene. Whatever the cause, there is a cult of violence—a motley collection of sects that practice and preach it. They are a decided minority in our population, yet they have polluted, and continue to pollute the moral quality of American life.

The cultists profess to believe that violence is the only way to bring about progress in our society. This claim is pure nonsense. The means to progress are hard thinking and hard work, and they always will be.

It is true that society—or at least a part of it—is to blame, in certain specific ways, for the widespread moral breakdown we are witnessing. The blame rests on permissive parents and on those educators and churchmen who have failed to teach them the simplest differences between right and wrong and failed to instill in them self-control and respect for the rights of others. And further blame lies on permissive courts which, out of misguided compassion or false reasoning, fail to punish those who go wrong and are convicted of wanton acts of destruction and criminality.

Thus countless personal, human failures over the years—most of them probably committed by individuals who lightly shrugged off responsibility for their defaults—pro-

duced the swarms of moral misfits who afflict our society like mobile cancer cells today. They are in a minority, but so, at the outset, are the malignant cells that can destroy a healthy body.

As the President said, "What corrodes a society even more than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts in a misguided effort to accommodate the community's standards to those of the violent few."

"For when this happens, the community sacrifices more than its calm, and more even than its safety. It loses its integrity and corrupts its soul."

Mr. Nixon is absolutely right. The response of decent Americans should be nation-wide and highly personal. They should use all of the moral force and legal means they can muster to maintain, where it exists, and restore, where it is lacking, the rule of reason in family life, in private circles, in neighborhood, church, school, community and university.

The time to do it is now.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Sept. 18, 1970]

A KEYNOTE FOR COMMON SENSE

Not many Americans could have watched or heard President Nixon's speech at Kansas State University this week without denying a wholesome measure of encouragement, not only for the academic year now getting underway, but also for the future of the nation itself.

In many respects, the audience Mr. Nixon faced Wednesday afternoon was a microcosm of the university community generally. The forces of disruption were amply represented in the form of between 25 and 50 hecklers who hurled insults and obscenities at the President. But the succession of standing ovations accorded the President, as he spoke out for the rule of law, for the willingness to listen, for ordinary responsibility on the part of university administrators, faculty members and students, suggested that there is in the universities, as in society generally, a hitherto silent majority committed to decency.

Mr. Nixon detailed the extent to which the cancerous disease of violence and terror has gripped America in only five weeks' time—the police officers and firemen who have been targets for assassination, the public buildings that have been dynamited, the fruits of years of research that have been destroyed. These, he said, are manifestations of a malady that has no place in America.

No cause, he went on, justifies violence in the name of change.

Mr. Nixon reaffirmed his commitment to continue scaling down the U.S. commitment in Vietnam, to utilize the combined resources of business and government to restore the wholesomeness of the environment, to dramatize what is right with the nation and to seek to correct what is wrong.

These are things that any university student body is pleased to hear.

But Mr. Nixon's purpose in going to Kansas State, we suspect, was to challenge the responsible educators and students to stand up for their rights—the right to pursue truth, the right to study, the right to hear. In effect, the President sounded a keynote for the common sense that most Americans hope will govern the colleges and universities during the academic season ahead.

The nation has seen how few anarchists it takes to cow and close a great university and on what tenuous grounds that insidious mission can be accomplished.

The question is whether the great majority of educators who want to teach and of students who want to learn will allow themselves to be intimidated into acquiescence.

We should like to believe that the young people of Kansas State University answered for their fellow students in every corner of America.

[From the Birmingham News, Sept. 20, 1970]

A TIMELY WARNING

Last week President Nixon addressed an audience of students—but his words were directed toward the administrators and faculties of the nation's universities and colleges.

And it would behoove the men who run higher education to listen to what he had to say:

"To put it bluntly, today higher education in America risks losing that essential support it has had since the beginning of the country—the support of the American people . . .

"It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by government. Government will move in and run it. To attempt to blame government for all the woes of the universities is to seek an excuse, not a reason, for their troubles."

Mr. Nixon was not engaging in idle rhetoric. Endowments of some of the most prestigious universities in the country are falling off sharply. A part of the blame for this lies with fluctuations in the economy, which affect investments universities, or anyone else, have made. But the real pinch comes from this in combination with the simple refusal of many alumni to continue to support an alma mater which they feel has gone astray.

Similarly, taxpayers grumble increasingly loudly about the trustees and administrators of public institutions of higher learning not being tougher with student disruption. Public opinion polls show a rare and overwhelming consensus that college and university administrations should take a firmer hand in dealing with student rowdies and destruction artists.

It is the voice of this majority which the President has heard and is recommending that the educators pay heed to. He recognizes the increasing level of public frustration with terrorism, radicalism and disruption, and realizes the increasing pressure for somebody to do something about the growing violence.

So Mr. Nixon's message to faculties and administrators was both a plea and a warning: Beware! Unite against violence and disorder. If you do not, education in America will suffer a grievous blow.

The President obviously knows the bitter consequences which would result from the kind of intrusion into campus freedom and autonomy which could ensue. Colleges and universities as we have known them and valued them might not survive such an intrusion.

But campus radicalism is prodding our society toward a resolution of this conflict.

We can only hope that faculty members and administrators and responsible student leaders listened attentively to what the President said.

The voice of the majority is getting louder and more insistent.

[From the Seattle Post Intelligencer, Sept. 20, 1970]

VIOLENCE AGAINST DEMOCRACY

President Nixon made headlines this past week when he declared at Kansas State University that American education, because of the violence and terror in its midst, is facing the greatest crisis in its history.

Pretty much the same thing might have been said about our whole democratic system—and the President's eloquent and forceful words suggested as much.

What we liked best about the speech was its always-needed emphasis on basic principles

which must prevail if freedom is to be had in any community, whether it be a college campus or a whole nation.

The first of these extremely simple but all-important rules is that violence and terror have no place whatever in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever the cause.

Equally important, if not more so, is a community which under no circumstances will compromise with people who seek change or advantage by any means other than non-violent protest or the ballot box.

It would seem that any intelligent student or other American who values his freedom would know and understand these principles. Yet everywhere we find groups, in the name of greater freedom, violently breaking the rules and—even worse—getting the passive acquiescence or even fawning approval of some fashionable and influential critics.

Those last words are extracted from the President's speech. It is clear whom he meant—from timorous college presidents to socialite contributors to the Black Panthers. What was left unsaid, but implied, was another all-important fact.

It is that democracy—if disorder, violence and terror threaten its destruction by chaos—not only has the right but the duty to protect itself by all possible means. The Constitution guarantees no liberty to commit subversion.

This is a fact which the hell-raisers would do well to consider, as the President obviously has considered it. Dissent and protest are the corner stones of democracy, when non-violence, and even violence in a democracy normally is treated with a minimum of restraint.

But there is a limit. And if that limit is passed on a national scale, a whole lot of fog-headed student activists, drawing room revolutionaries, urban anarchists and worse are going to learn to their surprise that Uncle Sam can be tougher than anybody when it comes to the basic matter of survival.

[From the Nashville Banner, Sept. 18, 1970]

NIXON SHELLED IT OUT: NOISE CULT CAN NOT SILENCE PROMPTINGS OF DECENCY

That handful of screaming hecklers seeking to harass President Nixon in his speech yesterday before the Kansas State University student body, illustrated perfectly those portions of his text presenting the case specifically for law and order, and elementary decency, as the basis of civilized conduct.

It underscored more than that, however—for this tiny fragment of those present constituted an infinitesimal minority; a splinter segment, a drop in the ocean of those in the audience—young men and women alike, an estimated 16,000, with enough respect for themselves, the institution, and the President of the United States, to conduct themselves as gentlemen and ladies.

The latter, irrespective of age, reflect that individual pride which, as Mr. Nixon said, stands up to be counted against the arsonists and wrecking crews who seek in their violent assaults to destroy not only the academic system but the nation, itself.

America knows by now the validity of his charge that the types of terrorism of which he spoke are addressed to that overthrow from within—and that it now is worldwide from campus radicalism to street assaults and bombings, to hijackings and kidnappings internationally.

They are one in their contempt for human life and human decencies, and in the phoniness of their claims that they are plotted to alter constructively the social and political ills of earth.

President Nixon was addressing an audience of youth—with their elders and respected officials present—of a state which has manifested a high regard for the elementary concepts of law and order, and

decency of conduct in both private and public affairs.

He chose that setting, an occasion by which Kansas State annually honors former Gov. Alf Landon, to enunciate anew his own doctrine—which is the doctrine of the vast American majority, expressed in these words of a central paragraph:

"The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change."

With that thought uppermost—and emphasizing again that the very spirit of freedom forbids assignment of the educational responsibility to government—he said what reason concludes: That the obligation to maintain a climate of peace and decent conduct and campus security, respectful of the rights of all, rests with the college administrators, faculties, and student organizations.

The thousands who listened respectfully attest to the decency of that majority; these same thousands, young and older, men and women, showing their resentment of that cadre who sought with noise and vulgarities to disgrace them. As ambitious young people, desirous of higher education to fit for worthy goals, they entertain no ideas that the world in all its details is perfect . . . or that the United States of America has no imperfections. They heard President Nixon acknowledge these things. They also heard his pledge to help maintain the things that are right, and to correct the things that are wrong.

Of the things that are wrong, he unquestionably included the waves of lawlessness to which a portion of yesterday's reference was made, and the student body just as unquestionably shared his view and his pledge.

Honoring the responsibility of stewardship—a trust—the President is not one to stick his head in the sand where any problem is concerned, and hope that by being ignored it will go away.

He faced the facts squarely in his diagnosis—presented again yesterday, as he put it, IN the heart of America, and TO the heart of America. Because what the nation has in its heart, it can achieve by its mind and hand.

He rang the bell.

[From the Wichita Eagle, Sept. 18, 1970]

NIXON MESSAGE NOT NEW BUT WORTH REPEATING

There was little new in what President Nixon had to say to students and faculty members at Kansas State University, but his message can hardly be overemphasized.

That message was that America is afflicted with a "cancerous disease" that is spreading violence and terror as a political tactic.

"The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change," the President said.

There can hardly be any quarrel with that. Nixon is right when he says higher education in America risks losing the support of the American people because of campus disorder, and it is up to students and faculty members to see that higher education does not collapse.

However, student dissent can't be marked off as simple agitation over the war in Vietnam, pollution of the environment and social injustice. Unrest is deep.

As Nixon pointed out, if the war were ended today, the environment cleaned up tomorrow and all other problems in the realm of government responsibility were solved, "the moral and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist."

Not only is the President right, he may have underestimated the extent of student dissatisfaction.

But that is no reason to drag the administration's feet in taking care of such problems as can be solved by government. Ending the war and eliminating pollution might not pacify college students, but it would go a long way toward eliminating the stickiest problems, the ones which contribute the most toward unrest. And students would be less likely to fall prey to the professional agitators who foment so much of the violence students are blamed for.

The President can't solve the problem of student and faculty unrest by making a speech at Manhattan, Kan., but surely some contribution was made to bridging the communication gap.

The President made statements that should be made, and by large, students and faculty extended the courtesy and respect due the President of the United States, or any speaker for that matter.

He didn't ask students for blind agreement, but suggested that the years ahead could be bright for America if there is an atmosphere of reason, of tolerance, of common courtesy—with the basic regard for the rights and feelings of others that is the mark of a civilized society.

In their hearts, most young people agree with this viewpoint. Some of them differ with others as to what America's future should be.

[From the Burlington Free Press,
Sept. 17, 1970]

AMERICA'S STUDENTS REJECT MILITANTS

The fact that campus militants are totally unrepresentative of today's younger generation was never more clearly demonstrated than at Kansas State University yesterday.

President Nixon received ear-splitting ovations from the massive crowd of nearly 16,000 persons, mostly students. There were a few hecklers, maybe a dozen or so (less than one-tenth of one per cent of the students) but they were drowned out and babbled only to themselves.

The students cheered thunderously when the President declared: "In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change." And when Nixon appealed to the responsible administrators, faculty and student leaders of America's colleges to "stand up and be counted" and to join in taking "an uncompromising stand against those who reject the rules of civilized conduct and of respect for others," the Kansas State students rose to the occasion.

Clearly, the message is getting through. Political candidates who have appealed to the bitterness of the militants, such as Philip Hoff in Vermont and Teddy Kennedy in Massachusetts, are in deep trouble. This was convincingly shown in Vermont's primary elections last week and in the Massachusetts primary elections this week, where Senator Kennedy (running unopposed) lagged more than 150,000 votes behind the totals cast in the polling for governor.

The reality of this situation is buttressed by all manner of recent news reports, on and off campus. For example, all of that well-publicized commotion over ROTC has had little effect on the vitality and acceptance of the ROTC program. This program turned out 23,000 military officers in last June's graduating classes from 347 campuses.

So much for the militants. They have managed to burn some buildings, and scorched some political careers in the process, but little else of consequence. And probably the most poignant confirmation of their failure was the many standing ovations accorded President Nixon yesterday by the student body of Kansas State University—which truly represented the spirit and mood of contemporary America.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1970]

OUR CAMPUSES AND ENDS AND MEANS

At Kansas State University yesterday, President Nixon ably developed the major subject of ends and means. The topic is a classic, perennial one on which it is impossible to say anything altogether novel. But it is a timely one—not only because the timeless is always timely, but also because university campuses are currently undermined by a significant minority willing to use evil means.

Nixon's major thesis was: "Violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators are and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change." Applying his thesis to the context of higher education, Nixon said, "It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty, and student leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America."

This needs saying, nearly incredible to the need is. The incidence of murderous violence in campus communities has been increasing in recent months, and everyone looks forward with considerable anxiety to the school year now opening. The record all too clearly shows that the contemporary campus cutup is neither funny nor harmless, but deadly serious and ready to go to any lengths. The record shows, too, that university authorities have all too often been irresolute and compromising when they should have acted promptly and decisively. The President could have chosen no subject more appropriate to a major address on a university campus at this particular time than the one he developed at Kansas State.

The President's argument was all the more cogent for being eminently reasonable and fair. The high line he took yesterday sought no partisan advantage. He spoke as everyone's President, in terms that any good citizen, however critical he might be of some of the President's policies, can cheer and commend.

[From the Newark Evening News,
Sept. 17, 1970]

VIOLENCE AND YOUTH

What President Nixon said yesterday at Kansas State University—that violence and terror have no place in a free society—needs repeated saying, and nowhere should it be taken more to heart than on America's campuses.

Among members of the older generations, outrage is already wide-spread against the mindless bombings, shootings and seizures which have shaken our universities, our courts, our aerial commerce and our cities. In the community of nations, the savagery of Arab guerrillas and their threats to murder innocent hostages have drawn almost universal condemnation.

More conspicuously, however, the condoning of terror tactics, the yielding to pressure groups, the toleration and even encouragement of violent obstructionism has been practiced in our universities, great and small, not only by immature students carrying activism and emotion beyond reason but also by some of their preceptors, thoughtlessly venting frustrations or seeking irresponsibly to follow the fashions.

This acquiescence to elemental indecencies by some in the academic world has been of sore concern for a variety of reasons. First, the universities and colleges are training grounds where the mental ideas and approaches of tomorrow's leaders are being shaped. Second, the role of higher educational institutions as centers for free exploration of knowledge and ideas is being undermined. And, last, campus disorders and chaos threaten to curtail the traditional support from the public essential to continued existence of the universities.

As Mr. Nixon pointed out, passive conformity is not being called for. Nor is any end to protests against the faults of society. Nor unquestioning acceptance of things as they are. Changes can, and should, be made, but only with respect for the rights and feelings of others. Arbitrary force invites arbitrary reaction, and neither our universities nor our liberties can survive excessive use of either.

Even adults must concede that the world community has not yet learned to live in peace, to achieve needed reforms without occasional violence. But if it's to be done at all, responsibility for showing the way rests nowhere more heavily than on educational leaders in our academic communities, and on our students of today and public officials of tomorrow. It is time, as Mr. Nixon noted, for responsible members of those groups to stand up and be counted.

THE ICC AND ITS CRITICS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when some are suggesting that the Interstate Commerce Commission has failed in its objective of regulating the transportation industry, I would like to point out an editorial in the September 28 edition of *Transport Topics*, published by the American Trucking Association.

The editorial makes some valid and often overlooked points about America's free enterprise transport system. The article follows:

THE ICC AND ITS CRITICS

Despite the growing complexity of modern day living there persists a widespread tendency to oversimplify things. Last week, for example, there was legislation introduced in the Senate to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission. Like an earlier bill for the same purpose, the new measure was offered as a solution for transportation problems of a grave but generalized nature.

The main complaint seems to be a contention that our transportation system is not performing as needed and this, indeed, comes as a surprise. Not more than two or three years ago the consensus among public officials was that the United States had the best transportation system in the world and virtually the only one operating under free enterprise.

The latter factor was widely hailed as the reason why our system was outstanding. State owned railroads and, in many countries, government operation of other forms had often been demonstrated to be vastly inferior.

At the time of the adoption of the Transportation Act of 1958 the word went forth from Congress that we had too many railroads and something should be done to consolidate them into a few great systems. A great amount of progress toward this goal was achieved. Some, including the trucking industry, thought the concentration of railroad management into a few companies was allowed to go too far.

But the path of consolidation really got rough when the Penn-Central, into which had been combined the two largest railroads, became the largest flop in corporate history.

It will take a long time to reassemble the pieces sufficiently to determine the whole cause. But one thing is already clear; this was not the product of regulation by the

ICC. Both railroads had prospered more of the time under more than three quarters of a century of regulation and it's a fair bet that they would have wound up under government ownership if there had been no such regulation.

A more likely answer is the mistaken notion that bigness is good per se. It should also be remembered that even the colossus that fell of its own weight—the Penn Central—operated profitably in the freight business, and that was under ICC regulation.

STRONG U.S. NAVY BECOMES IMPERATIVE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in my recent newsletter report to my constituents on the trip to the Mediterranean by the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee I expressed my concern at the deficiencies of the U.S. Navy 6th Fleet.

The fleet is shackled by a skimpy budget in the midst of a very serious political-military situation in the Middle East. Operations have been cut back for economy reasons, more antisubmarine surveillance is needed, and there are not enough planes aboard ship or at shore bases.

I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial from the September 27, 1970, edition of a great newspaper, the San Diego Union. It expresses very well the dangers of defense cuts in the face of growing Russian naval activity:

STRONG U.S. NAVY BECOMES IMPERATIVE—"NO HIDING PLACE FROM HAMMER AND SICKLE"

The Middle Eastern crisis instructs us anew that there is no substitute for naval power. Because the British permitted their national military strength to be eroded in the name of economy, their only proposal toward settling the Middle Eastern trouble now had to be confined to talk. Sadly, unless the United States of America ceases to dismantle its fleet, it will join Britain as a nation with little international clout. Such task forces as the 6th Fleet, which even in their weakened state now maintain some measure of equilibrium in crisis areas, will become ineffective ghost forces unless we restore the Navy's waning strength.

The Navy's announcement a few days ago that 58 additional ships will be deactivated reduces the fleet to 700 ships—down 25 per cent from 932 units two years ago. The Navy's air arm—cut by 732 planes—is being diminished correspondingly. The fiscal 1972 budget will provide for only 550 ships. The U.S. Navy has been slashed by approximately 40 per cent during the last three years.

The ships that are being decommissioned are indeed aged and should be scrapped, but only when they are replaced by units which will maintain an acceptable level of maritime power.

Meanwhile the Soviet Union is determined to call the tune at sea in its confrontation with the United States. Each year, its all-ocean navy is strengthened by new rocket-firing cruisers and destroyers. Each year the Soviet nuclear propelled, nuclear missile submarine fleet grows, and in another two or three years may almost equal our Polaris fleet. Obviously the Soviets believe they can afford a modern navy.

Realizing the growing discrepancy between aging U.S. naval units and the brand-new Soviet models, the Pentagon has reluctantly accepted a drastic reduction in fleet size to husband its limited funds for new ships. During 1969, Navy shipbuilding received only \$1.27 billion—less than half of the 1963 figure. The Administration is requesting \$2.57 billion for new ships in the current year, but the Navy needs a minimum of \$3 billion each year for the next decade just to keep abreast of Soviet sea power.

"Jane's Fighting Ships," the accepted authority on the world's navies, warns that in the oceans today, "there is no hiding place from the hammer and sickle."

However, we do not have to consult the acknowledged experts on defense to see a moment of truth. We have but to look at Great Britain, which once ruled the waves because of its great fleet, now reduced to waving its finger and jaw in the Mediterranean because it has no navy.

THE SCRANTON REPORT ON CAMPUS UNREST

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, September 29, 1970, the Washington Evening Star ran an excellent editorial discussing the Scranton Commission Report on Campus Unrest. I would like to insert this editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today so that all Americans can have access to this well-balanced commentary:

THE CAMPUS REPORT

There is some danger that, because it has the makings of controversy, the advice given to the President by his Commission on Campus Unrest will overshadow the rest of the long report. This would be a shame, because the commission, created because of last spring's violent disorders, has useful words for all of us.

For the public at large, the principal message is that unrest in the colleges is a complex phenomenon in which issues of the day interact with the emerging "youth culture." The report, by pointing out the wide variety of student attitudes and by distinguishing between the good and bad in the protest movement, should make it harder for politicians to score simple points at the expense of national unity and understanding.

The commission speaks to everyone, as when it notes that university administrators "cannot do their jobs without the support of alumni, citizens and government leaders. All three of these groups have been guilty of substituting thoughtless criticism for helpful support precisely at a time when the welfare of the nation's institutions of higher education is in grave peril."

Not that commission Chairman Scranton and his associates have let disruptive or violent students, or vacillating administrators—or anyone, for that matter—off the hook. The report takes a strong stand against disruption and violence, and offers plenty of specific advice about how to handle it and how not to. On the last point, police overreaction is blamed for sometimes worsening the problem, and the commission makes recommendations for improving the performance of police and National Guardsmen.

Getting back to the President: The commission regards as its most important recommendation its call to the President to use "the compassionate, reconciling moral leader-

ship that can bring the country together again." This may be the least successful of the commission's attempts to advise us away from destructive campus turmoil, because the President sees himself as having very limited responsibility in the field. Since Mr. Nixon probably will continue to view the majority of campus disturbances as primarily the problem of college administrators, he can serve better by working on the issues that are the ostensible causes of many demonstrations—ending the war and achieving a better measure of racial and social justice.

The President should perform one small service by accepting the commission's idea that "no one plays irresponsible politics with the issue of 'campus unrest.'" Though Vice President Agnew is not mentioned in the report, he is the main offender in this respect and Mr. Nixon is the only one in a position to do anything about it.

THE WAYWARD WELFARE STATE

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently a distinguished scholar and resident of my congressional district, Dr. Roger A. Freeman, of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, addressed the Governmental Research Association in Chicago on the subject "The Wayward Welfare State."

I consider this address to be most timely and strongly urge that each of my colleagues read it carefully and give it considerable thought:

THE WAYWARD WELFARE STATE

(By Roger A. Freeman)

The birth and growth of the modern service state in the United States during the second third of the 20th Century may in historical perspective well have been the most significant governmental development of its time. To its architects the coming of age of the welfare state—as it is more commonly called—is a matter of supreme pride and immense satisfaction. To its opponents it is the cause and mark of the decline and the likely fall of a great nation which rejected its promise, forsook its destiny, and squandered its birthright. Future historians will decide whether the America of today and tomorrow is to be compared more closely to the Rome of the Second Century—the Golden Age of the Antonines—or to the Rome of the Fifth Century—the time of the Goths, the Vandals and the Huns.

The most visible manifestation of the new age, certainly the most amenable to measurement, is a vast expansion and intensification of public services in the broad field of social welfare, accompanied by a sharp increase in the size of public budgets and public payrolls. Dependence on government by a large number, and eventually a majority, of its citizens, whether as dispensers of public benefits or as recipients, is a distinctive mark of the welfare state.

Everybody knows that federal spending has been soaring over the past ten or twenty years, far outpacing the growth rate of the nation's economy. Also, that the federal bureaucracy has dramatically expanded, at a much faster rate than the U.S. population or the civilian labor force. Everybody that is, who has not looked at the record.

The fact is—and this may come as a surprise to many usually well informed persons—the federal expenditures increased in

the past ten years at about the same rate as the gross national product (GNP) or the personal income: they approximately doubled. To be sure, half of that increase is merely illusory and only reflects a shrinkage in the value of the dollar. But even so, it still leaves a 50% real increase during the 1960's in the national income and product as well as in federal budget outlays, a record of remarkably balanced growth and stability.

We can even go back nearly twenty years, to about 1952, and find a similar picture. Since 1952 the federal budget has almost exactly tripled, as did GNP and personal income. In other words, the federal budget and the economy have been growing at parallel rates for almost two decades, during a period when many people thought that we were living through times of runaway, spendthrift budgets.

HOW MUCH IS THE PUBLIC PAYROLL UP?

A study of the federal bureaucracy which is widely believed to be proliferating at an exorbitant speed yields a similar result: Federal civilian employment increased 17% over the past ten years, which parallels the growth of the civilian labor force and of total civilian employment of 15% and is only slightly ahead of the population growth of nearly 14%. If we go back to 1952—as we did when we viewed the budget—we find that federal civilian employment grew at only about one-third the rate of U.S. population, labor force and total employment.

We might then conclude that the United States experienced during the past two decades a very modest expansion of governmental activity, well in keeping with the growth of the private economy, and a relative shrinkage of the central bureaucracy. Those are trends which most of the American public would tend to applaud wholeheartedly.

But before we get carried away too far with such thoughts we might be well advised to study not only the magnitude of the change in governmental activity but also its nature and composition. Such an analysis shows that the seeming stability in the size of government was achieved only by financing a spectacular expansion of domestic services through a dramatic cutback in outlays for the military. Let us first look at the payroll, and, to stay with the example used before, compare the current year with 1952.

Federal civilian employment increased only 10% between 1952 and 1970, while the U.S. population and labor force simultaneously went up 31% and 32% respectively. But this covers a staff reduction of 14% in the Department of Defense, and of 3% in the Veterans' Administration, an increase of 39% in the Post Office—slightly ahead of the population growth—and an expansion of 43% in the remaining agencies which control all other federal programs.¹

Does this mean that employment in domestic public services grew only slightly faster than the population? No—because the federal payroll is only the visible part of the iceberg, the one above the surface.

Most domestic public services are partially or wholly financed by the federal treasury but carried out through state and local governments. It is the national government which offers, finances, encourages and sometimes mandates the programs while most of the employees which implement them are statistically classified "state and local." Well over 500 categorical grant and loan authorizations are now in operation and their cost has jumped from \$2.5 billion in 1952 to \$24 billion in 1970 and an estimated \$27.6 billion in FY 1971. So, if we want to get a proper picture of public employment we need to add state and local to federal payrolls.²

State and local government employment increased 136% between 1952 and 1970, or about four times faster than population and labor force. All governmental employment in

the United States (federal, state and local)—including defense—increased 90% which still is three times the growth rate of population and labor force.

	1952 (June)	1970 (June)	Increase or decrease in percent
Department of Defense	1,216,000	1,045,000	-14
Veterans' Administration	173,000	167,000	-3
Post Office	322,000	724,000	+39
All other agencies	509,000	727,000	+43
Total	2,420,000	2,663,000	+10
U.S. population	157,553,000	205,395,000	+31
Civilian labor force	62,138,000	82,125,000	+32

Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission; Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

	1952 (June)	1970 (June)	Increase in percent
State and local governments	4,188,000	9,890,000	+136
Federal civilian except DOD, VA, PO	509,000	727,000	+43
DOD, VA, and PO	1,911,000	1,936,000	+1
Total	6,608,000	12,553,000	+90

Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission; Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The most spectacular expansion in the federal payroll occurred in the Department of HEW whose staff ballooned from 35,000 in 1953 to 107,000 in 1970. On the state and local side, public education accounted for 3.2 million out of a total 5.2 million growth between 1952 and 1969, with the other two million spread over a wide range of activities. Rates of increase by function were:

Public education	+170%
Public welfare	+159%
Health & hospitals	+125%
Police	+105%
All other	+67%

HOW MUCH IS THE FEDERAL BUDGET UP?

A review of the federal budget shows similar developments. In the aggregate, revenues and expenditures have for many years been growing about as fast as the national economy. But when we analyze this seemingly moderate rate of expansion we find that the share of defense was cut nearly in half while the share of domestic services more than doubled (Table A, attached).

Defense costs went up 57% between 1952 and 1971 which is just barely ahead of the simultaneous rise in prices.³ In relative terms, defense fell from 66% of the total budget to 36%, from 13.6% of GNP to an estimated 7.2%. Spending for domestic public services meanwhile multiplied 7½ times (+662%) and their share of the budget jumped from 17% to 47%; the remaining 17% of the budget went for interest, veterans, international affairs and space. Outlays for education, health and welfare multiplied 12 times—an increase of 1142%—for all other domestic purposes combined, three times (+219%).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN 1952 AND 1971

	Calendar year 1952	Fiscal year 1971	Increase in percent
National defense	\$46,745	\$73,583	+57
International affairs, space, veterans, interest on the debt	11,976	33,263	+178
Education, health, and welfare	5,915	73,470	+1,142
Other domestic services	6,409	20,455	+219
Total	71,045	200,771	+183

INCREASE IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, 1952 TO 1971

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Amount	Percent
For national defense	\$26.8	21
For international affairs, veterans, space, interest on the debt	21.3	16
For education, social welfare, and health	67.6	52
For all other domestic services	14.0	11
Total	129.7	100

Sources: Department of Commerce, "The National Income and Product Accounts of the United States, 1929-1965"; Bureau of the Budget, "The Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1971."

Nearly two-thirds of the \$130 billion increase in federal revenues and expenditures between 1952 and 1971 was allocated to domestic programs—over one-half of the total budget growth is just to education, health, and welfare—one-sixth to interest, veterans, international affairs and space, the remaining one-fifth to national defense.

From the warfare state to the welfare state?

It is apparent that the shift in national priorities which some political and academic groups have been demanding for years, "from the warfare state to the welfare state" has taken place. It would probably have been impossible to expand social welfare programs at the rapid rate we experienced since the mid-fifties without cutting into national defense. Congress could not have provided sufficient revenues by boosting taxes.

The welfare state has come of age in the United States, as it had earlier in some European countries. Interestingly enough, it was not created by socialistic or left-leaning governments. It was Bismarck who advanced welfare plans in order to forge an alliance between the *junkers* and the industrial workers against the rising forces of the liberals, the business and professional classes. This axis between statist on the right and statist on the left was renewed on several occasions, most clearly in the Germany of the 1920's and 1930's when Nazis and Communists joined in attacks to bring down the liberal forces in the middle. But it was only in America, where the liberal tradition was stronger than in Europe, that the statist in what was probably a shrewd move assumed the label which their opponents had held for so long: they became the new "liberals."

Actually the welfare state is the very antithesis of the liberal idea. If we define liberty or freedom as the ability of the individual to make meaningful choices between known alternatives, then it follows that the extent of his freedom depends on the range of decisions he can make for himself and his family or which are being made for him, and on the share of his resources which he can allocate to his various wants according to his own wishes or which the government allocates for him.

In classic political theory, from Thomas Hobbes through Jim Locke to John Stuart Mills, the prime purpose and duty of the state is the protection of the safety of its citizens, their lives and property, from would-be attackers, foreign and domestic. The second task of the state is to establish and enforce rules for the ordinary and peaceful conduct of civil affairs and to settle disputes among its citizens. Such was the American tradition that guided the authors of federal and state constitutions. It still expresses the beliefs of a broad majority in this country.

But in the conduct of public policy we have turned 180 degrees. Our international position and our defensive strength, measured against the power of potential enemies, have never been as weak. The safety of person and property in our homes and streets—and on highways—has never been as much threatened or more frequently violated. At the same time, government has never before

Footnotes at end of article.

claimed, heid or exercised so many responsibilities for our personal affairs nor made so many decisions affecting our individual lives. It has assumed duties which, judging by the results, it is unable to discharge satisfactorily, while neglecting or forsaking its foremost and primary obligations.

THE WELFARE STATE COMES OF AGE

The American welfare state has its roots in the great depression. Prior to 1930, federal expenditures for domestic purposes never came close to \$1 billion. Even in seven years of New Deal they remained below \$7 billion a year and did not reach \$12 billion until 1952, twenty years after the birth of the New Deal.

In other words, it took 163 years—from 1789 to 1952—for federal expenditures for domestic purposes to reach \$12 billion. Then they "took off" and will in the FY 1972 in all likelihood hit \$100 billion.

While its political, philosophical and legal bases were laid in the 1930's, the American welfare state launched barely twenty years ago, gathered speed in the late 1950's and zoomed at a breathtaking rate in the 1960's. Its prophet is John Kenneth Galbraith who in *The Affluent Society* propounded the theory that government and its services are being scandalously starved while the private consumer luxuriates. His solution: to tax the latter more heavily so as to support the former more generously.

What this approach conveniently overlooks is that the consumer who supposedly luxuriates only consumes the goods, or their equivalent, which he produced. The welfare state idea recognizes no claim of the producer. It wants to redistribute income according to its own sense of social justice. It aims to overrule, through the political process or by threats, the rewards and punishments of the free market. It is blind to the lesson of history that there can be no free society without a free market nor can there be justice.

The case for the welfare state was well presented by George Katona:

"This is the most serious argument against the mass consumption society: The consumer exercises his influence in a socially undesirable manner. It is Galbraith's accomplishment to have presented the argument to the American public in a most convincing way. We do not have enough schools and spend far too little on education; we do not have enough hospitals and spend far too little on the health of our people; there are too many slums which breed delinquency and crime, scarcity prevails in the entire domain of public expenditures, such as highways, parks, and recreation facilities.

While Galbraith blamed the consumer, Katona charged that "the largest part of government expenditures has been used for national defense, not for health, education, slum clearance and the like."⁸

If we are to test this claim we cannot consider only federal expenditures but must study all governmental expenditures in the United States, federal-state-local, combined. A review shows (Table B, attached) that outlays for national defense equalled 50% of all governmental expenditures in 1952 and declined to 28% in 1969, the latest year for which complete data are available. Defense spending may be estimated close to 24% of all public outlays in the current fiscal year. The share of domestic services climbed from 37% in 1952 to 62% in 1969 and approximates 66% in the current fiscal year. The remaining 10% of governmental expenditures goes for interest, international affairs, etc. Social welfare (education, income maintenance, health, etc.) receives currently about 45% of all public expenditures, or almost twice as much as the military.

Between 1952 and 1969 governmental expenditures increased by \$196 billion. Three-fourths of this huge amount were allocated to domestic services, less than one-fifth to national defense:

INCREASE IN GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES, 1952-69

	[Dollar amounts in billions]	
	Amount	Percent
National defense.....	\$35	18
Domestic services:		
Education.....	41	21
Income maintenance.....	46	23
Health and hospitals.....	10	5
Other.....	48	25
Subtotal.....	145	74
Interest, international relations, etc.....	16	8
Total.....	196	100

But the absolute amounts may not be as significant as the trends. Table "B" shows that between 1952 and 1969 (prior to the \$8 billion cut in military appropriations between 1969 and 1971) outlays for defense increased 74%, for domestic services 420%; for education 489%, for income maintenance 694%, for health and hospitals 286%, for all other domestic services 299%. Over the same span, personal consumption expenditures grew 167%: for food 93%, for clothing 125%, for housing and household operations 200%.

Galbraith related inadequate spending for public services to exorbitant private consumption, Katona to excessive military outlays. The record shows these increases over the past 17 years (from 1952 to 1969):

National defense.....	+ 74%
Personal consumption.....	+167%
Domestic public services.....	+420%

THE HARVEST OF THE WELFARE STATE

Rates of increases do of course not necessarily prove that a function gets too much or does not get enough. That can be evaluated only by measuring what the expenditures actually accomplished, how much progress was achieved, if any, in reaching or coming closer to program goals. The amounts now being spent—\$180 billion for domestic services in 1969, of which \$118 billion went for social welfare, and the period over which the programs have been growing rapidly—between ten and twenty years—is long enough to expect some tangible and measurable results. With outlays for education and for income maintenance each now exceeding \$50 billion a year, we certainly may expect to have come closer to the goal "to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare. . . ." We should at least have sharply reduced crime and other social ills and lifted education to new heights.

But the evidence is to the contrary. Crime, delinquency and most kinds of social ills, new and old, have been multiplying at a frightening rate, to a point where American citizens are less safe than they have ever been—or as people are in most other countries. Nor have there ever before been such anarchy-like conditions in the United States, mob violence, arson, looting, terror bombing, wanton destruction, assault and killings of law officers, as we have seen in recent years.

The status and products of our educational system do not reflect the fact that more than five times as much public money is now being allocated to it each year than was less than two decades ago. Instead of helping to achieve "domestic tranquility," educational institutions have become the breeding places, and often the cause, of civic strife and contempt of law. Schools and colleges rank lower now in the respect and af-

fection of the American people than they have at any time.

The frequent conflagrations in our cities and our campuses, at the slightest provocation or no provocation, prove that deep-seated unhappiness, frustration, and mutual hatred characterize wide sections of our people. Is it a coincidence that the most violent and ugly page in American history is being written just as the welfare state is being put into practice? Is it a coincidence that the worst series of street riots began shortly after the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964? Is it a coincidence that a succession of campus rebellions began shortly after Congress passed several laws providing institutional and student aid and colleges began accepting and actively recruiting unqualified students? Was it an accident that the worst urban fights over the schools followed the expansion of compensatory education? Or can we trace the widespread bitterness and upheaval to false hopes raised beyond any possibility of fulfillment by the promises of ambitious politicians and bound to be disappointed? Are now seeing the results of acting as if all social ills could be cured by generous infusions of public money, of pretending that the effects of a law will be what its preamble says it should be?

Attempts to correlate tangible achievements with the resources applied to a program have cast great doubt on the idea that improvements are necessarily proportionate to the amounts spent or even tend to be favorably affected. In case after case we must question whether there is a positive cost-quality relationship or whether expenditures have been counter-productive. Huge federal spending often brought forth no social miracles but resentment among those who felt cheated when no miracles materialized as the money dissipated.

Addressing the National Governors Conference just a year ago President Nixon said: "We confronted the fact that in the past five years the Federal Government alone has spent more than a quarter of a trillion dollars on social programs—over \$250 billion. Yet far from solving our problems, these expenditures had reaped a harvest of dissatisfaction, frustration, and bitter division.

Never in human history has so much been spent by so many for such a negative result. The cost of the lesson has been high, but we have learned that it is not only what we spend that matters; but how we spend it.

Why are the facts not brought out more clearly for the public? Because most of the specialists in the various areas of social welfare, and certainly the best known among them, are committed to expanded federal spending for the goals of their professional and special interest organizations. Those are the experts that are called in and relied on by government agencies, by some of the major foundations, and by the nation's leading press. Young graduates in the social sciences tared. They find out that good jobs, grants and publicity go to the enthusiasts for enlarged federal spending, while the critics have a hard row to hoe. Small wonder that so many of our young people devise their strategies accordingly.

The American public seems to be far more conscious of the excessive growth of governmental activities in the past one to two decades and of the resulting danger to freedom than are its representatives or most academicians. The Gallup Poll asked in October 1969 and again in August 1969 "which of the following do you think will be the biggest threat to the country in the future—big business, big labor or big government?" Among those who responded the percentage of those who feared labor most fell from 59% to 31%, of those who feared business from 21% to 14%. But the number of those viewing government as the greatest threat jumped from 20% to 55%.

⁸Footnotes at end of article.

When more than half the American people are afraid of what their government will do to them while it is pretending to do something for them, then it's time to take a close look at what government has been doing and is planning to do.

Twenty years ago a freshman Massachusetts Congressman wrote: The scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of people all over the world is the delegation of great problems to the all-absorbing Leviathan—the state. . . . Every time that we try to lift a problem to the government we are sacrificing the liberties of the people. That young Congressman's name was John Fitzgerald Kennedy.⁸

The two biggest areas of governmental activity which have been growing most rapidly are welfare and education which, in the aggregate, account for two-fifths of all public spending and, at present trends, may soon total one-half or more. The third major field is of course national defense, which has been proportionally shrinking—in response to demands for increased welfare and education spending which otherwise could not have been met.

In a carefully documented study of post-war budget formation, Samuel P. Huntington of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, found in 1962:

In both the Truman Administration before the Korean War and in the Eisenhower Administration after the war, the tendency was:

(1) to estimate the revenues of the government or total expenditures possible within the existing debt limit;

(2) to deduct from this figure the estimated cost of domestic programs and foreign aid; and

(3) to allocate the remainder to the military.⁹

This suggests that defense was allocated whatever money was left after everybody else got his share.

The more recent practice seems to be to put pressure on the Pentagon for further cuts whenever demands from the domestic sector cannot easily be met by boosting taxes or enlarging the budget deficit.

Let me now illustrate for you what the American welfare state has produced in a few areas of governmental activity:

PUBLIC WELFARE IN THE WELFARE STATE

Several European countries have a more comprehensive social security system than we have. A few even have universal coverage for all their people, something which we have not yet fully achieved. But no country in the world has anything like our program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children—nor would want to. That AFDC is a nightmare and a plague on the body politic is now more widely recognized than it was just a few years ago. Thus there are efforts underway to abolish it and put something else in its place. But the plans now most actively considered such as Guaranteed Annual Income, Negative Income Tax or Family Allowances, no matter how attractively packaged, labeled and merchandised, would set us from the frying pan into the fire, and saddle us with something far worse than we now have.

ADC—as it was then known—came into being without public attention. It was not even mentioned in the extensive congressional debates that preceded the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, because it was regarded as merely placing a federal financial underpinning under the widows' pensions which all but two states were then paying. With the maturing of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, it was thought, ADC would gradually become unnecessary and peter out, as would other public assistance programs. OASDI has matured over the past 35 years, now covers more than 90% of all workers and pays monthly benefits to 26 million persons and their families. ADC was

meanwhile perverted into something it was not intended to be: an escape from the necessity to work for a living, for low-skilled people who refuse to accept jobs at a skill level they can handle, at a wage commensurate with the value of their output.

The child population (under 18) has gone up 40% since 1952 but the number of AFDC recipients increased 376% and is currently growing at an annual rate of 20%.

The orphans moved to Social Security (OASDI) long ago; only 6% of the AFDC children now are orphans. In three-fourths of the cases the father is "absent": half the women claim, rightly or wrongly, that they were deserted (up from one-fourth in 1961), one-fourth are unmarried. AFDC has replaced gainful employment and become the accepted way of life for well over two million women and men—for the latter usually indirectly and surreptitiously. It is now the preferred and most respected mode of living, blessed by the government with a stamp of approval, in poverty or slum sections of major American cities. AFDC has become an essential nutrient in the breeding grounds of crime, delinquency, illegitimacy, prostitution and all other forms of social ills, for a new generation to repeat, and possibly excel in, their parents' careers.

In his State of the Union Message in 1935 Franklin Delano Roosevelt warned: The lessons of history . . . show conclusively . . . that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fibre. To dole out relief is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. . . . The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief.

Truer words were never spoken: AFDC has turned into a cancer on society, planted and nursed by the federal government which has been getting deeper and deeper into "this business of relief" in the 35 years since FDR's warning. A plan passed by the House and now pending in the Senate would triple the number of recipients—to something like 25 million—while changing the program's name to one that is not yet as discredited as AFDC.

Repeated experience since the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 and 1952 to 1962 should have taught us that, despite of what they may promise to Congress, social caseworkers will not rehabilitate recipients to turn them into self-sustaining workers. That's not what they have been taught to do at schools of social work or what they believe in. The idea that social casework is or can be effective in improving the attitude or life style of problem cases has been called into serious question by several research studies and experiments, from *Girls at Vocational High* to the Chemung County (N.Y.) project.¹⁰ The number of welfare workers has been increasing 50% faster than recipients since the early 1950's. That did not help the caseworkers get recipients off the rolls, as Congress thought it would. It helped them to recruit more beneficiaries.

The precept of the welfare state, as incorporated in various guaranteed annual income plans, is that there should be no connection between work and income. When the two congressional appropriations committees ordered a sample study of the welfare case load in the District of Columbia in 1962, to be directed and staffed by the Controller General's office they found out that 59% of the recipients were not eligible for the benefits they were getting. What was done about that? A national study was undertaken, staffed by state welfare departments, which, to nobody's surprise, reported that everything was all right and the incidence of ineligibility insignificant.

There is no mystery why AFDC recipients nationally almost quadrupled since 1952—from 2 to 7.5 million, at a time of rising prosperity and employment: between 1952 and 1970 the average monthly benefit of

AFDC families more than doubled, from \$82 to \$178, a 117% increase during the period when consumer prices rose 42% and Old Age Assistance grants were raised 54%. A study by the Citizens Budget Commission of New York in 1968 found that average monthly benefits in the 10 states with the fastest rate of AFDC roll growth (median + 161%) were twice as high as in the ten states with the lowest rate of AFDC roll growth (median + 6%). Monthly AFDC payments averaged \$88 in the latter group of states, \$177 in the former. Why should persons of little skill and low productive capacity work for a wage that is not more than what they can get on welfare, and often less? Eligibility requirements have been gradually eased, under federal direction, and now consist of little more than filing a claim which must be accepted at face value and not be investigated or verified. Residence rules have been abandoned as have virtually all other controls. Work requirements are non-existent or non-enforced. Benefits per dependent are being raised (and personal exemptions for income tax purposes boosted) by the same Congress that recently approved a \$1 billion population control bill. Is this not like having a furnace and an airconditioning plant going full force at the same time?

While New York City is not typical of the rest of the country—fortunately, as some would say—it epitomizes and foreshadows trends and developments elsewhere. A look at New York City welfare is enlightening.

The number of welfare recipients in New York City jumped from 328,000 in 1960 to well over a million in 1969 and continued growing at an annual rate of 80,000 in 1970. In the world's financial capital there is now better than one person out of every eight on welfare and the rate may jump to 3 million in an 8 million population, according to the city's Commissioner for Social Services. Eighty percent of the AFDC mothers were not born in the city, 70% not reared there. They came from low-benefit, low-wage areas. Fifty-six percent of the welfare applications were approved in 1961, 79% in 1968. While per capita income in New York is 20% above the national average, welfare benefits are 70% above the national average. A man with a wife and two children can now expect to receive more than \$4,000 a year, in addition to various fringe benefits. That is more than he is likely to get on unemployment or earn in an unskilled job.

There are unskilled and low-skilled job openings around galore—but why should welfare recipients take them? Poor people may often be of low intelligence, but they are not stupid. The New York subway is filthy, household garbage is being collected at long and irregular intervals and left in alleys and streets in some sections of the city, parks are neglected and certain areas filled with refuse, rubble and decay. But to expect welfare recipients to help clean up the city, or at least their own neighborhoods or work as domestics, would be deemed an indignity.

It is interesting to contemplate how clean the subways, streets and parks are in Moscow and Leningrad—with whole swarms of men and women cleaning them all the time. But then, the Soviet Union offers no welfare or unemployment pay to able-bodied persons and its minimum wage was lifted from \$4 to \$66 a month only last January. Ours is \$277. Minimum pay was just raised in New York, and a parallel move is now being demanded on the federal level, which would force large additional numbers on welfare. The Soviet Union has a rule (Article 12 of its Constitution) that "He who does not work, neither shall he eat." In the United States that principle of St. Paul has long yielded to the welfare state precept that the ties between work and income should be weakened and eventually cut. We practice the first part of the Socialist principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work"

(Article 12 of the Soviet Constitution). But we would not think of applying the second part.

Soviet citizens are guaranteed the right to work (Article 118, USSR Constitution). Would we not be better off if we guaranteed everybody an opportunity to earn a living instead of accepting the principle that government owes everybody a living?

Little effort is made to hold both parents responsible for the support of their children and to overcome the refusal of welfare recipients to take unskilled and semi-skilled jobs.¹¹ It is thus not surprising that New York City's welfare outlays now total \$1.7 billion of which however only 30% comes from city funds. It was disclosed four weeks ago that the city is housing welfare clients at the Commodore and similar hotels and is paying \$85 a day to shelter just one family.

The War on Poverty has distributed huge sums among low-income persons, and placed militants in well-paid key positions. It has financed and otherwise facilitated much of the violence that has plagued our cities in recent years. Some of the money was used to buy weapons, ammunition, explosives, to train and organize sabotage and destruction.

Some assert that pouring additional billions into the schools, to raise the skills of the children of the poor offers them a way out. "Education an Answer to Poverty" has been their watchword. Let us take a good look at it.

EDUCATION—AN ANSWER TO POVERTY?

Americans have always viewed and treated education with special affection. They know that much of the enormous progress which our civilization, our economy, science, technology have achieved is due to a tireless effort and huge investment in schools and colleges. Our most successful men and women, the leaders in most fields, are generally well educated, though often self-educated. Our least successful people, those with the smallest earnings, tend to rank low in educational achievements, are deficient in basic skills, have attended school for fewer years than those higher up on the socio-economic scale.

This has led many to seek the cause of the income differences among people in the number of years they attended school and in the amount of money that was spent on their respective schools. It has long been customary to measure educational quality in dollars spent per pupil, in the teacher-pupil ratio and similar measures of input. Thus the answer to complaints about deficiencies in the output, the products of education were always answered with the same plea: give us more money, hire more teachers and pay them more. The American people so did. Here is what has happened since the early 1950's:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN 1952 AND 1969

	1952	1969	Increase in percent
Students in public education.....	27,862,000	49,500,000	78
Employees in public education.....	1,850,000	5,038,000	172
Expenditures for public education (billions).....	\$8,387	\$49,424	489
Employee-student ratio.....	1-15	1-9.8	
Expenditure per student.....	\$301	\$998	

Source: Office of Education and Office of Business Economics.

But the evidence is overwhelming that there is little if any cost-quality relationship in the schools. James Coleman so found in the most extensive study of American public schools ever undertaken and Christopher Jencks in summarizing the ensuing national debate concluded: "Variations in schools' fiscal and human resources have very little

effect on student achievement—probably even less than the Coleman report implied." Hundreds of class size studies show that students do not learn more in smaller classes.

In 1965 Congress was persuaded that a vast expansion of "compensatory education" programs would reduce the lag of one or several years in basic skills of children from low-income backgrounds. Now, five years and more than six billion dollars later, the record of thousands of projects, from "Higher Horizons" and "More Effective Schools" in New York to "Banacker" in St. Louis, from "Madison" in Syracuse to the Berkeley schools, all of them begun with great enthusiasm, tells a story of consistent failure to produce the educational improvement among so-called deprived children which their sponsors had hoped for and promised.

In his School Reform Message of March 3, 1970, President Nixon reported:

The best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up. . . . Recent findings on the two largest such programs are particularly disturbing. We now spend more than \$1 billion a year for educational programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Most of these have stressed the teaching of reading, but before-and-after tests suggest that only 19 percent of the children in such programs improve their reading significantly; 13 percent appear to fall behind more than expected; and more than two-thirds of the children remain unaffected—that is, they continue to fall behind. In our Headstart Program, where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similar poor backgrounds.

The President suggested research into educational methods and reform of our apparently ineffective methods as the way to improvement. He added: "As we get more education for the dollar, we will ask Congress for more dollars for education."

But Congress would have none of that. As in so many other cases it decided to use money as a substitute for necessary reforms.

Despite the conclusive proof of failure, Congress a few months ago extended and expanded the compensatory education program with a three year, \$24.6 billion price tag, and then increased appropriations over the budget, overriding a presidential veto. Belief in the educational magic of the dollar dies hard.

These efforts at compensatory education resemble nothing as much as the quest of the alchemists who tried, for hundreds of years and at a huge cost, to do what we now know cannot be done. I have discussed this subject elsewhere more extensively than I can in this context and must refer you to those papers.¹²

Again, as in the case of public welfare, New York City offers an excellent proof of the futility of spending huge amounts of money without reforming our methods. "Our schools are the most lushly funded school system in the nation," boasted Mayor Lindsay recently, adding that "it has the best teacher-pupil ratio of any city—not just some but any city in the country." (*New York Times*, June 6, 1969) But his Advisory Panel reminded him in November 1967: "The New York City school system, which once ranked at the summit of American public education, is caught in a spiral of decline."

New York City schools now have about the same enrollment as they had 25 years ago. The number of teachers has almost doubled, expenditures have multiplied eight times and now average, on a per pupil basis, twice those of other cities in its size class. But students in New York City schools lag substantially

behind national norms (averages) and slipped another two months in reading scores last year. Pupils in New York schools with the highest expenditures and lowest class sizes lag the most; pupils in schools with the lowest expenditures and the largest classes are ahead in achievement scores.

Politicians have played a cruel hoax on the poor in urban communities by selling them a new type of snake oil—"compensatory education"—as a cure-all for their ills. Many schools in low-income neighborhoods offer courses that are irrelevant to the true needs of disadvantaged children instead of teaching them marketable skills. In the end the schools give them, in place of an education, a diploma which some of the recipients can't even read. When the failure becomes manifest, as sooner or later it must, the sponsors blame it on niggardly appropriations that should have been at least twice as high.

Private schools and colleges which offer students and their parents an alternative curriculum and a freedom of choice have been pushed to the wall in recent years by unwise public policies. Many of the institutions face extinction within the next decade, at a huge additional cost to the taxpayers, unless remedial action is soon taken to reduce the severe penalty for attending non-public school or college.

WELL INTENDED BUT ILL CONCEIVED

Most actions by governmental authorities concerning the schools are well intended but too often they are ill conceived and seem to aim at objectives other than improved learning. Some urban school systems appear to be engaged in a process to ruin not only public education but the cities they serve. They pursue policies which cause business enterprises and large numbers of the type of residents they need most to sustain their social and economic base, millions in the national aggregate, to move out as their only means of escape from the city's or the school district's jurisdiction.

To be sure, government has an essential role to play in many problems of our contemporary society. But in too many cases we must ask: are you helping to solve the problem or are you part of the problem? Time and again, government has perpetuated a problem that otherwise would long have been solved. Sometimes it makes a mountain out of a molehill.

For more than three decades we have been trying to boost the price of farm products and to reduce farm production, at a cost to the public treasury which has now run well over \$100 billion. Simultaneously, we worry over the high cost of food and the inadequacy of our food base for an "exploding" population. As time goes on we are moving away from a free market instead of coming closer to it, as the country's largest farm organization has long advocated.

We have poured more than \$100 billion into aid to over 100 foreign countries where in many cases it has reaped a harvest of thistles and venom while supporting self-destructive policies of the recipient governments.

For over a century we have been trying to act as the Great White Father to the remnants of the Indian people, piling on new programs in recent decades—with meager and often tragic results.

Many activities call for public regulation but this sometimes turns into public strangulation, as in the case of railroads. Occasionally the use of governmental power is needed to prevent the formation of a monopoly. But in most cases only government can and does create a monopoly by encouraging, granting or directly exercising it, often with huge losses (e.g., Post Office).

Grants to state and local governments have long been a popular device to promote

¹¹Footnotes at end of article.

and finance favored public services. But the multiplication of authorizations to well over 500 in recent years has turned federal aid into an administrative nightmare which if continued much longer will wind up in chaos. Plans to simplify intergovernmental aid by shifting some of the decisions to states and cities—through grant consolidation, fiscal grants, revenue sharing or tax credits—have so far been given the cold shoulder by members of Congress who feel that there is but little wisdom outside its own halls.

We have been complaining about inflation, pointing fingers in several directions, demanding that government discipline unions and management by guideposts, jawboning, fines or controls. But only government itself can and does create inflation, largely through budget deficits, easy money and lopsided labor policies, and only government can stop inflation—by exercising self-discipline which so far it has shown no inclination of doing.

Twenty-two years ago we started an urban renewal program which, at a huge expense, has since destroyed three times as many dwellings as it has completed, and has built mostly apartments which the former residents of the area cannot afford. It has been called a slum removal program because it has mainly shifted slums from one part of the city to another, sometimes spawned "instant slums" to replace the old ones. The true welfare state enthusiasts blind themselves to the fact that slums are not decaying buildings but people.

In an effort to keep rents down, New York City has maintained, ever since World War II, rent control over 1.3 million apartments. When maintenance costs soared and losses mounted to unbearable levels, many landlords were forced to abandon their property. Over 130,000 apartments and houses, two-thirds of them structurally sound, were left to rot in New York City during the past four years and housing units are now being retired twice as fast as new ones are opened.

Dozens of urban programs intended to improve housing conditions were enacted, extended or enlarged in recent years. What is their combined impact? What would you expect to happen in a market in which private demand is high, costs and prices are rising at a faster rate than in the rest of the economy¹² and government adds billions to the demand, offering generous subsidies and infusing large amounts of grants, loans and guarantees? As a consequence, the price of houses, and of construction generally, and inevitably also rents, increased at an even faster rate, driving additional millions of moderate income families out of the housing market. Not surprisingly they added their voices to the clamor for more housing subsidies—for middle-income families. We have here the classic case of a vicious cycle: government action intended to cope with a problem ballooning it and creating the need for an expanded program.

Not enough attention has been paid to Jay Forrester's *Urban Dynamics* (MIT Press 1969) which showed that to start solving the urban problem at the housing end is self-defeating. The city, he suggested, should aim to create an environment that will attract and generate jobs; everything else will then fall in line.

While private housing starts languish, in spite of liberalized government loan funds, guarantees and subsidies, public housing construction is going ahead at a rapid clip—and most of the public housing authorities are in financial trouble, some near-bankrupt, though their buildings are supplied for free.

The bill of particulars against the expansion of public services in recent years under the aegis of the welfare state could be continued. But the few illustrations I have given may suffice.

There is however one job, one major duty in the domestic field, which government was

always expected to do and which only government can do in a modern society: crime detection and prevention. And it has turned this into the worst failure among its domestic activities.

CRIME IN THE WELFARE STATE

No reliable statistics exist that would permit an accurate comparison of the incidence of crime in the United States and in the other countries. But enough information is available to state that without doubt the United States has become the most crime-ridden country in the world. In no other megalopolis could its leading newspaper say, as the *New York Times* recently did: "This city's 8 million people live in daily fear of mugging, robbery and other violent crimes."

Nor is this a "crime wave" as it is often called. Waves crest and ebb—but crime has been going straight up, with no sign of cresting or ebbing. According to FBI reports, the number of serious crimes leaped from 2 million in 1960 to 5 million in 1969. That averages out to an 11% increase each year—while population was growing 1% per year.

Soaring crime is widely being blamed on social conditions. There is an element of truth in this charge, if not in the sense in which it is usually meant to be understood—that society has neglected the poor. Spending under public income maintenance programs jumped from \$7 billion in 1950 to \$23 billion in 1960 and is now running at an annual clip of over \$70 billion. The number of families with an income under \$3,000 fell from 22.7% of all families in 1959 to 9.3% in 1969, of families classified "below poverty level" from 18.5% of all families to 9.7%. But the number of female-headed families went up by more than a million and several other indicators of social health also suggest undesirable trends while the welfare state increasingly permeated American society.

There really is no mystery about the cause of the soaring crime rate: would-be criminals did their homework; they checked the record and came up with a simple fact: *Crime pays*. A recent study concluded that the chances of going to prison are less than one in 200 for a man committing a felony in New York City. While the number of felonies committed in that city multiplied more than threefold during the 1960's, the prison population fell by about a third. The backlog of New York City's criminal court has been estimated at 700,000 cases—which would take 2½ years to clear up at the present rate—if no new arrests were made.

Ten years ago 27% of the offenses known to police were cleared by arrests, in the national average; this has since fallen to 20%. In other words, the criminal now has four chances in five never to be arrested. A person arrested has five chances out of six *not* to serve time in prison or jail although only 5% of those tried are acquitted. And the one in about thirty criminals who is unlucky enough to wind up behind bars, serves on the average only 55% of the time to which he was sentenced. Is there any other money-making or ego-satisfying enterprise in which the chances are nearly as good?

Nor can this appalling record be blamed on stinginess with which governments have been treating their law enforcement agencies:

POLICE EMPLOYMENT AND EXPENDITURES 1952 AND 1969

	1952	1969	Increase in percent
Employment in State and local police departments...	238,000	487,000	105
Growth of U.S. population (millions).....	157.5	203.2	29
Expenditures for police (Federal-State-local) (millions).....	\$993	\$4,448	338
National income (billions).....	\$291	\$770	164

Source: Bureau of the Census and Office of Business Economics.

Data from New York City, Washington, D.C., and other major cities show the same picture: as the number of policemen and the size of police appropriations multiplied, so did crimes, often at surprisingly similar rates.

This does not suggest that police departments have been lying down on the job. Eighty-six policemen murdered in line of duty during 1969 testify to that. But it does suggest that there is something terribly wrong with our methods, with the procedures under which police are forced to operate, under rules imposed by courts whose concern seems to have largely shifted from the victims of crime—and potential victims—to the criminals who committed the offenses.

Nowhere is the philosophy of the welfare state more clearly expressed than in our attitude toward crime and our treatment of criminals, in no other manner do we more manifestly reap the harvest of what we have sown.

The American public is increasingly frightened by the jungle-like conditions in our cities and anxious to end this reign of terror. In a Gallup Poll, asking whether the courts should deal more harshly with criminals, the percentage of respondents who have an opinion, rose from 57% in the affirmative in 1965 to 82% in 1969. But neither the courts nor legislative bodies seem so far ready to take the drastic measures which at this stage may be necessary to restore law and order in the United States, at least to a level that is closer to conditions which prevail in other civilized countries. Though much more money will undoubtedly be needed if crime is to be reduced, there is little hope that any amount will reverse current trends unless far more fundamental changes are made, until a semblance of safety is restored to our streets and homes.

Grave as the threat is from evergrowing crime, the most ominous danger to our long-range national survival lies in a gradual weakening of our national defense.

GIANT ON MUDBRICK FEET

With a planned appropriation of \$73 billion in the current fiscal year and over 3 million men in uniform, our defense establishment offers a mighty and imposing sight. But the crucial point is that our potential enemies have for many years been building up their military strength while ours has been diminishing, measured by the only meaningful yardstick: the combined power we may have to face some day in a major confrontation at a future Armageddon.

Not that the Soviet Union is planning to start a war with the United States or that Red China is. They both probably hope that a war may in the end not be necessary. They believe that they may achieve their aim of Communist world domination without a war if current trends continue long enough because the United States will eventually be in no position to oppose or resist any action our adversaries may choose to take.

American military might reached its apex toward the end of World War II and has been coming down ever since. The United States dismantled its defense establishment between 1945 and 1948, cutting outlays from \$80 billion to \$12 billion. That unilateral disarmament prompted aggressive action in Korea in which we barely escaped military disaster. The defense budget was then raised to \$50 billion and is still at that level, if counted in dollars of constant value. Not many people know that much of the Vietnam operations was carried on by depleting the rest of the defense establishment. This leaves us with "Swiss cheese" defenses, as several recent incidents suggest.

We enjoyed a decisive military superiority over the Soviet Union at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 which is why the Russians yielded to President Kennedy's ultimatum that their naval vessels steaming to-

ward Cuba reverse their course. Moscow has since been pushing one of the greatest armament programs ever, pulled abreast of us in many respects, is ahead of us in land-based intercontinental missiles, missile-launching (and other) submarines, anti-ballistic missiles and in several other major weapons systems. The Soviets are headed for a clearcut arms superiority within not too many years.

It takes five to ten years to develop, test, produce, and deploy a major weapons system. What we do now about our missiles and missile defense, about the F-14 and F-15 fighters, the MBT-70 main battle tank, C-5A cargo plane (whose fleet was cut from 120 to 81), the AMSA (advanced manned strategic aircraft)—now to be implemented as the B-1 new strategic bomber—the nuclear carriers and submarine programs will decide whether our defenses will be strong in the second half of the 1970's and beyond, or whether the United States will have to yield to nuclear or other forms of blackmail. The Joint Chiefs and other military experts appear to be fighting a losing battle and the warnings of the chairmen of both congressional armed services committees are not sufficiently heeded.

Defense appropriations were cut by \$20 billion, or 27%, between fiscal years 1967 and 1971, counted in constant dollars. But there still seems to be an open season on the military. Only five weeks ago Senator Proxmire, in a major Senate speech, proposed to slash Pentagon funds by another \$10 billion.

IN CONCLUSION:

I have not even mentioned the excessive and ever-rising tax burden which critics of the welfare state often use as their argu-

ment. I refrained from referring to taxes not because I believe they are unimportant. The tax argument is valid—but it has been brought up many times by others and it pales in its significance when held against the detrimental impact of the welfare state on our domestic services, social health and on security from attacks, at home or from abroad. The steady weakening of the nation's moral fibre and of its global and military power are the primary and most compelling points in my indictment of the American welfare state. I rest the case on them.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Federal Civilian Employment (Continental U.S.) in 1952 and 1970.*

² *Government Employment in the United States, 1952 and 1970.*

³ The change in U.S. Budget methods—from the "administrative" and "cash consolidated" to the "unified" budget—makes historical comparisons difficult. No recomputation backward or forward is presently available. The Office of Business Economics (Dept. of Commerce) has prepared revenue and expenditure analyses by function, on a national income account basis, which go as far back as 1952; latest year now available is 1969. The beginning year in the table below, 1952, is taken, as the earliest year available, from OBE data, the ending year (FY 1971) from the President's Budget. Statistical inaccuracies resulting from the use of two different bases however are not significant for the data shown.

⁴ In constant dollars \$12 billion were worth less in 1952 than \$7 billion had been in 1939.

⁵ Of the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, in: *The Mass Consump-*

tion Society, McGraw Hill, N.Y., 1964, Chapter 8, "Private Opulence and Public Poverty," p. 62.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

⁷ E.g., see Ira Sharkansky, "Government Expenditures and Public Services in the American States," *American Political Science Review*, December 1967.

⁸ For further thoughts along this line see my "Big Government—Friend or Foe?" *Congressional Record*, February 24, 1966.

⁹ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Common Defense: Strategic Programs in National Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961). Warner R. Schilling, Paul Y. Hammond, Glenn H. Snyder, *Strategy, Politics and the Defense Budgets* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962). Maxwell Taylor, *The Uncertain Trumpet* (New York: Harper, 1960).

¹⁰ See: Henry J. Meyer et al., *Girls at Vocational High*, N.Y., Russel Sage Foundation, 1965; *The Multi-Problem Dilemma*, ed. Gordon E. Brown, Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1968.

¹¹ This is well pointed out in an inclusive analysis *Welfare in New York City*, by the Center for New York City Affairs of the New School for Social Research, February 1970.

¹² "The Alchemists in Our Public Schools," *Congressional Record*, April 24, 1969, and "The Crisis in American Education," *Congressional Record*, June 22 and 23, 1970.

¹³ "To buy now what \$10,000 bought in 1929, would require \$22,400 for consumer goods, but \$40,900 in the case of a house. Consumer prices have risen 30%, residential construction costs 46% since 1957/59, although wholesale construction materials meanwhile went up no faster than wholesale prices in general: 18%.

TABLE A.—FEDERAL EXPENDITURES 1952-71

	Expenditures (millions)		Percent increase 1952-71	Expenditures as a percentage of GNP		Percent of total expenditures	
	Calendar year 1952 ¹	Fiscal year 1971 ²		1952	1971	1952	1971
Total expenditures.....	\$71,045.0	\$200,771	183	21.1	19.5	100.0	100.0
National security and cost of past wars.....	58,721.0	106,846	82	17.4	10.4	82.7	53.2
National defense.....	46,745.0	73,583	57	13.9	7.1	65.8	36.7
International affairs.....	2,380.0	3,589	51	.7	.3	3.3	1.8
Space research and technology.....	4,599.0	17,799	287	1.4	1.7	6.5	8.9
Interest on debt.....	4,997.0	8,475	70	1.5	.8	7.0	4.2
Veterans benefits and services.....	12,324.0	93,925	662	3.7	9.1	17.3	46.8
Domestic services.....	5,915.0	73,470	1,142	1.8	7.1	8.3	36.6
Education, welfare, and health.....	6,409.0	20,455	219	1.9	2.0	9.0	10.2
All other.....							
Exhibit:							
Education.....	323.0	8,129	2,417	.1	.8	.5	4.0
Social welfare.....	5,151.0	50,384	876	1.5	4.9	7.2	25.1
Health, hospitals, and sanitation.....	431.0	14,957	3,370	.1	1.5	.6	7.4
Population of the United States (thousands).....	157,553.0	³ 206,500	31				
Consumer Price Index.....	92.5	138	49				
Gross national product (billions).....	\$345.5	³ 1,030	198				
National income (billions).....	\$291.4	³ 850	192				
Personal consumption (billions).....	\$216.7	³ 638	194				

¹ The National Income and Product Accounts of the United States, 1929-65, a supplement of the "Survey of Current Business," U.S. Department of Commerce, 1966.

² The Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1971, Bureau of the Budget.

³ Estimated.

TABLE B.—GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1952 AND 1969

	Expenditures in millions		Percent increase	Expenditures as a percentage of GNP		Percent of total expenditures	
	1952	1969		1952	1969	1952	1969
Total expenditures (Federal-State-local).....	\$93,652	\$290,079	209	27.1	31.1	100.0	100.0
National security and cost of past wars.....	59,104	110,163	86	17.1	11.8	63.1	38.0
National defense.....	46,795	81,687	74	13.5	8.8	50.0	28.2
International affairs.....	2,380	2,623	10	.7	.3	2.5	.9
Space research and technology.....	3,905	13,461	175	1.4	1.4	5.2	4.6
Not interest paid.....	4,886	13,461	175	1.4	1.4	5.2	4.6
Veterans benefits and services.....	5,043	8,487	68	1.5	.9	5.4	2.4

Footnotes at end of tables.

	Expenditures in millions		Percent increase	Expenditures as a percentage of GNP		Percent of total expenditures	
	1952	1969		1952	1969	1952	1969
Domestic services.....	34,548	179,916	420	10.0	19.3	36.9	62.0
Social welfare ²	19,101	118,332	520	5.5	12.7	20.4	40.8
All other.....	15,447	61,584	299	4.4	6.6	16.5	21.2
Exhibit:							
Education.....	8,387	49,424	489	2.4	5.3	9.0	17.0
Social security and public welfare.....	6,664	52,968	694	1.9	5.7	7.1	18.3
Health, hospitals and sanitariums.....	3,414	13,189	256	1.0	1.4	3.6	4.5
Population of the United States, July 1 (in thousands).....	157,553	203,213	29				
Consumer Price Index.....	\$92.5	\$127.7	38				
Gross national product (GNP) (billion).....	\$345.5	\$931.4	170				
National income (NI) (billion).....	\$291.4	\$769.5	164				
Personal consumption (billion).....	\$216.7	\$577.5	166				

¹ While part of the national debt results from peacetime deficits, the major part was incurred during wars.

² Includes education; health, hospitals and sanitation; social security and public welfare; labor; housing and community development.

Sources: The National Income and Product Accounts of the United States, 1929-65, a supplement of the Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1966; Survey of Current Business, July 1970 and Economic Indicators, July 1970 and 1967 supplement.

TABLE C.—PERSONAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURES, 1952 AND 1969

Type of product	[Dollars in millions]		Percent increase
	1952	1969	
Total.....	\$216,679	\$577,458	167
I. Food and tobacco.....	68,357	131,943	93
II. Clothing, accessories and jewelry.....	26,416	59,387	125
III. Personal care.....	2,782	9,666	247
IV. Housing.....	26,476	83,999	218
V. Household operations.....	31,673	81,546	158
VI. Medical care expenses.....	10,225	42,569	316
VII. Personal business.....	7,791	31,921	310
VIII. Transportation.....	23,987	75,032	211
IX. Recreation.....	12,102	36,305	200
X. Private education and research.....	1,870	9,688	419
XI. Religious and welfare activities.....	2,784	8,161	193
XII. Foreign travel and other, net.....	1,106	4,261	285

Source: The National Income and Product Accounts of the United States, 1929-65, a Supplement of the Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1966, and Survey of Current Business, July 1970.

ANNUAL POLL RESULTS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, each year I conduct an annual poll by mail of my

constituents. I continue to find this technique a valuable and useful tool in helping me to better represent my district and my people.

Last June I mailed my annual questionnaire to every household in my northeast Philadelphia district. Over the summer months, the results were tabulated. I am now mailing these results to the more than 140,000 households in my district.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I would like to enter this most recent report to my district in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE

OCTOBER 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: After a full summer of studying the questionnaires I mailed to you in June, the results have been compiled and, as I promised, I am mailing these results to every home in the Northeast. I was impressed by the depth of your concern and the concern of our friends and neighbors about the problems of crime and drug abuse. The crime problem was listed as the second most pressing in the Nation and the single problem of most concern to people in the Northeast.

FIGHTING CRIME

In this Congress I have sponsored more than a dozen bills designed to curb crime and to give important assistance to local law enforcement officials. One of these bills, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970, extends the life of this major legislative innovation in the fight on

crime. This act authorizes direct assistance by the Federal government to local police departments. At my invitation, Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo in March testified in support of this legislation before the House Judiciary Committee, which first considered the bill and on which I serve. In the last two fiscal years, this legislation was responsible for providing nearly \$3 million to the Philadelphia police department.

FIGHTING POLLUTION

Our friends and neighbors also are concerned about pollution and ranked it the Nation's fourth most pressing problem and the third problem of concern in the Northeast. This is a concern I share. I have introduced legislation to help communities keep their water supplies safe and another bill, now law, which establishes standards and programs to abate and control water pollution from synthetic detergents. I am a sponsor of a package of legislation designed to eliminate air pollution from automobile exhausts and emissions by the mid-1970's. Experts have estimated that from 60 percent to as high as 92 percent of air pollution in big cities like Philadelphia can be directly traced to the automobile.

YOUR VIEWS ARE COUNTED

On the reverse side, you will find the results of the questionnaire, reported by percentage on each response. I want to thank the many, many people who answered this poll and all those who added their own perceptive and useful comments. Thank you for your consideration and attention.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOSHUA EILBERG.

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG REPORTS YOUR VIEWS

	Yes	No	Un-decided	No response
1. Do you believe that inflation is under control.....	3	89	4	4
(b) If not where has inflation hurt you the most? (check one):				Percent
(1) Food.....				58
(2) Housing.....				5
(3) Education.....				2
(4) Transportation.....				1
(5) Clothing.....				1
(6) Medical costs.....				7
(7) Taxes.....				23
No response.....				3
(c) Do you think increased unemployment is an acceptable way to curb inflation?.....	7	80	7	6
2. Which tax do you resent the most:				Percent
(a) Federal income.....				24
(b) State sales.....				47
(c) Local real estate.....				24
No response.....				5

	Yes	No	Un-decided	No response
3. Do you think the present social security benefits are adequate?.....	18	64	14	4
4. Nonessential Government spending must be cut. If you were writing the Federal budget which program would you cut first? (check 1):				Percent
(a) Crime.....				1
(b) Defense.....				15
(c) Education.....				1
(d) Foreign aid.....				45
(e) Highways.....				2
(f) Housing.....				1
(g) Pollution control.....				1
(h) Space.....				23
(i) Welfare.....				10
No response.....				1
5. Would you increase or cut Federal aid to:				No Increase Decrease Response
(a) Elementary and secondary public schools?.....	66	9	25	
(b) Private and parochial schools?.....	37	40	23	
(c) Colleges and universities?.....	36	41	23	

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG REPORTS YOUR VIEWS—Continued

	Percent					Percent			
	Yes	No	Un- decided	No response		Yes	No	Un- decided	No Response
5. (a) Which of the following constitutes the most serious threat to your health and the health of your children? (check one)					(c) Do you think persons outside the Internal Revenue Service should be allowed to see your income tax return?	4	93	2	1
(1) Air pollution.....				76	11. (a) Would you reduce first offender penalties for possession of marijuana.....	41	52	6	1
(2) Water pollution.....				18	(b) Would you increase the penalties for those who sell drugs to schoolchildren?	95	3	1	1
(3) Noise pollution.....				2	12. Do you think that 18, 19, and 20 year olds should be permitted to vote?	52	40	7	1
(b) Who do you think has the greatest responsibility for curbing pollution? (check 1)					13. Do you think Associate Justice William O. Douglas should remain on the Supreme Court?	29	39	28	4
(1) Government.....				39	14. What do you think are the three most pressing problems facing America today? Please list in order of urgency. (Using a weighted point system, the following results were tabulated by percentage.)				
(2) Private industry.....				52	(1) Vietnam.....				22
(3) The private citizen.....				7	(2) Crime and drug abuse.....				18
No Response.....				2	(3) The economy.....				11
7. (a) I do not support an increase in first-class mail postage to 8 cents. Do you?.....	18	75	6	1	(4) Pollution.....				18
(b) Rather, I believe junk mail rates should be substantially increased to pay their own way. Do you agree?.....	96	2	1	1	The remaining 23 percent went in descending order to racial problems, campus unrest, high taxes, education, and the need for national unity and more patriotism.				
(c) I support strict prohibition of the mailing of unsolicited pornography. Do you agree?.....	92	5	2	1	15. What one problem in the Northeast is of most concern to you? (Using a weighted point system, the following results were tabulated by percentage.)				
8. (a) Do you support a Vietnam-type commitment in Cambodia and Laos?.....	18	72	8	2	(1) Crime and drug abuse.....				31
(b) Do you believe we should withdraw from Vietnam?.....	69	21	8	2	(2) Public school crisis.....				12
(c) If yes, do you think we are withdrawing fast enough?.....	23	46	7	24	(3) Pollution.....				9
9. Do you think the United States should sell Phantom jets to Israel?.....	64	24	1	2	(4) Public transportation.....				8
10. (a) Do you feel personally threatened by crime on the streets?.....	83	14	2	1	The remaining 40 percent went to a wide range of problems including high taxes, inadequate and poorly kept recreational facilities and parks, high rents, housing shortages, racial problems, and dirty streets and lots.				
(b) Do you think the police should be able to enter your home and search it without first knocking on your door?.....	10	86	3	1					

RESOLUTION ON DISMISSAL OF PROFESSIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS BY THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed by the discharge on Saturday, October 3, of three air traffic controllers by the Federal Aviation Administration Regional Manager in Miami, because of their participation in the air traffic controllers' "sick-out," which was in protest over the unsafe operation of air traffic control systems.

When I first received an urgent appeal from constituents that this was about to occur, I immediately wired the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary, Department of Transportation, urging that his department, upon fair assurances from the three men, decline to discharge them. I also wired the Regional Director of the FAA, in Miami, urging his reconsideration of the action in light of all the circumstances.

It was only this morning that I received the following wire from Mr. R. P. Skully, Miami Area Manager, FAA:

I have again reviewed the individual cases for Robert C. Eberst, Jerald L. Seeley and Edgar Hunt and can only conclude their discharge is appropriate and will be carried out October 3, 1970.

The alleged facts relating to these FAA dismissals indicate that FAA is taking punitive action against officers of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization which action is undoubtedly discriminatory. Of the 55 controllers who have been fired as of last week, is it not unusual and not more than a matter of coincidence that 95 percent of these controllers are PATCO officers;

several thousand other controllers have received disciplinary leaves ranging from 2 to 30 days.

The U.S. District Court in Denver, Colo., issued a protective order to prevent the firing of controllers at that airport and the order was upheld by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The U.S. District Courts in New York and Chicago have also issued restraining orders against the FAA's firing of controllers.

The FAA has established certain standards of disciplinary action, including discharge against its employees and has then charged officers of PATCO with having violated such standards; but in applying the penalty of discharge FAA has ignored its own standards; the officers have been discharged without reasonable basis solely upon the allegations made against them, and the agency has placed upon the officers of PATCO the burden of proving their innocence of complicity in the so-called sick-out.

Many of my colleagues have petitioned President Nixon to cease this action; others have pleaded with Secretary Volpe to achieve a conciliation between the Nation's air traffic controllers and the FAA and to give priority attention to improving conditions affecting the country's air traffic control system.

None of these avenues of appeal have proved to have made any impression on the administration. It seems the time has come to call a halt on the tendency of independent congressional agencies from interfering with constitutional supervisory functions of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to agree to the Resolution on Dismissal of Professional Air Traffic Controllers by the FAA which I have introduced today and now submit for the Record:

RESOLUTION ON DISMISSAL OF PROFESSIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS BY THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the safety and convenience of the traveling public and the maintenance of an

efficient air transportation system are of paramount importance to the welfare of the nation; and

Whereas the operation of such a system is not possible without the recruitment, training and utilization of highly skilled and conscientious air traffic control personnel; and

Whereas the training and recruitment of such air traffic control personnel involves substantial expense to the public; and

Whereas such professional air traffic controllers are already in critical short supply such as to endanger the continued efficient and safe operation of this nation's air commerce; and

Whereas the Congress notes that recent personnel policies of the Federal Aviation Administration with respect to air traffic controllers have tended to penalize and intimidate such personnel from adequately performing their duties and have resulted in the questionable discharge of a large number of such personnel; and

Whereas it appears that in certain instances discharges have been made without the support of substantial evidence and in violation of the agency's applicable administrative rules; and

Whereas the above said conditions and policies tend to impair the nation's flow of air commerce and to endanger the public safety;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Aviation Administration shall forthwith suspend further adverse personnel actions against air traffic control personnel, including dismissal, suspension or other administrative sanction, until the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall have investigated the matter and reported thereon. Such investigation and report shall specifically include examination of the question of reinstatement, with back pay, of all those air traffic controllers who have already been dismissed, suspended or otherwise sanctioned by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Provided, however, that this resolution shall not apply to adverse personnel actions against air traffic control personnel arising from activities or actions engaged in by such personnel subsequent to the date of the adoption of this resolution.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO
COMBAT FASCISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a so-called National Committee to Combat Fascism appears to be operating within my State. Locally it is better known as the Black Panthers.

Our Commissioner of Welfare in Louisiana has mailed to me a leaflet being distributed to welfare recipients announcing that they will be contacted personally during the month of October and each month thereafter for a minimum assessment of 10 percent of their welfare check.

Interestingly, the lawyer identified on the flyer is a salaried attorney with an OEO federally funded agency, the New Orleans Legal Aid Corp.

We have this date passed House Joint Resolution 1388 providing for continuing appropriations and S. 1461 raising the fees for lawyers representing indigent criminal defendants. The appropriations bill continues taxpayers' contributions to the welfare programs without providing any protection either to the giver or the receiver from such exploiters as the National Committee to Combat Fascism nor from legal aid lawyers who can be expected to advise the poor that they must pay the 10-percent tax on their welfare check.

Mr. Speaker, I am sending a copy of the leaflet and the welfare commissioner's letter to the U.S. Attorney General and demanding an investigation toward prosecution of this shakedown operation.

Who are the Black Panthers to call others Fascists?

I include a copy of Mr. Bonin's letter and the flyer he refers to, as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA, DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Baton Rouge, September 30, 1970.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For your information, I am attaching a leaflet being distributed in New Orleans. You will note that welfare recipients are to be contacted by members of the N.C.C.F. (National Committee to Combat Fascism), also locally known as The Black Panthers.

I would like to call to your attention that they list Ernest Jones as one to furnish additional information. Mr. Jones is an attorney with the New Orleans Legal Aid Corporation, an OEO funded agency.

Sincerely yours,

GARLAND L. BONIN,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

Power to the people. . . . Power to the people.

Who are the people??? You are the people. You the people of desire, Of Gert Town. Of lower-nine. Of all the white racist owned ghettos of New Orleans. You the people of the pig controlled projects. You are the people.

The oppressive, racist government of this country has taken away your dignity by paying you for not working. The welfare has

CXVI—2203—Part 26

made you slaves of this fascist government. The N.C.C.F. has given it all for you. Now you must give to the N.C.C.F. Help us free the New Orleans 14. Help us rebuild our headquarters. Help us feed the children.

"If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem."

A list of welfare recipients is being compiled by our field workers and area captains are being trained. All welfare recipients will be contacted personally between October 1 and October 10 and each month thereafter until we are rebuilt.

Minimum contribution . . . 10% of welfare check.

For more information come to 3540 Piety or call attorney Ernest Jones at 895-5733.

QUINCY GIRLS DRILL TEAM WINS
FIRST PLACE AT ILLINOIS STATE
FAIR

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Quincy's award-winning Columbian Girls Drill Team placed first in drill team competition on Veterans Day at the Illinois State Fair. It was the first time that they had brought home first-place honors, and the fulfillment of a 7-year-old dream for them.

About 7 years ago, a small group of people, remembering the big days of drum and bugle corps in Quincy, asked several service clubs and other organizations to form a drill team thinking that eventually Quincy would have another championship drum and bugle corps. From this beginning, the Columbian Girls Drill Team was formed.

The girls range in age from 12 to 18 years and attend public and parochial schools in Quincy. They come from every section of town, work together, play together and travel together. They all live as one big family—sharing tears when things go wrong and cheers when things go right. The girls practice in the winter, 2 nights a week, and almost every night during the summer.

Against stiff competition, the Columbians placed second at the Illinois State Fair in 1966 and 1968. In June 1970, they again took second place honors at the VFW State Convention drill team contest in Springfield and second place at the American Legion contest at Chicago in July. At each contest they competed against all the drill teams in the State of Illinois. Twice in 1967 and 1968 they entered the national contest in Milwaukee and placed 11th both years.

Until August 16, 1970, the Columbian Girls Drill Team had done a great job for their community and for their State. But the No. 1 recognition had eluded them. Then, on Veterans Day, all the practice paid off. They won top honors in the State.

The people in Quincy and the surrounding area have much to be proud of. The group has been self-supporting since it was organized, raising money from card parties, contests, and donations. Their uniforms of turquois, white and

black, designed on a Spanish theme, are quite striking.

The group consists of 33 girls and is sponsored by the Knights of Columbus 583 of Quincy, American Legion Post No. 37, and Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5129 of Quincy, Knights of Columbus 4175 of Springfield, Ill., have adopted the girls as their guests whenever they make an appearance in the capital city.

STATES COMMEND CONGRESSMAN
MONAGAN FOR DONABLE PROPERTY
WORK

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, for the past two decades, a rather special Federal program, with which you yourself had much to do, has made it possible to give substantial amounts of Federal surplus personal property to our States for public health, educational, and civil defense purposes. The Special Studies Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, on which I serve, has the assigned jurisdiction over this program, under the able chairmanship of Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN, of Connecticut. Since 1961, Congressman MONAGAN has chaired the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations to which Chairman DAWSON of the full committee has assigned donable property matters.

The Federal Property Act requires that the management and distribution of donable property within each State be handled by a specific surplus property agency. Every State, plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands has its own agency for this purpose.

Recently, the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, during its 23d Annual Conference in Denver, Colo., unanimously adopted a resolution directed to Congressman MONAGAN which expresses the association's appreciation for his untiring support of the donation program. I feel the resolution is strong testimony to Congressman MONAGAN's long and effective contribution to the objectives of the program. I am pleased, therefore, to call the resolution to the attention of our colleagues by including it in the RECORD at this point:

Whereas, Honorable John S. Monagan, distinguished member of the House of Representatives from the state of Connecticut, has demonstrated his interest in and support of the Donable Surplus Property Program; and

Whereas, Congressman Monagan as Chairman of the Special Sub-Committee on Surplus Property has worked diligently and faithfully to promote the Donable Surplus Property Program;

Therefore be it resolved, that the members of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property by copy of this resolution express to Congressman Monagan their sincere appreciation and thanks for his untiring support of the Donable Surplus Property Program.

TRASHING THE RECORD

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we should all be thankful for our great newspapers, that are both free and diligent. In a memorable editorial, the New York Times has shown with superb clarity the kind of a man that we have as Vice President. After reading this editorial, one wonders how Mr. AGNEW can expect his self-righteous pose to be taken seriously.

The editorial, which appeared in the New York Times for October 1, follows:

TRASHING THE RECORD

There is little hope for a return to an atmosphere of reason in the relationship between the students and the American people if Vice President Agnew's distortions of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest are a preview of the Nixon Administration's response.

In his Sioux Falls, S.D., fund-raising speech, Mr. Agnew deliberately created the impression of a report that is soft on radicals. His attack undermines the commission's primary effort—to bring about a new era of reconciliation.

Here are some of the discrepancies between what the Vice President said the commission said and what it actually did say:

Mr. Agnew: "To lay responsibility for ending student disruption at the doorstep of this President—in office twenty months—is 'scapegoating' of the most irresponsible sort."

The Commission: "We urge that the President exercise his reconciling moral leadership as the first step to prevent violence and create understanding. . . . We recommend that the President seek to convince public officials and protesters alike that divisive and insulting rhetoric is dangerous."

Mr. Agnew: ". . . The President cannot replace the campus cop."

The Commission: "We have deep sympathy for peace officers—local and state police, national guardsmen and campus security officers—who must deal with all types of campus disorder. . . . We therefore urge that peace officers be trained and equipped to deal with campus disorder firmly, justly and humanely."

Mr. Agnew: "It [the report] is sure to be taken as more pabulum for the permissivists."

The Commission: "Students who bomb and burn are criminals. . . . There can be no more 'trashing,' no more rock throwing, no more arson, no more bombing by protesters. . . . Criminal acts by students must be treated as such wherever they occur and whatever their purpose. . . . Faculty members who engage in or lead disruptive conduct have no place in the university community. . . ."

Mr. Agnew: "Nor can one find in that report the justified recognition of the enormous contribution of the working men and women of this country whose taxes have built most of our great colleges and universities and who have rights within those institutions as well."

The Commission: "Millions of Americans—generations past and present—have given their vision, their energy, and their patient labor to make us a more just nation and a more humane people. . . . It is a considerable inheritance; we must not squander or destroy it."

What appears to anger the Vice Presi-

dent—or elude his comprehension—is the commission's suggestion that students are deeply concerned about the war and racial injustice and also about the verbal attacks on such legitimate concern by politicians in pursuit of votes. He clearly dislikes the commission's plea for a Presidential admonition that, "in the current political campaign and throughout the years ahead, . . . no one play irresponsible politics with the issue of campus unrest."

Mr. Agnew chides the commission for not denouncing as an "utter falsehood" the students' charge that the nation is engaged in "an immoral war." Does Mr. Agnew truly believe that any Presidential commission that seeks to attain credibility with a concerned generation of young Americans must extol the morality of the nation's Indochina policies?

"There is," said the commission, "a deep continuity between all Americans, young and old, a continuity that is being obscured in our growing polarization." It would be an unestimable tragedy if the Administration shared Mr. Agnew's insensitivity to this threat.

THE SOVIET THREAT

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, has today sounded the alarm loud and clear as to the Soviet threat.

The alarm has needed special sounding with respect to the Soviet submarine menace. Our chairman today has indeed spread this awesome threat across the record.

But, there is more that needs saying. Our ability to meet this Soviet submarine threat is being slashed. A major portion of the cuts that have been made in our Navy have been in the ships and planes responsible for antisubmarine warfare. In addition, we have failed to provide the moneys needed for the extensive research and development vital to our antisubmarine warfare defense.

Only 6 days ago our Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare made a report on its visit to the Mediterranean area, "Trip to the Mediterranean Area, August 31 to September 5, 1970, Made by the Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare." In that report the subcommittee pointed out the weaknesses of the 6th Fleet. It stressed the needs for increased antisubmarine efforts in the Mediterranean. There the greatly increased Soviet naval operations, combined with the recently acquired ability to use the northern shores of Africa, constitute a real threat to our Sixth Fleet and to the southern shores of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot praise the chairman of the Armed Services Committee too highly for his efforts in bringing the Soviet naval threat home to all in the House. I pray that our people will wake up to the real menace long before the Soviet submarines line up off our shores and we receive an ultimatum to give up our freedom and our sovereignty.

PROSPECTS FOR MORE DOCTORS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the lead paragraphs of a Sunday, September 27, 1970, Minneapolis Tribune story by Lewis Cope dramatically describe an important development in Minnesota medicine:

The equivalent of a small new medical school will open in Minneapolis on Monday to help meet the need for more doctors in the state.

Actually, it's just the University of Minnesota Medical School starting a new year—but with a major increase in enrollment.

This expansion was made possible by a National Institute of Health—NIH—grant under the NIH Physicians Augmentation Program—PAP.

On October 1 the Tribune published an editorial on this development. The editorial points out that the new class includes seven black and two American Indian students.

The Tribune could have added that there are also 21 women in the incoming medical school class. This expansion and broadening of my alma mater's medical school student population is an encouraging move. To meet the grave need for more physicians without lowering standards we must tap sources of talented and qualified individuals previously largely ignored.

The article and editorial follows: "U" FRESHMAN MEDICAL CLASS GROWS BY 65 (By Lewis Cope)

The equivalent of a small new medical school will open in Minneapolis on Monday to help meet the need for more doctors in the state.

Actually, it's just the University of Minnesota Medical School starting a new year—but with a major increase in enrollment.

There will be 227 first-year medical students this year, and the school plans to continue with freshman classes of about this size in future years. Until now, the school has accepted only about 162 beginning medical students a year.

Hence, the school is starting a program that will increase its output of new doctors by about 65 a year. To illustrate the comparative impact of this, about a fourth of the 100 medical schools in the nation are in the "70 graduates or less a year" category. Minnesota is simply a big medical school that has grown bigger this year.

"In recent years Minnesota has ranked among the 10 largest medical schools in the nation," Dr. H. Mead Cavert, associate dean, said. "Now our enrollment of first year students will rank somewhere in the top six."

A federal grant, under a short-term crash program, made it possible to start the increased enrollment this year. New facilities are to be built to accommodate the larger classes on a permanent basis.

Two other points about this year's freshman medical class:

Seven blacks and two Indians are among the class members. The Indians are believed to be the first such students in the medical school's history, and never before have there been more than two blacks in a class.

These students were recruited under a new faculty policy to seek out such students.

One aim is to give minority group members a chance to achieve equality of oppor-

tunity in the key profession of medicine. Another is that such students are likely to be particularly motivated to practice in poverty areas, where the need for physicians is acute.

There are 21 women among the 227 freshmen medical students this year.

About the same proportion of women applicants is accepted as men applicants, Dr. Cavert said. But he explained that many more men apply each year.

Many medical schools regularly accept only a handful of women students each year—some as few as one. These schools have been criticized by Women's Liberation leaders.

This year's increase in freshmen medical student enrollment was made possible by a \$1-million grant from the National Institutes of Health under its Physicians Augmentation Program (PAP), designed to help fill the national need for more physicians.

The school expects to get similar PAP grants to cover the new, higher level of enrollment through the next few years.

PAP is just a five-year program. But that fits in perfectly with University of Minnesota plans.

The last session of the Legislature approved the start of a major building program, designed to increase medical class size to about 225 students by 1973.

Then the federal PAP program was announced and "this enabled us to expand that much faster," Dr. Cavert said.

Most schools that have received PAP grants are expanding class sizes by at most 15 students, knowing that the PAP funds will run out after five years.

But Dr. Cavert explained that Minnesota, knowing permanent facilities are on the way, was able to get the largest PAP grant given any school.

"We would not have seriously considered this program without the plans for permanent expansion," Dr. Cavert said.

"Things will be very crowded for a few years until new facilities are built," he said. "It's less than optimal, but we can get by for a short while."

He noted that the increased class size will require the hiring of about a dozen faculty members. It would have been hard to recruit them for only a temporary program, he explained, but since they know their jobs will be permanent there has been no problem.

In all, there will be 748 students in all four classes. The junior and senior classes receive some extra students who transfer from schools offering only the first two years of training.

While medical school is normally a four-year program, the University of Minnesota is one of a small number of schools that allows some students to get through in three years by skipping summer vacations. This also is designed to help meet the present shortage of doctors.

PROSPECTS FOR MORE DOCTORS IN STATE

After years of talk about the need for more doctors in Minnesota, this fall the University of Minnesota Medical School is able to take major action. The new freshman class has 227 students—65 more than last year's class.

Long-range planning for expansion of the whole health-sciences complex at the university provides for comparable enlargement of the medical school by 1973. The speed-up is made possible by a federal grant under the new Physicians Augmentation Program, a plan to add 1,000 medical students to usual enrollments in the country this year. The university medical faculty, to its credit, agreed to handle the additional students in spite of the inconvenience and crowding inevitable until more teaching facilities can be constructed.

In addition to the boost in class size, it is noteworthy that the incoming group in-

cludes seven black students and two Indians—not large numbers, but an encouraging representation in comparison with the very few minority students admitted in the past.

Another significant development in medical training is the opening of Hennepin County General Hospital's new family-practice clinic. Involved in this will be resident doctors who intend to specialize in general practice in the future. The program is financed by a grant of \$400,000 from the 1969 Legislature, which was concerned about the shortage of doctors going into family practice, especially in rural areas.

There is no guarantee that the additional doctors in training at the university, or all of those specializing in family practice at General Hospital, or enrolled in the university's new department of family practice, will remain in the state. But records at both institutions show that high percentages of those they train do stay in practice in this area. So increasing the numbers in training here seems an encouraging step toward increasing the supply of physicians for Minnesota.

CONGRESSMAN RODINO REPORTS ON HIS MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, now that we are nearing the end of the 91st Congress, I think it is appropriate to report to my constituents on some of the most important legislative actions of the House Judiciary Committee of which I am a member.

CRIME CONTROL

Of the 19 areas of legislative responsibility of the committee, undoubtedly the one of greatest public interest in this Congress is that of crime prevention and control. As ranking member of the subcommittee to which most of the major anticrime measures are referred, I have had a leading role in the development of a wide variety of significant crime control bills. The most important in recent years include:

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

This act initiated modernization of the Nation's criminal justice system and authorized the Justice Department to assist State, local, and private groups to strengthen crime control programs. It also provided grants to local and State agencies to improve police work, correctional systems, courts, and prosecutors.

GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

This measure channeled firearms through federally licensed dealers and prohibited mail-order sales of guns. It imposed reasonable requirements to keep guns out of the hands of drug addicts, mental incompetents, felons, fugitives, individuals considered dangerous, and minors.

OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT OF 1968

This act created the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency to administer a grants program to distribute crime-fighting funds to States. It provides

funds to create coordinated planning agencies in States, improve recruiting procedures, construct law-enforcement facilities, improve community-police relations, and encourage education in law enforcement and crime prevention. In fiscal year 1970, New Jersey received \$641,000 in planning grant funds and \$6,372,000 in action grants. Programs undertaken include a narcotics education project, a project to improve the response time of police to radioed calls and formation of a statewide organized crime unit.

OMNIBUS FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGESHIP BILL OF 1970

This measure provides 61 additional Federal judges to help eliminate the excessive backlog of criminal cases in Federal courts.

1970 AMENDMENTS TO THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL AND SAFE STREETS ACT (PASSED HOUSE, AWAITING SENATE ACTION)

This most important anticrime measure provides vital improvements to the original act, including the allocation of priority funds to urban high-crime areas that most need financial aid to prevent the robberies, rapes, and attacks that menace every citizen. The committee authorized \$650 million for 1971, \$1 billion for 1972, and \$1.5 billion for 1973.

ANTI-OBSOESCITY BILL (PASSED HOUSE, AWAITING SENATE ACTION)

This bill makes it a Federal offense to use interstate facilities, including the mails, to transport unsolicited salacious advertising. It also increases substantially the penalties for offenses under the bill and supplements legislation approved earlier to prohibit delivery of obscene material to children and to enable citizens to prevent the receipt of sex-oriented advertising.

EXPLOSIVES CONTROL AND ANTI-BOMBING BILL (RODINO BILL, H.R. 18476, AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AND INCLUDED IN S. 30, NOW AWAITING HOUSE ACTION)

My bill to establish strong regulation of explosives and bombs has been approved with committee amendments. It establishes licensing and recordkeeping regulations for dealers in explosives, prohibits mail-order sales to individuals, and the sale to anyone under 21 years of age. It also broadens and increases existing Federal penalties for the unlawful transportation of explosives and use of the mails or telephone to convey bomb threats.

ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL BILL (S. 30, PASSED SENATE, APPROVED WITH HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS AND NOW AWAITING HOUSE ACTION)

This complex measure, which the Senate considered for over a year, stems from efforts to implement recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. It contains 12 substantive titles to improve Federal authority to deal with organized crime. It strengthens the legal means of obtaining usable evidence, brings any major illegal gambling operation within Federal jurisdiction, makes it a crime to use income from organized crime to acquire or establish a legal business, and authorizes increased sentences for habitual crim-

nals who pose a continuing danger to society.

NARCOTICS CONTROL—THE RODINO PLAN

To a large extent, the very core of the Nation's crime problem is narcotics addiction. In urban high crime areas, over 50 percent of crimes are committed by addicts. Traffic in narcotics finances organized crime on an international scale. Pushers of heroin and other hard narcotics prey on our children. Narcotics addiction has become truly a national epidemic. For this reason, I have formulated a comprehensive, three-pronged attack on narcotics.

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970 (RODINO BILL, H.R. 17269)

My bill would require medical supervision and control of every person known to be an addict, with mandatory confinement if necessary. Treatment would be under the Public Health Service, but my bill would not interfere with criminal prosecutions of addicts charged with crimes. It has the support of law enforcement officials and the American Medical Association, and is under active consideration by the Judiciary Committee.

Under the second phase of my program, such use of public health officials to control narcotics addicts would free law-enforcement officials to conduct vigorous crackdowns on one of the most heinous criminals in our society—the narcotics pusher.

SANCTIONS AGAINST COUNTRIES PERMITTING ILLEGAL NARCOTICS EXPORTS (RODINO BILL, H.R. 18397)

The third step in my program is strong action to eliminate the supply of illegal narcotics entering our country. My bill would impose economic sanctions on foreign governments that fail to take adequate measures to curb illegal production and processing of such drugs. Some 140 Members of the House are cosponsors of my bill, and I am pressing for action on it by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

The Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce, of which I am chairman, has worked assiduously for years to develop an equitable and workable interstate tax system. In this Congress, my Interstate Taxation Act has passed the House and is awaiting Senate action. It has support from business groups across the country.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ISSUES

Another of my major responsibilities on the Judiciary Committee is on immigration and naturalization and refugee policy. As ranking member of the Immigration Subcommittee, I can report that we have made significant improvements in these laws. Our objective is a flexible immigration system to meet the needs of the United States, not only domestically but in our foreign relations. The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act repealed the national origins system and established our basic policy—to reunite families, give preference to aliens whose skills we need, and recognize the plight of refugees. However, as in the case of any complex law, unforeseen inequities and problems have arisen.

In the 91st Congress, my subcommittee developed a bill, now law, that solves some of the problems. Its major features are: To facilitate the entry into the United States of certain nonimmigrant aliens of distinguished merit and ability, such as executives of companies engaged in international trade, doctors, professors, and nurses; to permit the fiancées of citizens to enter as nonimmigrants; and to eliminate the 2-year foreign residence requirement for certain exchange visitors.

Current problems that still require action are: Development of an improved preference system; perfection of the labor certification procedures in a fair and uniform manner; the decline in Irish and Western European immigration; and the backlog in immigration of brothers and sisters, particularly from Italy. My bill, H.R. 17370, contains provisions to remedy all of these problem areas, and extensive hearings have already been held on it. I am hopeful of action in the next Congress.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION—THE WORLD REFUGEE PROBLEM

I will again be serving as senior adviser to the U.S. delegation at the 1970 meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. This 31-member nation committee is expected to move over 800,000 refugees during 1970 to new homelands.

NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY—INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION

As a result of my efforts in the foreign relations area, for the past 8 years I have served as a delegate to the NATO North Atlantic Assembly, composed of members of the NATO nations' parliaments. I am Vice Chairman of the Scientific and Technical Committee, which has had a continuing, special concern about international environmental problems such as air and water pollution, oceanographic research, and fisheries resources. We have also worked on desalination of water, global hunger, and the exchange of information on drugs. The committee has always been particularly interested in U.S. environmental activities, and 2 years ago I presented a survey of air pollution in the United States. Last year I reported on the Santa Barbara oil spill, and for the 1970 meeting later this fall I am preparing a study of U.S. water pollution control policies.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 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?

REPORT TO 10TH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. Speaker, my final newsletter for 1970 was mailed to 100,000 northern Virginia families last month. As I believe the items covered might be of interest to American citizens elsewhere, I insert the text at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN JOEL T. BROYHILL REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, SEPTEMBER 1970

As the 91st Congress moves into its closing days, I send you my final newsletter for 1970. The number of subjects covered again dictated a lengthy issue, for which I apologize, but I hope to send shorter and more frequent reports next year.

While I have had the pleasure of discussing major issues personally with many thousands of you, I hope to hear from more of you in the future. It has always been my conviction that the citizens of Northern Virginia are entitled to a first-hand assessment of legislation from their Congressman, and at no time in the eighteen years I have been in the House of Representatives has it been more essential for all of us to know the facts behind the governmental process, as well as the motivation and intention of our public leaders. With this in mind, I hope you will find this report useful and informative.

FOREIGN TRADE

The House Ways and Means Committee recently completed work on an omnibus trade bill, designed both to stimulate exports and to provide new and reinforced roadways to relief for domestic industries and workers hurt by imports.

Our overriding aim was to develop legislation which would help our country's enterprises compete under conditions of world trade today.

Unlike bygone eras, these times demand innovative tactics and strategy on the part of the United States. We no longer are the unchallenged giant of global trade. Other nations, notably fast-rising Japan and Germany, are offering us strong and growing competition for both goods and markets throughout the world. Also of significance are the mushrooming international trading blocs, such as the European Economic Community, more popularly known as the Common Market.

Against this background, the Committee tried to perfect a bill which would work in three directions:

1. To encourage substantial and profitable increases in the exports of U.S. goods to other countries.

2. To offer tangible assurances to our trading partners that the U.S. remains ready and willing to negotiate for fairer and freer trade.

3. To establish, for American industries and workers, provisions of law which would enable them to gain prompt and adequate relief from the ravages of large and unusual increases of imports.

The bill's principal ingredient to spur exports is a provision which would permit American businessmen to establish Domestic International Sales Corporations, or DISCs.

Under present law, American firms can set up foreign subsidiaries, which are able to take advantage of lower cost labor abroad. Also advantageous is a provision of law allowing the income of these foreign subsidiaries to remain untaxed until it is returned to the United States.

The Committee's bill would extend this

same tax deferral privilege to the DISCOs. Their profits would not become subject to U.S. income tax until distributed to shareholders.

In giving DISCOs the same tax deferral advantage now enjoyed by foreign subsidiaries, the aim, of course, is to encourage American enterprises to manufacture goods domestically and ship them abroad, thus keeping both jobs and capital at home.

It also should encourage American businessmen, who are not now interested in world markets, to become exporters and thus further improve our country's balance of trade position.

In an effort to show American willingness to be conciliatory in world trade, the Committee included a provision in the bill paying the way for removal of the so-called American Selling Price (ASP) system of customs valuation.

For some time now, our trading partners have raised strong objections to the ASP system, which means that tariffs on certain chemicals and other products are based upon the American wholesale price of the products involved.

In effect, the Committee voted to authorize the President to proclaim an end to ASP whenever he feels this country has received, in return, the best possible concessions from our trading partners.

Hopefully, this would be good visible evidence that the United States remains committed to the principle of give-and-take in global trade, and in fact, is willing to go a little more than half-way to meet the other party.

The bill recognizes also that sound trading must be reciprocal, that trade should be fair as well as free.

A number of provisions are included along these lines, among them a strengthened "escape clause" mechanism which would provide for more automatic relief, in the form of adjusted tariffs or quotas or both, if a domestic industry could not only show escape clause injury but meet additional criteria demonstrating damage from the inroads of imports.

The bill further provides for specific quotas on imports of certain textile articles and shoes. These would be limited by category and by country to an annual amount equal to the average for the years 1967, 1968 and 1969.

In taking this action, the Committee made clear its hope that principal supplying nations would be willing to open negotiations leading to voluntary limitations on imports, similar to the arrangement which now exists between our government and the leading steel producers of Japan.

If such a voluntary agreement could be worked out, for textiles or shoes, it would supersede provisions of the bill, even if the measure had become law by this time.

Woven throughout the bill, in all its provisions which could lead to increased tariff or import quotas, is an overriding clause allowing the President to decline to take action whenever and wherever he feels it would be contrary to the national interest.

The bill allows the President to be highly flexible in his actions on trade, and extends his authority to proclaim reductions in rates of duty. His tariff cutting authority would be limited generally to 20 percent of the rates of duty which will exist when the final stage of the Kennedy Round reduction is made effective, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, on January 1, 1972.

The bill also gives the President added authority to act against discriminatory moves by other countries. Whenever another nation imposes restrictions which unjustifiably or unreasonably burden United States commerce, the President is directed to take such action as he deems necessary and appropriate. This counteraction could take the form

of duty impositions or any other restriction against products of the offending country.

In viewing this, and all the other provisions of the bill, it is important to keep in mind that the present law, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is eight years old. World trade has changed drastically over these intervening years, and we urgently need a new law for a new set of conditions.

The Trade Act of 1970 was tailored to these current demands. It is today's law—to meet the needs of today, and hopefully, tomorrow, too.

DRUG ABUSE

The Ways and Means Committee also has been occupied this summer with a problem of paramount interest, and concern, to many segments of our society, especially parents of young people.

This problem has to do with drugs—and how to cope with them.

Until 1968, the control of narcotics and other dangerous substances was scattered among the departments and agencies of the Federal government. Also, there were varied laws, handled by several different committees of the Congress, to deal with these items.

But under the Reorganization Plan which went into effect in 1968, control of these substances was placed under one Federal agency—the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

A move is now underway in Congress to bring together the divergent, pertinent laws—to reorganize them and to place them in a single statute to be enforced by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

In keeping with this aim, the Committee on Ways and Means agreed to participate and cooperate in the legislative reorganization. As a result, we are retaining jurisdiction over importation and exportation, but we are leaving to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the handling of domestic traffic in these substances, ranging all the way from marijuana through heroin to the hallucinogens such as LSD.

If this legislative reorganization is successful, there will be uniform requirements for those licensed to handle narcotics and drugs, and uniform penalties for those who deal in them illicitly.

Our concern, in the Ways and Means Committee, was to help make the law just, and the enforcement of it more efficient. We endeavored, in preparing our portion of the overall bill to offer due protection for the innocent and mercy for the youthful first offender, but at the same time to make it tough and therefore unprofitable for the "pushers", the importers and the other "hard cases" whose aim is to corrupt our children.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the drug abuse bill just before the Congressional recess, and the recommendations of the Committee on Ways and Means were included as Title III of the bill.

Title I of the bill authorizes the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to increase its efforts in the rehabilitation, treatment, and prevention of drug abuse, through community mental health centers and through public health service hospitals and facilities. Increased research and training are also authorized through the National Institute of Mental Health, and the bill would likewise encourage treatment of narcotic addicts by private physicians.

Control of drug abuse through registration of manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and all others in the legitimate distribution chain would be vested in the Department of Justice, and all transactions outside the legitimate distribution chain would be made illegal. Drugs specifically named for control include all hard narcotics and opiates, marijuana, all hallucinogens, amphetamines, barbiturates and tranquilizers subject to

abuse. The bill also revises the entire structure of criminal penalties involving controlled drugs by providing a consistent method of treatment of all persons accused of violations. While mere possession of controlled drugs is made a misdemeanor, manufacture or sale of illicit drugs is punishable by up to 15 years in prison in the case of the most dangerous drugs, and second offenses would carry double the penalty for first offense.

The bill also establishes a presidential commission on marijuana and drug abuse which will study and report to the Congress within one year on problems involved in marijuana use, and within two years on the causes of drug abuse and their relative significance.

VIETNAM

During the past few months the American people have regained their trust and confidence in the words, promises and policies of their government with regard to Vietnam. The President has made basic decisions to change the course of the war, acting on the available alternatives in full view of the public. And in every instance he has fulfilled the pledges he has made based on these decisions.

He promised not to send in more troops; he promised to start bringing the troops home; he promised to supplant our troops with fully trained and fully supported South Vietnamese forces, so that our withdrawal would not result in a Communist conquest and bloodbath; and he promised that our troops would leave Cambodia promptly after their successful sanctuary strikes.

The big inside news from Vietnam recently indicates that a dramatic reversal of ground combat roles now has been achieved, with South Vietnamese forces replacing almost all American combat troops along the borders of Cambodia and Laos.

Eighteen months ago, thousands of American troops were pinned down with the nasty responsibility of fighting North Vietnamese invaders from the jungles and mountain frontiers of these two nations. Now, however, our troops have been almost completely replaced by South Vietnamese ground forces.

We continue to man some artillery outposts and provide helicopter and bomber support. But since the Administration began the policy of responsible withdrawal of our combat forces, South Vietnamese have replaced our soldiers along all but a small part of South Vietnam's jungle and mountain boundaries.

The only American combat units now left along the frontier are the equivalent of one infantry brigade operating in the northern part of the military region in which Saigon is located.

The most dramatic change has been made in the provinces closer to the South Vietnamese capital. Three months ago American troops formed the outer line of defense there against three North Vietnamese divisions along the border. South Vietnamese troops were for the most part concentrated in the inner ring around Saigon.

Now those roles are reversed. The South Vietnamese man the front lines against the enemy, a decisive product of our policy of Vietnamization.

In the South, in the Mekong Delta, South Vietnamese units have been acting alone, except for American support, since our Ninth Infantry Division pulled out last summer, leaving no U.S. ground maneuver battalions in the Delta.

In the Central Highlands, South Vietnamese forces are now responsible for the entire border with Cambodia and Laos. The U.S. Fourth Division moved its headquarters away from the border four months ago.

Progress has been slower in the northern provinces and along the demilitarized zone between South and North Vietnam. But

even in these areas, South Vietnamese troops are taking up the initiative. Combat responsibility is now at least shared, being no longer a sole U.S. operation, and our mission is changing from combat to one of supply and support.

Much of this shift in ground combat roles has taken place since the successful strikes at the Communist sanctuary bases in Cambodia.

We all remember the wall of woe that went up in some quarters when the Cambodian operation was launched. We were told that it meant the end of our staged withdrawal program and the end of the Paris negotiations. The critics said it meant that American troops would be bogged down in still another Southeast Asian nation for years to come.

It was loudly if not responsibly forecast that the U.S. troops would not be quickly withdrawn from Cambodia and that, to the contrary, more and more would be assigned to stabilize a deteriorating situation there, as had been the pattern in South Vietnam in previous years.

We all know what happened. In the stakes against the Communist sanctuaries, the border pressure on South Vietnam was relieved. Our withdrawal program, including replacement by South Vietnamese ground combat troops, was helped rather than hindered.

Great amounts of food and other supplies were denied to the Communist invaders. Their major supply port in Cambodia was closed and remains closed to them.

And, in the most direct benefit, vast stores of guns and ammunition were seized. Otherwise, these arms would be in use against our troops today.

The American forces were withdrawn promptly from Cambodia after conclusion of their successful mission, just as the President had calmly forecast all along.

Contrary to what pessimists feared, the enemy was weakened, the borders of Vietnam were strengthened, the army of South Vietnam received some desirable field seasoning, and conditions permitting our continued secured withdrawal were enhanced.

Despite the successes of the troop withdrawal program, and the solemn promises of the President that this program will continue until the American ground combat role is ended with the South Vietnamese army safely in control, some critics demanded a deadline plan.

I don't question their sincerity, but I do most seriously question their judgment.

It would be the sheerest and most reckless folly to command the President to withdraw all of our troops from Vietnam by a certain date . . . regardless of the prevailing circumstances and regardless of the effects of that action on other vital considerations.

The President, who has all the facts, not only about South Vietnam but about all of the other related challenges we face all over the world—could not operate with responsible flexibility if his hands were tied by such a deadline order.

Here are some of the questions he has to consider, even if they apparently do not rate high in the view of some of his critics:

The government of South Vietnam. Could it cope with suddenly being left alone, without adequate preparation and planning, to continue building a democratic government while fighting internal subversion and invasion from three frontiers?

The people of South Vietnam. All those who placed their faith in us, and in our solemn promise to shield them until they were fully armed to defend themselves, suddenly would be left alone and identified to their Communist foes.

The path of negotiations. Why should the enemy even consider negotiating an acceptable end to the war if we announce we are

withdrawing by a certain date no matter what happens? Why wouldn't they just for it to be delivered to them?

The honor of America. For the first time in our history, an American army would trudge home in a posture of defeat, if we pull out before our best military and political judgment indicates. And, if South Vietnam fell under such overnight pressure, then 285,000 Americans would have suffered and 43,000 would have died for nothing.

The safety of our troops. If we order our men out on some sort of hasty, pell-mell pattern, what would happen to them if their reckless retreat was hit by a major Communist attack? It could be a battlefield disaster unprecedented in our history.

The other nations of Southeast Asia. All of the neighboring governments now are struggling with their own wars of Communist subversion and invasion. Thousands of enemy troops are active within their borders. Can anyone doubt they also would go under if South Vietnam falls?

After spending four years in the military service, some as a prisoner of war, during World War II, I personally am all too familiar with the horrors and devastation of war not to want to bring this conflict to the quickest possible end. But there is no easy way out of Southeast Asia. A hasty ill-prepared pullout would raise new dangers and not really settle any old dangers.

I am certain the American people want us to terminate the war, but they want to see an honorable end so that still another generation of Americans will not have to fight again in that part of the world in a bigger war.

We are turning the war over to the South Vietnamese as rapidly as they become ready to assume the combat role for their own country.

This is a sound policy for victory, a policy that is working, and that will continue to work until every American combat soldier is out of Vietnam in safety.

To recklessly quit before the South Vietnamese are ready, just because we are understandably weary of the burdens of leadership, would risk the lives of our fighting men and the cause of freedom itself.

THE ECONOMY

The inflation still troubling our nation today was largely the result of an "expenditure explosion."

During a four year period beginning in 1964, the Administration and the Congress proceeded on the assumption that no deficiency existed in our society which the Federal purse and the heavy hand of Federal regulation could not cure. Each piece of legislation begat more legislation—each new expenditure by the government begat other expenditures.

When President Nixon took office, he was faced at the outset with a projected expenditure budget of about \$195 billion and projected revenues of about \$187 billion for fiscal 1970. The financial and business sectors of our economy were fast approaching a state of chaos. Prices and interest rates were rising at an accelerated pace which was unprecedented in the memory of most of us. We were reaping the harvest of excessive government expenditures and lack of foresight on the part of government to meet those expenditures.

Inflation is the most unfair of taxes, as it hurts most severely the poor, the elderly, and those who live on small fixed incomes. It was clear at the outset that the new Administration in order to combat effectively the advanced inflation it inherited, must adopt a new spirit of self-discipline in government . . . willingness to make hard choices and to enforce a strict sense of priorities needed to create a budgetary surplus.

Throughout 1969 the President repeatedly demanded cuts in spending in every depart-

ment and agency. Low priority programs were deferred, much waste was eliminated, and methods are now being developed for controlling such runaway costs as those which have plagued the Medicaid program.

The President's Fiscal 1971 budget was strongly anti-inflationary. It was the first budget in history to emphasize long-range planning by predicting domestic expenditures five years in advance. But even more dramatic was a shift in our national spending priorities.

For the first time in twenty years, defense spending has fallen below human resources spending. In 1969 we were spending 44 percent of our budget for defense and only 34 percent for human resources. But the 1971 budget calls for 37 percent for defense and 41 percent for human resources. Space expenditures have also been significantly reduced. Altogether, space and defense expenditures were reduced by some \$6 billion in the 1971 budget. In addition, the President has called for the reduction, termination or restructuring of some 57 obsolete or low priority programs which will result in savings not only next year but in the years to come.

Anxious and indignant over the high cost of living, some of my constituents have asked, "Why not freeze prices?". It sounds so reasonable. It seems so simple. Freeze prices and the pay check will go further. The only trouble is that it won't work. Instead of controlling inflation, it is likely to aggravate it.

Except in time of great national emergency declared by Congress, I would oppose giving the President standby controls over prices, wages and credit.

The nation attempted one great experiment with price controls. We learned in World War II that price controls curtail the profit incentive, which curtails production, which causes commodity scarcities, which leads to rationing. In turn, price ceilings, commodity scarcities and rationing lead inevitably to the black market. In the black market, the dishonest merchant gets rich, his selfish customer lives high and the honest average consumer is left the helpless victim.

Even if the black market could be prevented, once you begin the business of freezing, you have more than prices to consider. The costs of production must be frozen. This means you have to freeze wages. You have to freeze working conditions. You have to freeze fringe benefits. You have to freeze dividends. You have to freeze credit and capital investment. And when you freeze these things, you are freezing income, purchasing power and the standard of living.

Increases in the cost of living are, in part, an inevitable result of changes in our society. Over the years we have seen an increasing growth in the demand for services—not goods. In the service industry, increases in productivity are difficult to achieve. In an affluent society there is a shortage of labor in those fields, whether we are talking about the medical profession or the servicing of the many conveniences offered by industry.

Neither tax increases nor reductions in Government spending can completely meet this problem. They will not produce any more doctors, nurses, or medical technicians. They will not increase the productivity of the plumber or home appliance repairman. Nor will they make it any less likely that the home owner will need those services. The Government can help by encouraging young people and the unemployed to seek training in these fields, through tax incentives and through programs such as the National Defense Education Act which, to meet other needs in earlier years, provided for scholarship assistance to those entering scientific and research studies.

Although, I believe the disciplined approach to fiscal policy seems to be working,

economic indicators show that our overheated economy is cooling. The initial decline in defense spending combined with an inventory adjustment pulled our gross national product down by some 10 billion dollars early this year.

For well over a year now our people have taken on new installment debt at a slower rate. Apprehension has resulted in deferring purchases by many consumers of durable goods—appliances, automobiles. They now seem to be in a position to increase borrowing if they choose, at a time when business growth depends on consumption rather than the illusion of growth inherent in an inflationary economy. For the first time in two years, the wholesale price index dropped in August. Personal income has moved up to an annual rate of \$802 billion compared to \$774 at the end of 1969, and recent tax cuts have increased disposable income, another good omen for business.

As Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said after the Council's meeting with the President on August 24, "We are establishing now, I think, a good base for a rise in business activity, but a rise that will be orderly and will still make it possible for us to continue to make progress against inflation."

FEDERAL BOMBING LAWS

Revolutionaries who increasingly are turning to manufacturing explosives and planting them in office buildings, police stations, churches, synagogues and schools, deserve neither pity nor mercy. They are dedicated to violence, to terrorism, to senseless killing and to overthrow of the American system of government. They must be stopped.

During the 1969-70 school year the FBI recorded 346 arsons or attempted arsons and 14 bombings on college campuses alone. And a recent Department of the Treasury report to Congress of a survey of a 15-month period between January 1969 and April 1970 revealed that the country suffered a total of 4,330 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings and 35,129 threatened bombings.

This terrorism resulted in the deaths of 40 people during the survey period and \$21.8 million in property damage. Countless others were in imminent danger of physical injury or death and even more were frightened and intimidated.

In the same period the federal government sustained damage to buildings and other property in the amount of \$612,569, although this loss was insignificant when compared to the \$2.2 million expense involved in evacuating 130 public buildings.

In cooperation with law enforcement officials in 49 states, the Treasury Department analyzed police records on 40,934 cases. In 64 percent of the cases, it was impossible to determine cause or attack because of lack of information available to the police. With respect to the other 36 percent, 8 percent were in aid of general criminal activities (such as extortion, robbery, and arson); 1 percent were attributed to attacks on religious institutions; 2 percent were attributed to labor disputes; 56 percent were attributed to campus disorders; 19 percent were attributed to black extremists (of both left and right); and 14 percent were attributed to white extremists (of both left and right).

Less than a dozen states now have adequate regulations to guard against dynamite getting into the hands of irresponsible people.

The President has made a number of specific proposals aimed at the rash of anarchistic bomb-setting. He proposed that the maximum penalty for transporting or receiving explosives for illegal use go to 10 years or a \$10,000 fine or both, as opposed to the one year or \$1000 fine now applicable. He proposed that persons convicted of transporting or receiving explosives in violation of the federal provision be made subject to the death

penalty if a fatality occurs. The penalties for causing injuries by explosives would also be doubled to 20 years and/or \$20,000, and incendiary devices would be treated as explosives with several new provisions to protect buildings.

Both the House and Senate Judiciary Committee are now conducting hearings on both the Administration proposals and other anti-bombing measures before Congress. The police of the nation are anxiously awaiting federal assistance in their fight against these extremely dangerous tactics, and I am working with my House Colleagues in an effort to push for enactment of the most effective possible anti-bombing measures at the earliest possible date.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Shortly before the House of Representatives adjourned for a brief August recess, the so-called "Equal Rights Amendment" to provide equal rights for men and women under law was passed.

Like many others, I believe that this amendment should not be necessary. The Constitution already provides for equal rights under law, and much of the discrimination which we must all acknowledge is suffered by American women results more from male pride and prejudice than from law. But there are areas in the law where distinctions based solely on sex do exist, and the constitutional amendment will either invalidate these laws or extend them to men and women equally.

Some states have laws placing special restrictions on women with respect to hours of work. Other state laws prohibit women from working in certain occupations. There are laws, including higher standards required for women applicants, which operate to exclude women from state colleges and universities or severely limit their number. Dual pay schedules exist in some localities for men and women public school teachers. In some states married women must obtain court approval before engaging in independent businesses, in others they are faced with special restrictions on their right to establish a legal domicile. There are even heavier penalties provided for women offenders than for men offenders committing the same crime in some states. And the Social Security and other benefits tend to be discriminatory in different treatment for men and women.

Many of these laws have been enacted because men sought to protect their women from the rigors of business and the work-a-day world. Americans have historically considered men the providers and women the wives, mothers, widows or children of the providers. Yet we all know that in America today the working woman is the rule, not the exception. She is a young woman not yet part of the family unit, a provider of income, providing supplemental income for herself and her family, or a single woman or widow dependent only upon herself. The rights of value to her are the same rights that are important to men, the right to a job; to a promotion; to a pension; to social security; to all the fringe benefits of any job. But laws passed by men in a desire to protect mothers, wives and children, frequently limit the hours she can work, the type of work she can do, the pay she receives for her work, and, in effect, her ability to provide for herself and her dependents in the same way a man can.

Both the Congress and the Executive Branch have attempted to reduce discrimination against women, through legislation and through comprehensive guidelines for Federal contractors and agencies. While the overwhelming number of court cases involving equal rights have resulted in rulings against women petitioners, the Equal Pay Act has recently been interpreted for the benefit of women in a few instances.

If American women waited long enough to

successfully appeal the constitutionality of the myriad of discriminatory laws now affecting them, I am convinced that they would at some time in the future find that an amendment to guarantee equal rights would be unnecessary. But after waiting 50 years to secure the adoption of the 19th amendment and the vote, they then began a 47-year wait for the amendment we considered in the House last month. I believe I speak for a large majority of my Colleagues in expressing the conviction that we felt they had waited long enough.

While I supported the amendment, I did so with some anxiety. Because the legislative process by which the bill came to the Floor permitted no amendments, the language is somewhat imprecise. As presently worded, it will probably repeal a number of labor laws designed especially for the health and comfort of the female worker, and its effect on child support laws, child custody laws, inheritance laws, and even draft laws is still questionable. Now that the House has clearly expressed its intent that women shall have equal rights without further delay, I am hopeful that the Senate will consider these still murky questions and improve upon the language, so that the amendment, when ratified, will guarantee both equal rights and protection under law for those who have waited so long.

MEDICREDIT

One of the most potentially alarming questions facing the average family today is how to pay for necessary medical care should a critical or prolonged illness strike.

There is simply no way most people can handle the financial burden caused by a truly major health crisis.

This problem, which affects the middle income person as well as the very poor, has prompted me to introduce a bill which I believe holds real promise of relief.

It is the "Health Insurance Assistance Act of 1970," which provides for a plan christened Medicaid by its chief architect, the American Medical Association.

Essentially, Medicaid recognizes that the ability of the American people to pay for adequate health care varies greatly. Some just cannot afford it at all; others are wealthy enough to cover any conceivable emergency.

But most Americans are in-between; they can afford a part of the cost, depending on their respective incomes.

Under Medicaid, the truly poor would be given certificates to use in buying the proper coverage from private insurance carriers.

This system would replace the present Medicaid program, which has proved to be an administrator's nightmare and a spendthrift's dream.

Medicaid is loaded with problems, and its costs are all but prohibitive. It has been clear that a better way must be found to provide medical care for the indigent and I believe Medicaid is it.

Under Medicaid, we have been saying to people, in effect, "Go ahead and spend yourselves to the point of indigency, and then the Federal government will move in to help you."

Under Medicaid, we would be saying: "The Federal government will see to it that you get the insurance protection you need so that you will not be reduced to the point of indigency."

For those with greater ability to pay—those, for example, who pay an annual income tax of, say, more than \$300—the plan would provide tax credits.

The amount of the credit would vary with the person's tax liability. For example, someone who pays \$500 in income taxes would be given a credit against 70 percent of the annual premium cost of adequate health insurance. Those paying \$1,200 in income

taxes would receive 20 percent credit, and so on.

In order to receive the credit, based upon net taxable income, a taxpayer would have to show that he had purchased a qualified health care plan, approved by the appropriate state agency.

Medicaid would utilize existing, reputable private carriers and plans, and would allow the competition of the marketplace to operate in maintaining cost control and in assuring quality of care.

As a further safeguard, medical societies would be required to establish peer review units to keep watch over individual charges and services, hospital and nursing homes admissions and retentions, and other aspects of care.

Although it is impossible to pre-determine the exact cost of Medicaid, it would be perhaps a third, or not more than half, as much as some of the national health insurance programs which have been proposed already. And whatever its cost, it would do away with a genuinely disastrous Medicaid program which is now running at about \$5 billion a year, and is expected to jump to \$7 billion shortly.

In short, Medicaid offers a potential answer to one of the greatest problems confronting this nation today: The growing inability of too many Americans to pay for health care essential for themselves and their families.

POTOMAC RIVER POLLUTION

As I mentioned in my June newsletter, as our numbers and our industrial productivity have multiplied, we in America have almost overwhelmed our environment as we produce more, consume more, and waste more than any other people on earth.

Yet we have the skills to design and build effective anti-pollution equipment, and once we have committed ourselves to do what must be done we will be able to insure that our air will be fit to breathe, our water fit to drink, and our cities fit to live in.

As a sponsor of the Administration's comprehensive pollution control legislative program, I have been somewhat disappointed in the lack of progress made in obtaining enactment of these proposals. The package includes \$4 billion in Federal funds for waste treatment facilities and an Environmental Financing Authority to help local government finance their share of these projects. It extends authority of the Council on Environmental Quality to deal with solid wastes, such as old car wrecks, and gives HEW power to develop controls over vehicle exhausts. It also amends the Water Pollution Control Act by adding new enforcement measures and expanding research grants for pollution control, and updates the Land and Water Conservation Act to allow more surplus Federal property to be used for parks and recreation.

As the Congress and the Administration have struggled with solutions to pollution problems throughout the nation, I have also been working on legislation which I hope to include in a revenue measure soon to be acted on by the House—legislation which will create a Federal water and sewage authority to sell water and sewage service to the Federal Government, the District of Columbia Government, and parts of suburban Maryland and Northern Virginia.

The Potomac Interceptor was installed as part of the development plan for the Dulles International Airport. At the time it was foreseen that construction of the airport would create not only a specific amount of sewage from its own operation but would also encourage growth in surrounding areas. Rather than attempt to treat this anticipated sewage load locally and then discharge it into the Potomac River above the intake point for the drinking water supply for the District of Columbia, Arlington, Falls Church and parts

of Fairfax County, the decision was made to transport the sewage to the major facility at Blue Plains, which was to be expanded to become a regional plant.

At the time Dulles Interceptor Sewer was built, there were no problems with the water quality of the Potomac above Little Falls. Had the interceptor not been installed, alternative methods of sewage handling would have been necessary, and it is not difficult to conceive of the damage which might have resulted with regard to our water supply.

Unfortunately, although the Dulles Interceptor was completed in 1963, construction of the link within the District of Columbia which connects the interceptor and Blue Plains has been severely hampered by two factors. One is the controversy over construction and placement of highways in the Georgetown area and the building of the Three Sisters Bridge, because the placement of the proposed sewers is contingent on the locations and construction of roadways. The second reason for delay is the disruption of normal functions that always occur with the ripping up of streets to install sewers. In order not to bring all transportation in the Georgetown area to a halt, only portions of the sewer have been constructed at any one time.

These delays made it necessary to connect the Dulles Interceptor to existing sewers through the Georgetown area to bring that effluent to the Blue Plains Plant. The resulting overload has resulted in frequent flooding in the area, especially during periods of high storm runoff, with consequent dumping of raw sewage into the River in the Georgetown area.

Only a short link now remains to complete the route from Dulles to Blue Plains, and completion of this will alleviate the flooding situation. However, completion is contingent upon resolution of the Three Sisters Bridge controversy and the appropriation of additional funds.

In evaluating the costs of operating the Authority I am proposing, I eliminated the costs of solid waste disposal from the budget of the District of Columbia Department of Sanitary Engineering and added the costs of the Washington Aqueduct of the Corps of Engineers, and was appalled to find that the water-sewer operation is already short some \$6.2 million of the minimum \$25.9 million needed to be solvent and capable of proper operation this year. Another \$54,037,000 would need to be added to the \$19,775,000 authorized by Congress for Capital Outlay in 1971 in order to get the water-sewer program back on the schedule directed by Congress when the Dulles Interceptor was built. In subsequent years the costs for the projected program which will provide only adequate expansion and improvements to the system will be \$76,248,000 in fiscal 1972; \$42,802,000 in fiscal 1973; \$24,393,000 in fiscal 1974; \$27,495,000 in fiscal 1975 and \$31,275 in fiscal 1976.

Recent concern with the importance of nutrients in the Potomac has demanded re-consideration of present plans. It is becoming apparent that storm waters will also need treatment before discharge and hence will also have to be processed through Blue Plains or some similar facility. While I hope initially that the new Authority will assume responsibility for the present projected program, I believe we will soon need to move toward more sophisticated treatment and the possible construction of deep wells to store combined sewage during storms for processing at slack periods at Blue Plains. I believe the program the Authority must eventually follow if the Potomac is to be pollution-free is far too extensive for the fragmented operation now involving the Department of Army and Interior, the District of Columbia, and several communities in suburban Maryland and Virginia.

Water and sewer rates provide the major source of income for the Water Fund both District of Columbia and Washington Aqueduct, and the Sewage Works Fund which includes the Blue Plains Treatment Plant and the funds to maintain the Dulles Interceptor Sewer. There is at the present time no source of revenue for stormwater sewers except the District of Columbia general revenues. So the new Authority, like the Sanitation Department of the District and the Corps of Engineers, would rely heavily on borrowing authority or bond authority, together with establishing a new rate for stormwater sewer use or benefit.

Lest there be confusion as to the jurisdiction of the Authority I hope to see created, I would like to point out that Northern Virginia is served by two watersheds. The Authority would concern itself with the upper watershed which supplies water and sewer service to parts of Northern Virginia and also to the neighboring jurisdictions of suburban Maryland and the District of Columbia.

The lower watershed, which supplies approximately half a million Northern Virginians, is faced with equally severe problems. However, this watershed is under the jurisdiction of the Fairfax County Water Authority, and plans are already underway for solving its more serious problems with projected plans for large-scale improvements and protection of the water supply at Occoquan Creek and reservoir. I recently met with County authorities, the Governor, the Assistant Secretary of Interior for Water Quality and Research, the Commanding General at Fort Belvoir and members of the Virginia Water Control Board to try to work out difficulties the Authority is having in obtaining State and Federal funds to help with its program. I shall continue to work for solution to these problems, and am hopeful that speedy passage of the comprehensive pollution control program by Congress will result in the availability of Federal funds to speed this program and other like it across the nation to early completion.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFITS

In early July, the House acted on a bill to help Federal employees and retirees meet the rising costs of medical care. It was proud to be among the strong supporters of this legislation which will require the Government to meet its responsibility as an employer and, by so doing, to set an example for other employers throughout the nation to follow.

When Congress first considered the program in 1959 the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I was then a member, determined that a 50-50 participating plan was fair and reasonable. Because it was a new program and the cost to the Government was not yet estimated a formula was adopted whereby the Government would pay 50 percent of the cost of the least expensive low option family program. By virtue of the type of insurance plan the employees subsequently adopted, however, the cost distribution at the time of enactment amounted to a 38 percent cost for the Government and a 62 percent cost for the employee. Increased medical care costs made it necessary for the Congress to increase the Government contribution in 1966 simply to maintain the unfair 38-62 ratio, and further increased costs has caused the 1966 ratio to be reduced to 24-76 in 1970.

In other words, the Federal Government is now paying only 24 percent of the cost of what should be a 50-50 employer-employee program. The legislation approved by the House will, if passed by the Senate, correct this inequity and provide for a 50-50 participation in the future regardless of increases in the cost of medical care.

Another feature of the bill, one of which I am quite proud since I have urged its enactment for a number of years, is a provi-

sion to eliminate an inequity resulting from overlapping and duplicating provisions between part B of medicare for employees who retired prior to 1960.

In order for the Federal employees who retired prior to 1960 to benefit from the retired Federal employee health insurance program, they had to pay for certain benefits which were also provided for them under part B of medicare which is available to all American citizens whether former Federal employees or not. This bill, if enacted, will permit the amount of the Federal contribution to the retired Federal employee health insurance program to be paid as a part of the employee's share of part B of medicare, thereby eliminating overlapping and duplication of benefits.

PASSAGE OF LEAD POISONING LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the House today passed H.R. 19127, the Lead-Based Paint Elimination Act of 1970.

As the original sponsor of lead poisoning legislation: the Lead-Based Paint Elimination Act of 1969 and two other bills, I was gratified that the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee held hearings so quickly and that the bill was reported out of the full Committee and on to the House floor within 3 months of the hearings.

I am hopeful that the Senate will be similarly swift in its deliberations of the bill, and that the Lead-Based Paint Elimination Act of 1970 will be passed by the Senate before the end of this session of Congress.

I am including in the RECORD an article from the September 23 New York Times by John Sibley, entitled "City Detects Rise in Lead Poisoning" at this point:

CITY DETECTS RISE IN LEAD POISONING—SLUM CHILDREN AFFLICTED BY EATING CHIPS OF PAINT
(By John Sibley)

"Dangerous levels" of lead poisoning, the debilitating ailment that afflicts slum children, have been found in nearly 1,800 youngsters so far this year, city health authorities reported yesterday.

This is more than double the number of cases detected during all of 1969. However, this does not reflect a real increase in the number of cases; rather, it reflects the city's intensified campaign to detect and treat lead poisoning.

Up to Sept. 11, the Health Department reported, 85,674 children were tested. Of these, 1,772 were found to have more than 0.06 milligrams of lead per 100 cubic centimeters of blood, the official danger level.

Lead poisoning occurs most frequently among children under 5 years old who have eaten chips of paint and plaster that fall from the walls and ceilings of slum tenements. This habit of undernourished youngsters' eating nonfood objects is called "pica."

Although lead-based paint has been outlawed for indoor use here since 1959, many old tenements still have peeling walls that date from pre-World War II days.

MANY REPORTED "AT RISK"

Dr. Vincent Guinee, director of the Health Department's Bureau of Lead Poisoning Control, estimated yesterday that about 120,000 children here are "at risk." Of these, he estimated, between 6,000 and 8,000 actually have dangerous levels of lead in their blood.

Lead is not excreted from the children's bodies, but is stored, mostly in the bone marrow. Depending on the amount swallowed, it can cause anemia, cramps, kidney troubles, convulsions, severe mental retardation and death.

Dr. Guinee's bureau was given a special \$2.4-million appropriation in January to attack the problem, a program that was given high priority by Mayor Lindsay.

It soon became apparent, however, that detection and treatment of a child's lead poisoning was not enough. Children were being sent home to nibble again at the peeling, lead-impregnated paint chips.

Landlords whose buildings have toxic materials on the walls are now required to cover them with wallboard for at least four feet from the floor level. Of 1,776 apartments inspected this year, 921 were found to have unacceptable amounts of lead.

In many cases, the landlord voluntarily makes the necessary repairs. When he does not, the job is done by the city's Housing Development Administration and the bill is sent to the landlord.

LANDLORDS ARE WARNED

James Kagan, director of the lead program's control unit, said yesterday that 814 letters had been mailed to landlords up to Sept. 11, directing them to comply.

Of these, he said, 685 have been reinspected. The reinspection showed that 111 had already been repaired by the landlords and that was in progress on 14 others.

Mr. Kagan's office sent 481 orders to the city's Emergency Repair Program to make repairs where landlords had not. He said 265 of these jobs had been completed.

A major benefit of the program, Dr. Guinee said, is a growing public awareness of the problem. Because the symptoms often are not apparent until the damage has been done, even physicians have often been slow in diagnosing lead poisoning.

"Now it's one of the first things a doctor looks for," said Dr. Guinee, "and the parents are on the lookout, too."

MARYLAND SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

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

MARYLAND SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

Staff Sergeant Thomas H. Messer, 21, was killed on August 28 at Binh Dinh when enemy troops fired at a military plane in which he was a passenger. The plane, which was preparing to take off on a military mission, exploded on the ground when hit.

Sergeant Messer was born in Greenville, S.C. He later moved to Alexandria, Va., where he graduated from Mount Vernon High School.

He enlisted in the Army in September, 1968. A year later he was sent to Vietnam.

WROTE ALMOST EVERY DAY

He wrote home almost every day and described the war as being "hell," his wife said yesterday.

Survivors include his wife, the former Gabriele Zeitlin; a nine-month old son, Thomas H. Messer, Jr., both of College Park, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert E. Messer, also of College Park. His father is a master sergeant in the Army.

DAVID LOUIE WINS INAUGURAL AWARD OF RADIO AND TV NEWS DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud that one of my young constituents, David Louie, has just won the inaugural award of the Radio Television News Directors in its electronic journalism scholarship program.

Young Mr. Louie, is the son of a well-known Lakewood, Ohio, man, Troy Louie, who owns the Sam Yah Yick Kee wholesale food supply house in Cleveland. A junior attending Northwestern University, David Louie is 20 and a most remarkable and brilliant young man.

In telling me of the award, Col. Barney Oldfield wrote:

An electric journalism scholarship program has been the dream of RTNDA since its founding 25 years ago, also in Cleveland, so all eyes will no David as he is the first tangible evidence that the organization's dream did, in fact, come true.

I know that David Louie, whose interest in journalism flowered when he was editor of the Lakewood High Times in high school and as a part-time employee at Cleveland radio and TV stations, will do his sponsors proud.

I am very pleased to include the press release issued at the time the award was made, including the remarks made by Colonel Oldfield when he presented it to young Mr. Louie:

DAVID LOUIE WINS BEN CHATFIELD FELLOWSHIP

DENVER, COLO.—David Louie, 20, of Lakewood, Ohio and presently a junior in the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, became the first winner of the newly established \$1,000 annual Ben Chatfield Fellowship.

The Fellowship was established in the Radio and TV News Directors Foundation, and is named in honor of the 4th, and now deceased ex-President of the RTNDA. He was News Director of WMAZ in Macon, Georgia, and became one of the RTNDA founders.

David Louie's grandparents came from Canton, China, and his parents own the Sam Wah Yick Kee Company, wholesale food suppliers, in Cleveland, Ohio.

He was educated in Lakewood High School, was editor of the Lakewood High Times, the school's weekly newspaper. He worked on both WKYC and WEWS in Cleveland.

When he went to Northwestern University, he became a writer on Floyd Kalber's NBC News program on WMAQ, and is now on the assignment desk at the ABC-owned WLS-TV in Chicago.

An electronic journalism scholarship pro-

gram has been a constant desire of RTNDA since its founding as a means of emphasizing the high quality professional and specialized talents which are required for a career in news broadcasting.

It was post-1966 convention (Chicago), when ex-President Bruce Dennis (WGN-TV) appointed Col. Barney Oldfield, of Litton Industries, Inc., Beverly Hills, Calif., as Chairman, RTNDA's Scholarship and Financial Development Committee.

At the 1967 Board meeting in Toronto, he proposed the establishment of an RTND Foundation, which was voted into being and drafted into legal form by the Washington law firm of Pierson, Ball & Dowd. Then the many and various kinds of solicitation began to raise \$20,000 required to endow the first fellowship/scholarship. That level was reached late in 1969, and word went out that the first award could be made at the Denver 25th anniversary meeting.

The electronic journalism scholarship program is already well enroute to endow a second award and has about \$2,000 already in the Radio and TV News Directors Foundation treasury working to that end.

RTNDA asked that Col. Oldfield make the first award to first winner, David Louis.

REMARKS BY COL. BARNEY OLDFIELD

Members of the 25th annual convention of radio and TV news directors: As the 25th, 50th, 75th, and 100th of years have special significances in lifetimes and in durabilities of organizations, it is customary to celebrate such milestones sentimentally, perhaps in wonder that what started so small has grown so large and so professional, and to ponder a little the men who had the inspiration to try to put something like this together. Of all the presidents RTNDA has had, only one—the fourth, Ben Chatfield, longtime news director of WMAZ, in Macon, Georgia—has left us and in his honor the RTND Foundation has named a scholarship/fellowship which is to be awarded annually to some particularly promising and deserving junior in some university who is thought to have what it takes to have a career in electronic journalism.

If Ben were with us today, he would privately like what we are about to do, but he would be publicly embarrassed by all the fuss. He would like it for one thing, because during World War II Ben was an editor of a GI newspaper which had a migratory print shop in that it moved with the American forces in the Far East to war's end in Tokyo Bay. The young man we honor today, and in honoring—expect much of—was one whose grandparents came to this country from Canton, China.

Ben Chatfield, in middle Georgia, knew his town and every village within reach of WMAZ's transmitters. He was almost family to the people who listened to the newscasts he tailored. They called him in trouble, in celebration, and just to talk to him about how to get to a fella who knows a fella who knows a fella who could help. Long before Betty Friedan got mad at it for being what she calls a man's world, Ben Chatfield had a woman newscaster fulltime on WMAZ. In those days when news directors were just someone down the hall, and not yet part of managements and even vice presidents, Ben found a way to make coming to these conventions something each news director could afford to do. He did know how to get things done—and he did them, and his example of hard work, never giving up, working early and late, is not bad to have riding on our Ben Chatfield fellowship which we inaugurate today.

Now, I'd like to have David Louis join me here at the podium and have you meet him. What kind of a young man is he? He is 20 years old. He was editor of his high school newspaper in Lakewood, Ohio. He worked on WKYC and WEWS in Cleveland. When he

went to Northwestern, he was a writer on Floyd Kalber's NBC-WMAQ news show, and is now parttime on the assignment desk of ABC-owned WLS-TV in Chicago. One of his former bosses said he had to get him out of his newsroom, or he would have had his job. I have told him that with RTNDA's scholarship, and your sponsorship, he has just come into about 750 fathers who will all be looking at his report card. Ladies and gentlemen, David Louis, RTNDA's first scholarship winner.

PRICING OF NATURAL GAS

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, Senators Tower and Hansen today introduced a bill in the Senate that would exempt from Federal Power Commission control the authority to establish rates on natural gas sold in interstate commerce by independent producers.

This bill is a giant step in bringing back into play the marketplace pressures in determining the price of natural gas. We must assure an adequate supply of gas. To do this the man who takes the risk must be allowed to earn a fair return.

The 1950's and 1960's have taught us that regulation does not work. Artificial prices and unrealistic procedures have resulted in a decreasing interest in oil exploration that is a major factor in the energy crisis this country now faces.

Some weeks ago I asked Carl E. Bagge, Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission, to assist me in drafting legislation to deregulate the domestic price of natural gas in the hope that this kind of legislation would help stimulate oil and gas exploration. I plan to introduce a bill when Congress reconvenes in November. At this time, I insert in the RECORD a letter to me from Commissioner Bagge delineating the need for this kind of legislation.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 30, 1970.
Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSH: With reference to your letter to me of September 17, 1970, I submit for consideration, as an individual member of the Federal Power Commission, and not for the Commission, the enclosed draft of a bill to provide that the Commission's rate determination and review powers shall no longer be applicable to new sales by independent producers of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce. In my judgment, if enacted, the bill would be in the public interest by providing the necessary stimulus to encourage the accelerated exploration and development of this critical domestic energy source in order to meet the future demands of the consuming public. In addition it would provide the degree of certainty with respect to price which has been lacking in almost two decades of producer price regulation.

The concept of the public interest embodied in the regulatory enabling statutes passed thirty or more years ago was premised upon the need to prevent the exploitation of the consumer and, therefore, the price aspects of regulation were emphasized. How-

ever, in the intervening decades our national goals have been altered substantially and today extend more deeply and pervasively to include the preservation of our environment and a concern for the "quality of life." Indeed, there are many who urge corrective measures regardless of the price that must inevitably be borne by the ultimate consumer in a relatively affluent society. Regulation must today, therefore, assume a far broader perspective if it is to remain relevant to the attainment of these contemporary national goals.

It is particularly applicable to the regulation of natural gas which provides a unique weapon in the battle to combat air pollution and, through the technological development of the fuel cell, also provides a potential alternative to central station power generation with its long distance transmission lines. The need and the potential uses for this clean burning fuel is especially critical now and during the next two decades pending the operational development of the fast breeder reactor or other technological breakthroughs in power generation. In my opinion it is essential to the national interest that the gas industry now be stimulated to serve as an aggressive energy force during this transitional period.

Unfortunately, at the present time the natural gas industry is beset with gas supply problems. In a recent unanimous opinion in the *Hugoton-Anadarko* case,¹ the Commission pointed out that interstate pipelines have been unable to obtain desired gas supplies and in both 1968 and 1969 the national findings of natural gas have, for the first time, fallen below production. In many areas the intrastate market has successfully outbid interstate purchasers for such gas reserves as are available. As a result, some interstate gas pipeline companies have been forced to turn to substantially higher cost increments of gas from Canada and imported liquefied natural gas (LNG) from various foreign sources. Other pipelines who are not so favorably located have simply been unable to acquire additional new supplies in sufficient quantities to permit expansion to meet either the increased requirements of their existing customers or the demands of potential new market areas. The situation appears incongruous in view of the fact that the undiscovered potential reserves of natural gas in the United States are estimated at over 1,200 trillion cubic feet—enough to supply our present national needs for about fifty years.

The Commission itself in 1961 abandoned as unworkable the determination of producer prices on an individual company basis and turned to the present cost based area rate approach in order to fix the price of natural gas for each of the nation's major producing areas. In my judgment the area rate methodology that has developed is procedurally cumbersome and functionally unresponsive and, consequently, has contributed immeasurably to the problem in its present dimensions. If we are candid it must be acknowledged that the Commission has apparently failed the practical test which was established in the *Permian*² case, the first area rate determination, wherein the Commission stated:

"The separate price we fix herein for new gas-well gas in the Permian Basin should serve to furnish a practical test of whether in fact it will result in bringing forth additional supplies."³

Since the issuance of the *Permian* Opinion, less and less gas has been committed to the interstate market until now the inter-

¹—F.P.C. — (Opinion No. 586, issued September 18, 1970).

²Permian Basin Area Rate Proceeding, 34 F.P.C. 159 (1965).

³34 F.P.C. at 188.

state pipeline companies report that they have been unable to contract at the existing area prices for any significant quantities of gas in this prolific producing area.

What occurred in the Permian Basin was the intrusion of dominant market forces over which the existing regulatory scheme was unable to exercise effective control and, thus permitted the available reserves to be diverted to the intrastate market. The emergence of these market forces was again evident when, just a few months ago, the Commission, in recognition of the interstate market's need for new supplies, authorized the importation of significantly higher priced Canadian gas into the Midwest and West Coast markets. It has also certificated imports of even higher priced gas in liquid form to the East Coast and New England. Several major LNG import proposals are now also pending before the Commission and several vast projects to obtain gas from Prudhoe Bay and the Northwest Territory of Canada have come far beyond the conceptual stages. All of these projects, both pending and projected, involve substantially higher prices than those which presently are permitted to domestic producers of gas.

In view of the crucial period of transition which confronts us, it is most important that we do not ignore the admonishment of the Court of Appeals in reviewing the Commission's *South Louisiana Area Rate Opinion*. Justice Thornberry clearly indicated that blind adherence to the existing area rate methodology without giving consideration to market forces is unrealistic. I am in full agreement with the Court's reasoning but the question that still must be answered is how these market forces should be considered. Indeed the Commission has recently taken constructive action in this regard with respect to its proposed Permian Basin and nationwide rulemaking proceedings. I have joined without reservation in these efforts to repair the present regulatory scheme so that at least a responsive pricing method can be achieved. For regardless of any legislative amendments to the Natural Gas Act that might be proposed, we agency members are, of course, obliged to continue to work within the present statutory framework and should, therefore, take every step necessary to make it as effective as possible.

However, in my judgment the problem of producer price uncertainty and the problem of the protracted delays inherent in area rate regulation can be most effectively remedied by legislation. One approach to remedial legislation has been characterized as "sanctity of contract" which assures the producers that once a contract is approved and the sale certificated by the Commission there can be no rollback in any contract price, whether it be an initial or permissible escalation price. The benefits of such assurance in eliminating uncertainty to the producing industry would be substantial.

Protracted area rate proceedings extending over a period of five to seven years have created an unprecedented regulatory lag which has prolonged and therefore added to the existing uncertainties regarding price. These long delays and uncertainties also tie up funds collected by the producers which could be used for exploration and development. All of these uncertainties have inhibited the search for essential additional supplies of natural gas.

Any remedial legislation, therefore, must eliminate such regulatory lag and provide the degree of certainty regarding price which is essential to the development of critical new supplies. Both of these elements have been discussed for several years and have been incorporated in various forms of "sanctity of contract" legislative proposals. I am informed that recently the American Gas Association, after several years of debate, has now endorsed a type of "sanctity of con-

tract" proposal which also incorporates certain market criteria, rather than cost, as the Commission standard for determining producer prices. As a result, at the present time the entire gas industry, through their respective associations, support this amendment to the Natural Gas Act.

This proposal for reform of the current regulatory method is most constructive. Unfortunately, it should have been introduced when it was proposed more than four years ago. The majority of the Commission publicly endorsed one such "sanctity of contract" proposal more than three years ago and its enactment at that time by Congress would have contributed substantially toward averting many of the problems now confronting us. In principle I endorse the "sanctity of contract" concept and the need to permit market forces to establish the price. However, in my opinion, the market forces should function outside the regulatory process so that producer prices can be established unfettered by regulation.

Whether imposed by statutory amendment or by Commission election to alter the existing area rate methodology, any approach requiring the determination of producer prices by the Commission on the basis of some subjective market standard or criteria would fall far short of a satisfactory solution. Such standards are extremely difficult to define and thus are usually couched in general terms and, as a result, the Commission would be compelled in all likelihood to define, qualify and quantify the innumerable factors that could affect the market and might have to be considered in each instance. To submit market forces to the subjective interpretation of a regulatory body, regardless of its expertise or good intentions, can only lead to a distortion of their effect with imprecise and unresponsive results. In the final analysis, at best, the prices approved by the Commission should approximate those that would have been derived in a free market without the need for regulatory anguish and the inherent delays. In addition, a strong tendency would probably exist to approve the proposed contract prices without modification because of the difficulty in justifying any change. The basic objective of this approach is the establishment by the Commission of a market value as the permissible price level. However, it is my opinion that this can be more readily and more accurately achieved by the free interplay of supply and demand dynamics unencumbered by any futile regulatory attempt to decipher the complicated considerations and the subtle interrelationships involved in a free market. Inject market forces into the administrative crucible and no one will recognize the results.

It appears to me that sound public policy toward the natural gas industry today demands something more than remedial legislation which would require the Commission to approximate the dynamics of a free market. What is necessary in the context of the currently available supply disequilibrium is something more satisfactory than a reform of the current regulatory method. Today Congress ought to consider a basic restructuring of regulation which will reflect the market value of gas by eliminating the Commission's rate determination and review powers with respect to new sales by independent producers while retaining regulatory control of contract terms in order to effectively monitor market structure and market behavior. Until the Congress acts, of course, I shall continue to apply the present Natural Gas Act, as interpreted by the Courts, to the cases which come before the Commission.

The draft bill transmitted herewith is submitted primarily to surface for consideration and study the concept of permitting market forces, unencumbered by regulation, to establish the producer price level without the necessity of structuring a complicated regu-

latory scheme to interpret and analyze these forces in order to approximate the same result. In this way the price established by arm's length bargaining, as specifically set forth in the contract between the parties, would be controlling. A government policy to foster competition in the energy field by instituting policies to insure full development of all energy sources and easy access to the market will serve as a constant check on gas prices.

There are, of course, many ways in which the Natural Gas Act could be amended to permit market forces to freely determine prices and this bill should not be considered as incorporating the only effective approach for accomplishing this objective. Hopefully, by offering this possible alternative for consideration, the draft bill will serve as a constructive basis for further discussion and analysis which is so essential to the formulation of the most effective solution to the problem. Nor should it be considered as a panacea, for it focuses only on producer pricing and does not attempt to deal with many of the other unique problems such as pipeline production or sales between affiliates.

Permitting the market to determine the price of new gas does not require the dismantlement of all aspects of producer control. The major elements of the regulatory scheme under this proposal would include:

1. Only the contract prices for the sale of new gas by independent producers to non-affiliates will no longer be determined or reviewed by the Commission.
2. Flowing gas will continue to be regulated by the Commission and, consequently, any rate impact on existing customers would be very gradual since it will take many years for new gas to become a significant portion of their gas supply.

3. All other contractual provisions and aspects of the sale, regardless of their effect upon the contract prices, will continue to be subject to Commission approval and review. It is essential that the Commission continue to pass upon such aspects as the quality standards, delivery pressure, rate of take, billing and prepayment arrangements as well as other provisions, which so significantly affect the ultimate consumer.

4. Indefinite price escalations, except for certain taxes, will be prohibited and the contract prices, including any escalations, must be set forth as a definite price per unit since the consumer must be able to determine what price will be charged. If the producer believes that certain aspects of his contract have a value, it will be incumbent upon him to reflect that value in the unit price specified in the contract.

5. No unit price can be changed by subsequent amendment to the contract after acceptance of the certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission.

6. Any proposed abandonment of service will continue to be regulated by the Commission.

The enactment of the draft bill permitting the market to establish the price for new gas but which contains these elements of continuing regulation will assure continuity of service and permit the retention of control over the conditions and quality of service as well as the mechanism which translates costs into rates to the ultimate consumer. It would also allow the Commission to effectively monitor market structure and market behavior.

Also enclosed is a copy of my recent address before the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors in Dallas, Texas, in which I attempted to describe in more detail the considerations which, over the years, have led me to conclude that the enactment of legislation in this area is of critical national importance.

Respectfully submitted,

CARL E. BAGGE,
Commissioner.

GENE WILSON OLYMPIC
HAIRDRESSER

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, in Dallas, we have a hometown girl named Gene Wilson who has made it to the top. She has just returned from Europe where she was one of four Americans to represent our country in the hairdressers' world olympics.

Can you think of anything American women more admire than the skill and creative services of adept hairdressers? America sent to the olympics two men and two women who were the Nation's best. I had assumed Americans were sure winners, but in world competition, the Germans took the gold cup. We cannot win everything.

I am proud of Gene Wilson. In an era where many are generalists, she became an expert in her field.

Gene is 31 now, but she entered cosmetology at age 13 while she was in junior high school. She worked her way through school. By the time she graduated from Sunset High School, she had completed over 1,500 hours of practice time, passed her boards, and was licensed by the State of Texas.

There were many, many years of regular hair work in the shop. Then, 8 years ago she began to enter competitions. She has now won 115 different competitions. She won the America cup, which was the all-around champion for North, South, and Central America.

She swept the Belgium Grand Prix as her vase trophy reflected first place in four of the five events in Brussels.

In Belgium, Gene also won the crystal plate for the Oscar of Elegance which covered styling of hair, fashion, and individuality.

To make the U.S. Olympic team involved a series of matches in 1969. And she was eventually selected as one of our two women representatives. The Olympics are held only in alternate years. The competition covers five events and requires persons with broad skills in all phases of hair design and preparation.

She has experienced an active life in her career. In the beauty salon she works 12 hours a day and on Saturdays even longer. Gene is teamed with her sister Sue in Accent Salon Coiffures out in the friendly Oak Cliff area of Dallas. She is manager of the shop, with a staff of 14.

What does it take to be a champion. Gene is 5 foot, 6 inches, weighs 118 and is a bundle of dynamic energy. With all her hair creations, she always wears her own blonde hair in a casual daytime hair style.

In Texas we are proud of all of the fine people in the profession of hairdressing. They are good neighbors, hard workers, and active citizens in the community.

In America today, we need more emphasis on vocational direction. We need more youngsters who aspire to success

in a trade or profession. So a special salute to friendly Gene Wilson who personifies a great champion and represents so well the skilled profession of hairdressing.

HEALTH CARE—THE FIRST
PRIORITY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, can our Nation be defended if our people are not strong? Can our children be educated if they are too ill to learn? What good are jobs without healthy men and women to fill them? How meaningful are our other priorities if our citizens do not enjoy good health and cannot obtain adequate health care?

For years this Nation prided itself on the quality of its health services. Yet today we have regressed to the point where this Nation faces a health crisis without parallel in its history.

Many Americans simply cannot afford the cost of medical care today. Our hospitals and other medical facilities remain inadequate and overcrowded while skyrocketing construction costs prevent needed expansion and modernization. Millions of dollars that should be used to improve health services are instead being spent by hospitals for payment of interest to banks. There is an increasing shortage of doctors, nurses and other medical personnel. Medical schools are facing severe financial difficulties; some may be forced to close their doors. Many promising medical research projects are being curtailed or cut back due to lack of funds.

Those citizens who advocate the expenditure of more funds for health care in this country are not as entrenched as the defense lobby, not as well organized as the education lobby, and not as vocal as the civil rights lobby. Yet I submit, Mr. Speaker, that adequate health care is the most basic need of all our people. It must be our first priority.

Many of us in the 91st Congress have recognized this basic need and have attempted to meet it. My proposal to increase the PHA loan guarantee for hospital construction from \$25 million to \$50 million may be included in pending housing legislation. By its overwhelming vote to override the President's veto, Congress has emphasized the need to continue the successful Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

Yet we have made far too little progress in the past year. Our efforts to provide an additional \$360 million for health manpower, medical research, and hospital construction were defeated. We were unable to override the President's veto of the 1970 Labor-HEW appropriation bill last January. We could not convince the administration that the unmet health needs of our citizens require immediate attention.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for a

national commitment to meet these needs. The time has come for us to re-establish this Nation as a leader in providing health care for its people, for only with a healthy citizenry can our Nation remain strong.

A THOUGHT-PROVOKING LETTER
CONCERNING PORNOGRAPHY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems facing this Nation today, on the domestic front, is the smut and filth that is being disseminated, acted or broadcasted. A report on this evil, made by the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, is extremely disappointing because it tends to condone this practice. I regard this report as a disservice to all right-thinking Americans, and it should be repudiated.

On this subject of pornography, I include in my remarks a copy of a letter to the President from a prominent constituent of mine, Mr. Phillip F. Templeton, of San Angelo, Tex. It is timely and thought provoking, and I hope all my colleagues will take the time to read it. The letter follows:

RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1970.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am a young married general contractor with two children, ages 6 and 9. Like a majority of Americans, I am very much concerned with pornography and an immoral way of life displayed and glorified in current R and X rated movies, not to mention the more explicit pornography films being shown in some theaters across the country. We spend billions of government dollars trying to create a better environment for our slum dwellers. Sociologists tell us that a better, cleaner environment makes for a better, more useful and enjoyable life. Through these movies, it seems to me we are subjecting the American public, and the American youth in particular, to a filthy, sometimes perverted environment.

This is a real crisis, as I see it, and should be acted on as such by those of you in government. This seems to be a crisis that nobody is attacking with any degree of effectiveness. The argument that children or adults do not have to go to these if they don't want to doesn't hold water to me. Most school kids have always gone to the movies in their spare time, and they are going to go in order to be one of the gang, if for no other reason. A high school or college girl is not going to refuse an X rated movie date for fear of being called square.

I had an idea you might be able to use it to educate the public, and solicit their support in bringing about some decency guidelines for movies. I gave a speech last week in San Angelo entitled Mind Pollution—A Real Crisis. With various kinds of pollution on everyone's mind, I thought this would be well received by most of my audience and it apparently was.

In closing I would hope that your administration would find a way to effect decency guidelines for our movies and magazines, and thereby clean up the environment and save this society from Mind Pollution which

is virtually imposed on us by a few degenerates and others after a fast buck.

Yours very truly,

PHILLIP F. TEMPLETON.

POLICEMEN

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. HAGAN, Mr. Speaker, I feel my colleagues will share my personal pride in the outstanding articles which recently appeared in two of the fine newspapers of my district, the Lyons Progress, Lyons, Ga., and the True Citizen, Waynesboro, Ga.

In these truly difficult times many of our people seem to have no real understanding as to exactly what constitutes the increasingly harder role of the policeman in our community. It is not only enlightening but heartwarming to me to see in two of my district papers that people do exist who have a firm knowledge and respect for the defender of our lives and personal property—the policeman.

Because law and order can only be a reality through the combined efforts of responsible citizens and with the services of our peace officers, I am deeply pleased that there is definitely a feeling of pride and respect in our cities and towns for the individual who gives so much of himself to try to help and serve.

The two articles follow:

[From the Waynesboro (Ga.) True Citizen, Sept. 30, 1970]

A PEACE OFFICER IS . . .

(Author unknown)

"A peace officer is many things. He's a son, a brother, a father, an uncle, and sometimes even a grandfather. He is a protector in time of need and a comforter in time of sorrow. His job calls for him to be a diplomat, a psychologist, a lawyer, a friend, and an inspiration. He suffers from an overdose of publicity about brutality and dishonesty. He suffers far more from the notoriety produced by unfounded charges. Too often, acts of heroism go unnoticed and the truth is buried under all the criticism. The fact is that less than one-half of one percent of peace officers ever discredit their uniform. That's a better average than you find among clergymen.

"A peace officer is an ordinary guy who is called upon for extraordinary bravery—for us! His job may sometimes seem routine, but the interruptions can be moments of stark terror. He's the man who faces a half-crazed gunman, who rescues a lost child, who challenges a mob, and who risks his neck more often than we realize. He deserves our respect and our profound thanks.

"A peace officer stands between the law abider and the law breaker. He's the prime reason your home hasn't been burned, your family abused, your business looted. Try to imagine what might happen if there were no peace officers around. And then try to think of ways to make their job more rewarding. Show them the respect you really have; offer them a smile and a kind word; see that they don't have to be magicians to raise their families on less-than-adequate salaries.

"We think peace officers are great. We thank God for all the little boys who said they would be peace officers and who kept

their promise. We hope you feel the same way, and we hope you'll show it—so there will always be enough good peace officers to go around."

[From the Lyons (Ga.) Lyons Progress, Oct. 1, 1970]

WHAT IS A POLICEMAN . . .

(By Ollie H. McDilda)

A policeman is the little boy who grew up to be what he said he was going to be.

He is a son, a brother, a father, an uncle and yes, even a grandfather. He is a man like all men, who has the same needs, the same desires and the same religious beliefs. A man who even meets the requirements of the physically fit and who displays profound energy. He is an actor whose role is not one of fiction, but of reality. He is a protector of the people. A pal to all children. A pacifier in time of sorrow. A professor of psychology. A parent to the homeless and the lost. A pleasant man, who smiles through many trying situations. A prosperous man, who derives prosperity from the satisfaction of doing what he wants to do most.

He is an officer and official of law without whom neither you nor I could live in peace and harmony, and without whom our very nation would crumble. Yet an ordinary man, who displays extraordinary bravery . . . who far too often sticks his neck out to save ours.

He's sometimes a lawyer, always a defender, but never a prosecutor. His integrity is as much a tangible part of him as the shiny badge he wears. He's a twenty-four hour watchman whose aim, like his creed, is to protect and to serve.

Courage is his number one requisite and courtesy an everyday part of his being, and even though his courtesy isn't always reciprocated, he remains courteous both out of duty and out of respect.

He's a dedicated man, ready for action even beyond the call of duty, who so often performs the duties of a doctor, delivering a child under adverse conditions, rushing mother and child to a hospital at record breaking speed, and awaits his only reward . . . the report that mother and child are doing fine.

He's the guy who ushers and controls crowds at a parade, so that our youngsters can enjoy the clowns, the animals and the marching bands. Dedicated enough to give up his Sundays and holidays with his family, so that our families can enjoy Sundays and holidays.

Yes, a policeman is that friendly guy standing on the corner in all kinds of weather waving us on with his white gloved hand, assuring us that it's safe to proceed.

A policeman deserves the same devotion he displays toward his fellow man. He deserves respect and a kind word for his many heroic accomplishments. A policeman deserves a day in fact, named in honor . . . and every day of our lives we should all thank God for that little boy who grew up to be . . . a policeman!

NBC'S "DRUG ALERT" PROGRAM—AN UNPRECEDENTED EFFORT TO INFORM THE PUBLIC OF THE DRUG ABUSE PROBLEM

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. CAREY, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will share in my appreciation of an unprecedented public service

campaign successfully undertaken by the five television stations that are owned by the National Broadcasting Co. Using its powerful resources for telling effect, the NBC stations have concentrated a large number of programs in a 3-week period on the problems of drug abuse.

The programs—running the gamut of the drug problem—were reinforced with a saturated schedule of announcements calling attention to the programs and to the serious nature of the drug epidemic.

NBC's key station, WNBC-TV New York, presented a 22-day "Drug Alert," featuring a series of more than 25 programs relating to the causes, consequences, and possible cures of the current narcotics crisis in the Metropolitan New York area. The Channel 4 information project began on Saturday, August 22, and ran through Sunday, September 13.

The unprecedented "Drug Alert" was conducted by the other NBC-owned television stations: WRCT-TV, Washington, D.C., WKYC-TV, Cleveland, WMAQ-TV, Chicago, and KNBC, Los Angeles.

With an hour-long, prime-time local special on the drug crisis, "Turning Off," on Friday, August 28, 10 to 11 p.m., as one of the highlights of the series, "Drug Alert" focused on the many aspects of drug abuse and its effect on the life of the community, through existing program formats, the creation of new programming, through news features and an exchange of programs on narcotics produced by the other owned television stations. "Turning Off" was produced by veteran documentary producer, Vernon Hixson.

The first program in the "Drug Alert" series was a "New York Illustrated" report, "Three Roads From Nowhere," on Saturday, August 22, 7 to 7:30 p.m. The program examined current methods of treating drug addiction at centers in Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant, and Beth Israel Hospital clinics.

A special hour-long edition of "Direct Line," on Sunday, September 13, featured a panel of leading experts on drug addiction, answering questions telephoned to the studio by channel 4 viewers.

The firsthand experiences of drug addicts was aired on "Each in His Own Prison," a KNBC, Los Angeles, production, Sunday, August 23, 12:30 to 1 p.m.; on WNBC-TV's "Drugs: Inside Out," a "New York Illustrated" report featured addicts talking about their nightmare world, Sunday, August 29, 7 to 7:30 p.m.; and on a second showing of an hour-long WNBC-TV special, "Youth Views The Drug Scene," Sunday, September 6, 12 noon to 1 p.m.

On "Research Project," August 23 and 30—3 to 3:30 p.m.—Dr. Max Fink, professor of psychiatry, New York Medical College, discussed "Immunization Against Drug Addiction;" and Dr. William Abruzzi, College of Physicians, State University of New York, the doctor who attended hundreds of "bad trip" cases at the recent aborted musical festival in Connecticut, talked about drug use on college campuses, and the effects of some drugs.

The Catholic "Inquiry" series offered two programs on the subject, featuring Father John McVernon, director, Community Boys Clubs of Cambria Heights, Queens, on September 6, and Father Patrick Carney, coordinator of drug prevention programs of the Archdiocese of New York, on September 13.

Other programs in the "Drug Alert" series follow:

"A Trip To Nowhere," an NBC-TV Network special was produced by Lucy Jarvis to investigate the reasons people turn to drugs—Monday, August 24, 8 p.m.

"Drugs In the Classroom," a week-long discussion of the subject featured a panel of experts, questions from an all-feminine studio audience, and moderator Aline Saarinen—Monday through Friday, August 24 to 28, 9 to 9:30 a.m.

"Drug Information Please," vital information on drugs was presented by KNBC, Los Angeles, Sunday, August 30, 12:30 p.m.

"What Hope, Which Direction?" advice for parents with addicted children was produced by WMAQ-TV, Chicago, Sunday, September 6, 5 p.m.

"Ghetto Health: A Medical Emergency," a second showing of the "New York Illustrated report on medical care," included drug treatment in the ghetto, Saturday, September 12, 7 p.m.

"Coming Down,"—A report on the drug problem in Washington, D.C., was produced by WRC-TV, Sunday, September 13, 12:30 p.m.

WNBC-TV also presented more than 50 public-service announcements featuring famous personalities with antidrug messages addressed specifically to young people.

The spot announcements, ranging from 10 to 30 seconds, were aired throughout the broadcast day, and were delivered in the vernacular of the personality delivering the message.

Among the personalities seen in the antidrug campaign were football hall-of-famer and NBC sportscaster Kyle Rote, Sandy Koufax, Tony Kubek, Al Derogatis, and Johnny Morris. Basketball stars included Emmette Bryant and Fred Crawford of the Buffalo Braves; Tommy Hawkins of the Los Angeles Lakers; Spencer Haywood of the Denver Rockets; Dave Stallworth of the New York Knicks; and Walt Simon, Laverne Tart and Sonny Dove of the New York Nets.

Broadcast personalities included Hugh Downs, Dr. Frank Field, Ted Brown, and Joe Garagiola. The "Drug Alert" announcements were seen on the NBC owned television stations in Washington, D.C., Chicago, Cleveland and Los Angeles. They were produced and written by the Advertising and Promotion Department of WNBC-TV, with several of the segments produced by WMAQ-TV, Chicago, and KNBC, Los Angeles.

A previous antidrug service campaign, produced by WNBC-TV in cooperation with the Encounter Teenage Rehabilitation Center and the New York City Addiction Services Agency, won first prizes at the New York International Film and Television Festival and from the New York State Broadcasters Association.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the architect of this meaningful project, Mr. Theodore H. Walworth, Jr., vice president and general manager, WNBC-TV, should be commended and I wish to call it to the special attention of the FCC, the House Select Committee on Crime and the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency who have interest in television's role in fighting the drug epidemic.

If we are ever going to curb the drug epidemic—and we must, I am convinced that the start of the cure begins when the public understands the degree of the illness. Telling it to the public is the job of media. This job has been well done by NBC.

**MRS. BEULAH BEUTEL TELLS WHY
THE BALD EAGLE WAS CHOSEN AS
OUR NATIONAL EMBLEM**

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a most interesting letter from a thoughtful constituent, Mrs. Beulah Beutel of Lakewood, Ohio, who says:

When Prince Charles and Princess Anne visited in Washington, D.C., this summer the Cleveland Press made the statement that when Princess Anne asked some of the Senators why we chose the eagle as our emblem of the United States, they were not able to answer her. She remarked that it was a poor choice. I was keenly disappointed over no response, so have taken the privilege to send in an answer. Perhaps you can place it in their reach for me or give it to some one who can so that these Senators may read it for future use.

I am delighted to do so, for the information Mrs. Beutel has sent is both interesting and informative, and, as a bonus she has also included the anecdote of "Old Abe" the War Eagle.

The aforementioned follows:

**WHY WE CHOSE THE EAGLE FOR THE U.S.
EMBLEM**

The Bald Eagle of North America was chosen as our National Emblem. It is the noblest of all birds. It is known for its grace and beauty in flight, for its keenness of sight, and for great endurance and power of flight.

When full grown it has a wing spread of eight feet. The feathers on the head and upper part of the neck are white, which gives it the name of "Bald Eagle." It is the eagle represented on the coins and Coat of Arms of the United States. It was also a Military Standard of Ancient Rome, and of France under Bonaparte.

THE STORY OF "OLD ABE" THE WAR EAGLE

(Taken from Compton's Encyclopedia)

A band of Chippewa Indians living in northern Wisconsin were the first owners of "Old Abe," The War Eagle.

One day their chief, "Blue Sky" was out hunting. As he came near the lake, saw an eagle fly with a fish in its mouth to the top of a tall pine tree and feed its young. He chopped the tree down and took one of the young eagles home with him. He fed it on fish and raw meat, and it soon became tame. Then "Blue Sky" sold the eagle to a white man for five bushels of corn.

The Civil War began about this time and the 8th Wisconsin Volunteers thought it would be fine to take a real live "Bird of Freedom" to the war; so they bought the bird for \$2.50 from the farmer. At first the eagle walked about the camp like a dog. Then it chose a Master, an Irish soldier named Jimmie McGinnis, and would not allow any one else to feed him.

Jimmie made a red, white and blue shield for the eagle's perch. He set this on a pole and tied the eagle by the foot, leaving the cord long enough so that the bird could fly a little way. When the regiment went on the march Jimmie carried the eagle beside the color bearer.

The eagle was cheered by crowds of people in every town. In the State Capitol it was named "Old Abe" for President Lincoln. By that time "Old Abe" had grown to be a big bird. His coat of feathers was a beautiful chocolate brown. It had golden lights that gleamed like copper in the sun. His tail feathers were white, with black spots. His legs were bright yellow and his claws a shining black. His head and neck a grayish white. He weighed only ten and one half pounds, but when he was angry or excited he ruffled his feathers until he looked twice as big. His wings when spread measured six and one half feet from tip to tip.

"Old Abe" never liked boys or dogs, because they teased him, but he loved marching soldiers, and cheering and music. When the band played he flapped his wings and made a whistling sound. He liked to sit on an officer's horse to watch a parade. The officers of the regiment always saluted him. A battle excited "Old Abe." The very first time he heard a cannon shot, he broke his cord and soared away. The soldiers thought he was gone forever. The smoke hid him, but amid the booming of the big guns they could hear him screaming. After the battle was over he circled the sky, then he dropped to his perch. Whistling and chucking and ruffling his feathers he walked and fluttered all around the camp.

After that "Old Abe" was not tied. He often left his perch to go fishing or hunting. He seemed to know that he was a heavy burden for Jimmie to carry. Now and then he would lean over and chuckle a sort of good-bye, then he would soar aloft and fly above the marching regiment. The boys always cheered him when he came home again.

"Old Abe" went through four years of the war. He was in twenty two battles in all, and after every one of them he returned to his own regiment. He never made a mistake, or dropped into another camp. His perch was often hit by bullets and several times his feathers were torn but he was never badly hurt.

After the war "Old Abe" was given to the State of Wisconsin. For fifteen years he lived in the State House in Madison. In 1876 Jimmie McGinnis took him to the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia and there told the famous eagle's story and sold his photograph to thousands of admiring visitors. Jimmie McGinnis remained his keeper until the bird died of old age in 1881. He was then stuffed and set upon his perch under a glass case where he remained until the State House burned. Admired by thousands of visitors.

**BREAK GROUND FOR POLICE-FIRE
ACADEMY AT NORTH PARK, PA.**

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the increase of crime in the United States has

focused public attention on the fact there is a critical demand for well-trained, well-equipped and well-qualified law enforcement officers to meet the challenges of today.

At the same time, there has been, over the past 25 years, another tremendous increase by our citizens to the land of suburbia with its neatly clipped lawns and split-level homes. However, suburbia also is a land devoid of many conveniences enjoyed by city dwellers; fire protection, for example. In many areas this protection is provided by volunteers, men who willingly become part-time public servants without monetary compensation. They are men who also furnish numerous other services to improve their community free of charge.

Obviously great strides have had to be taken to properly protect both the suburban and the urban citizen. Too often, these steps never were taken. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that Allegheny County's Board of Commissioners in Pennsylvania broke ground on September 28 for a \$2 million Police-Fire Academy at North Park, near Pittsburgh.

This 52 acre site will be used as a training facility for police officers and firemen from the county's 129 individual municipalities, according to Commission Chairman Leonard C. Staisey and Commissioner Thomas J. Foerster. Completion of the academy, Mr. Staisey said, is expected within 12 to 15 months.

It will contain special facilities to meet the requirements of both police and firemen. There will be a multipurpose auditorium, classrooms and administrative offices. Police officers will be able to take advantage of an indoor firearms range in the winter and an outdoor range in the summer. Firemen will be able to update firefighting techniques through the use of a 100,000 gallon water tank, a 1,000 gallon-per-minute pump house and a 4-story fire tower.

The best equipment and training facilities in the world are useless, however, if they are not properly utilized. But, Mr. Staisey and Mr. Foerster have assured the citizens of Allegheny County that competent and highly qualified instructors will be selected to staff the academy's training faculty. For instance, Mr. Speaker, the director for the police academy is James W. Slusser, a career law enforcement officer who compiled an enviable record as the former superintendent of police for the city of Pittsburgh. No director has been chosen for the fire academy as yet, but the commissioners have said he will be of equally high caliber as Mr. Slusser.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has a stake in this ambitious and vital undertaking on the part of Allegheny County's commissioners. It is contributing \$719,000 toward the cost of providing the police and firemen with the best in education and training in their respective fields. The State of Pennsylvania is adding another \$323,000, and it is my understanding supplemental grants will be available as work on the academy progresses.

This is one expenditure, I believe, which reflects with great credit upon the Federal, State, and county governments. The need for such a joint facility is without question. It has long been advocated in Allegheny County and long forgotten. Now it is on the verge of becoming a reality and the parties responsible for it should be applauded for their foresight and initiative.

URBAN COALITION ROLE IN THE HEALTH FIELD

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the more one analyzes the problems faced by the cities of our Nation, the more one realizes that the roots of the difficulties are complex and interrelated. Substandard housing, high rates of unemployment, insufficient public services, and high incidence of crime are each symptoms of a deterioration in the quality of life, and each contributes to the others.

One of the most serious results of this process is that basic medical care is not available to residents of large parts of our major cities. The problem, unfortunately, is not limited to urban areas alone; severe medical shortages are suffered throughout our rural areas as well. Although fine hospitals and clinics exist, access to them is often difficult.

Nor are there sufficient numbers of private doctors to provide for all the residents of these areas who need medical care.

To make matters worse, living conditions are often not healthful, increasing the needs for health care above normal levels. Air and water pollution, crowded living conditions, inadequate waste disposal and the abundance of rats and other pests compound the problems normally to be expected when there are not enough doctors and nurses to go around.

If all our citizens are to have access to the medical care which our society is capable of providing, a concerted effort must be made by all. The Federal Government has a meaningful role to play, but the cooperation and initiative of the medical profession, hospital administrators, and citizens groups is vital to progress in this field.

The urban coalition has recently published a paper on the health problems of our cities which describes the nature of the problems perceptively and makes constructive suggestions as to how they might be approached. I recommend it to all concerned citizens and insert it in the RECORD at this time:

URBAN COALITION ROLE IN THE HEALTH FIELD BACKGROUND

While no one wants to be sick, among the desperate needs of the urban poor and disadvantaged, seeking good health, including practicing preventive medicine, will not be perceived as first priority. They find as more compelling needs, jobs, the opportunity to own a business, more educational opportu-

nity and better housing. But since without good health, daily functioning in holding jobs, running households, attending school and the like, is difficult, if not impossible, various kinds of health services are recognized by the poor as a necessary condition for them to function with any adequacy at work, at home and in their communities.

There is much evidence of the deplorable health status of the urban poor. "Poor" refers to all those families, including about 25 million individuals whose income falls below the commonly accepted government standard that would provide adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care. The disproportionate prevalence of ill-health among the poor, minority and disadvantaged groups is shown in many ways:

Death comes earlier to the poor. Life expectancy for the non-white is 7 years less than for the white.

Death is a more frequent visitor to poor mothers and infants. Non-white mothers die in childbirth 4 times as frequently as white mothers. Infant mortality is twice as high among the non-white as among the white.

Illness is twice as frequent among families with annual incomes of \$2,000 or less. There is 4 times as much chronic illness among these families, twice the number of days of restricted activity, a third longer hospitalization.

Tuberculosis and cancer of the cervix is found twice as often among non-white urban residents as among the white.

Visits to doctors and dentists, despite the obvious greater need, are less frequent among the urban poor. Children under age 15 average half the doctor visits in families with incomes under \$2000 compared with children of the same age in more affluent families.

Preventive services are not received by the same proportion of poor children as they are by the more affluent. Only 8.6% of white children have no immunizations compared with 22.5% of non-white children.

Existing health services delivery systems do not reach all of the urban poor. Medical care is generally provided in clinics where available, generally overcrowded, at inconvenient hours, understaffed, and run as categorical units; i.e., diabetes clinic, heart clinic, arthritis clinic. Care is episodic, focused on emergencies rather than continuous and comprehensive, with little if any attention to preventive services, or health education. There is little or no effort to reach those who need care, but lack motivation. There is little if any follow-up, coordinated control intake, or referral procedures.

Where private doctors' offices are the source of care, high costs deny needed services to many. While Title XIX (Medicaid) has been in effect for a number of years, not every state has yet participated, and even where the states have, legislative ceilings both Federal and state have imposed stern limitations. Less than 9 million people altogether in the country are covered and able to take advantage of the program. This means that for the other millions of the poor, the doctor's bill may strongly deter their seeking care.

In addition, the clinics and doctors' offices are not available to all. Many inner-city neighborhoods are far from where hospital clinics were set up a generation or more ago, doctors have moved to the more affluent suburbs; public transportation from many

¹ Of an estimated 45 million poor people, half live in large metropolitan areas. Another 25% of this total live in concentrations of population but non-metropolitan areas. Our primary concern is with the improvement of the health services in the cities that serve at least 25 million Americans.

of the innercity neighborhoods is lacking, insufficient or expensive. The shortage of health manpower generally is well known, and the shortages of physicians and nurses, and other health personnel have been well publicized.

The problem of accessibility of health care facilities is compounded in those instances where governmental and private agencies and institutions have failed to reorganize to meet the personal health needs of the poor. In addition to the fact that facilities are often absent, obsolete, or obsolescent, inadequate in scope of service or availability temporarily or geographically, emergency services are difficult to obtain, inadequately staffed, qualitatively inadequate.

Environmental health needs are only minimally met. The problems of air and water pollution are largely ignored. More personal environmental needs such as damp, cold crowded housing are widespread among the poor. Garbage and waste disposal is inadequately supplied. Rats abound, as do other pests. Most of such conditions result from failures of local policing and supervision.

Federal aid does not serve local health agencies effectively. For the past five years, a spate of Federal legislation has been enacted and the amounts spent by the Federal government in the health field have been tripled. At the same time, because of the multiplicity of funding sources and the complexity of approach, including the proliferation of planning bodies, local units were unable to take full or even partial advantage of the resources available. Furthermore, the new legislation looked to modification of the local organization and new methods for the delivery of health services that existing service agencies were completely unprepared to undertake.

Hunger and malnutrition can be both a concomitant to illness or a direct cause of it. Malnutrition is known to interfere with proper growth of the fetus in the mother during pregnancy, with the health of the pregnant woman, and is responsible in some degree for the higher maternal and infant death rates among the poor. Malnutrition is known to be associated with improper development of the growing child physically and mentally, and is responsible in part for the increased illness among the children of the poor, their learning difficulties in school, their later failure to find adequate employment and in adult life, their increased chronic illness.

Some 25 million people must be counted among the poor and the near-poor, yet nowhere near that number qualifies for, or lives in communities that operate, Food Assistance Programs. Only about 8 million actually receive food assistance, through commodity distribution or food stamp programs. Commodity distribution has been attacked as nutritionally inadequate, culturally unsuitable, and logistically impractical. Food stamp programs are hedged about with requirements of time and place and quantity of purchase reducing their coverage. School lunches are not free to million of children who cannot purchase them even where they are available. Some districts specifically exclude families on welfare from free school lunches for their children. Hundreds of counties where desperately poor people live have no food programs at all. A study of welfare food cash allowance in a report last year from HEW demonstrated its inadequacy even for the poorest of the poor who qualify for welfare aid; the food prices are based on 10-year old costs, or else the state and local welfare payment is only 18% or 50% of the state's own admitted level of need.

KEY ISSUES

The health of residents of the inner cities cannot be served by health programs alone. Education, including health education and

nutritional education, improved housing, more and better skill training, finding and retaining jobs, are integrally related needs. However, as already stated, significant and substantial progress must be made toward meeting each of these needs, but those ends will not be achieved unless simultaneously progress is made toward providing more adequate health services.

To achieve the progress that will better conditions in the cities and will reduce tensions in urban centers requires reassessment of responsibilities to be borne by the various elements involved in delivering medical care services:

What responsibilities can the private practitioners of medicine assume for improving the health of the urban poor?

a) For giving leadership through their professional organizations in the modifications required of medical practice to meet current needs? Of promoting group practice and more efficient and economical financing mechanisms?

b) For establishing offices accessible to the poor, and using non-professional aides from among the poor to serve the poor in these offices?

c) For reaching out to the needy, rather than passively waiting to serve?

What responsibilities must government assume for improving the health of the urban poor?

a) For establishing goals and priorities in health services that emphasize services to people rather than payment to providers?

b) For developing payment methods that minimize inflation and assist all needy individuals to meet the costs of essential medical care?

c) For development and distribution of resources such as trained health manpower, new and imaginative combinations of health workers, interrelated health facilities?

What responsibilities must hospitals and medical teaching centers assume for improving the health of the urban poor?

a) For developing a full spectrum of institutional services?

b) For modernizing educational opportunities to increase their productivity, and recruitment policies more applicable to the poor?

c) For outreach services and programs beyond their walls?

d) For continuing education?

What responsibilities should business assume for improving the health of the urban poor?

a) For eliminating air and water pollution?

b) For improving existing housing conditions?

c) For using their influence in board membership of voluntary and public agencies to facilitate needed change?

It has become increasingly clear that the absence of representatives of the community in the councils and committees that decide on policies, devise plans and programs and carry them out, is a serious flaw and probably contributes heavily to the failure or inadequacy of existing health programs. Priorities and allocation of resources cannot be appropriately assessed if not related to the community of discourse, as well as professional considerations. This is true of the poor, of all minority groups, and even more so where profound cultural and language differences exist. The involvement of poor whites and poor blacks is essential in decision making on health planning and programs, the involvement of Spanish speaking people in Mexican-American and Puerto Rican communities, the involvement of Indians in their areas of residence.

POSITIONS

The existence of the Urban Coalition is based on the belief that concerned citizens wish to contribute to the process of changing

institutions where the evidence of their inadequacy in dealing fairly and justly with all citizens is demonstrable. The failures of the health service system to deal fairly and justly with the poor is demonstrable. Change in this system will require painful readjustment, but is long overdue. It will not be enough to recognize the defects in someone else's operation. Sacrifice of traditional modes of thought and behavior will be expected in one's own part of the whole. Recognition on the part of each element involved, of his own deficiency is basic to change. Professions will be asked to re-examine their patterns of practice, reimbursement, recruitment into training, and the training itself. Institutions will be asked to review the services rendered, the staffing relationships, the interaction with other institutions, independence and responsiveness to community need. Governments will be asked to investigate their allocation of funds, evaluation procedures, program decision making and coordination with non-public bodies. In every instance the expert must expect to be questioned by the "beneficiary," or his advocate, in this case the sufferer from the deficiencies of the system, and reply as to whether his action or position is to benefit his narrow interest or the larger goal.

Aware of prevailing health conditions in this country's metropolitan centers, and the drastic effect of these conditions on the quality of life in the inner cities, the Urban Coalition believes that:

1. *Efforts must be redoubled in each city to make it possible for all citizens to have access to modern medical care.* This will require that:

a) Each community, with the aid of Federal assistance for "comprehensive health planning," should diagnose available health resources and identify the areas and the groups for whom medical care services are most needed and least available;

b) Coordinate existing services so as to eliminate duplication and make more efficient use of resources;

c) Suggest programs where now lacking, or introduce transportation where required to offer access to health services;

d) Extend existing services, particularly making clinic services available at opportune times;

e) Involve community residents in planning and delivery of outreach services, particularly use of the poor in reaching the non-users of care.

While no single method or plan will fit all communities, no potential opportunity must be overlooked. More convenient clinic hours, better transportation, more facilities nationally interrelated, more efficient use of Federal and other public funds, more realistic use of staff available and production of necessary manpower locally should all be explored.

2. *Concentration on improvement of special programs with particular relevance to the needs of poor people.* Here action is needed on the part of all related health agencies to extend and improve prenatal care and infant care services, school health services, case-finding of handicapping conditions and coordination of health service to treat orthopedic handicaps, provide glasses and other appliances. Major emphasis must be to improve mental health services and community programs for care and rehabilitation of the mentally retarded and emotionally disabled, returning them to homes and jobs as quickly as possible. More home health care is urgently needed. Family planning efforts must be intensified.

For all health services related to children, for example, the school can be used as a center for identification of cases, provision of care, and community involvement in health care. This will require a new focus on the part of granting agencies, planning groups and health service agencies. However, the

school is where the children are, and where mothers can be reached. While the present turmoil in education might be prejudicial to adding this concern to the already complex discourse, it may also offer a ready-made vehicle for change in health services. It deserves serious consideration.

3. No child should go hungry. No adult should be without needed food. To ensure these ends will require:

a) Consolidation of local resources to eliminate hunger. Every community must have a supplemental food program, and a case-finding program to identify all families and individuals whose resources are insufficient to provide them with the minimum required basic standard nutrients;

b) Existing Federal aid should be utilized to the fullest. That will necessitate the sharing by governments in the administrative cost of stamps, commodities or free lunches and breakfasts, and nutrition education;

c) Private resources, in addition, should be sought and used where needed.

4. Environmental hazards and disease-producing agents must be eliminated. This requires that large-scale air pollution and waste disposal problems must be more vigorously attacked by public agencies. While more rigorous nationwide standards may be needed, private business can act to eliminate its contribution to pollution of the atmosphere. Much of the clean-up, rat control, garbage disposal and elimination of pests and nuisances that make the surroundings of life in poverty unpleasant and prone to added illness, can be dealt with through specialized manpower; housing aides for inspection, sanitation aides for education and clean-up.

5. Expand the essential supply of health manpower through interaction with local educational institutions and health service bodies. A great deal of the community work that needs to be done in taking care of the non-professional aspects of personal health care, such as home health aides, interpreters, new kinds of technicians, the elimination of environmental hazards and the case-finding aspects of nutrition and handicapping conditions, the educational aspects of health and nutrition can be carried on by specially trained local people. In addition, through community conferences with medical school leaders and schools of public health, the opportunities can be developed for increasing the supply of physicians, nurses and public health workers. This should apply particularly to the possibility of recruiting local poor and disadvantaged into these health careers.

In brief, the Coalition will strive to aid local communities:

To make the best possible use of existing resources;

To expand health services for mothers and children;

To intensify Federal efforts to assist local communities in improving their health facilities and services;

To eliminate barriers to access to adequate supplies of food;

To strengthen Federal programs designed to add health manpower to the pool available for service to residents in the inner cities;

To press for greater citizen participation in community health service decision making and operation.

Short-term, immediate objectives should include all local efforts to improve clinic services keeping in view the long-term objective of comprehensive group practice, prepaid, possibly through neighborhood health centers; developing realistically defined entry level job opportunities coupled with health career development opportunities; improved food distribution programs.

To achieve these goals, the Urban Coalition is developing and will shortly publish, a "B for Action," offering local coalitions a wide range of choices in various areas of ac-

tion to improve health services; technical assistance through publications that will aid in accomplishing the ends prescribed in the manual; and consultant services to stimulate local coalition health activities.

CARL ALBERT ADDRESSES NATIONAL WATERWAYS CONFERENCE

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pride that I listened to our majority leader, my friend and colleague, CARL ALBERT, deliver the closing address at the recent National Waterways Conference in Tulsa, Okla.

I can think of no other Member of this body who has worked harder or with greater dedication to make the dreams of the late Senator Kerr and others like him, come to fruition through work on the Arkansas River navigation project. In his remarks to this Conference of National Waterways leaders, CARL ALBERT pointed to the future when he stated:

What happens to the land, the woods and the water determines what happens to the people.

Mr. Speaker, this foresight and determination to develop our water resources have been the hallmarks of the great leadership CARL ALBERT has provided to this body for more than 20 years. I urge my colleagues to study the remarks of our majority leader, and feel sure they will agree that what he has said is a blueprint for progressive and prosperous development of our Nation. I include the text of Congressman ALBERT's address in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF HON. CARL ALBERT

Bob Kerr had a dream and he spent a fruitful lifetime working for its fulfillment. He believed that man's progress was inseparably tied to the unified development of nature's resources—to the development of land, wood, and water, as he so eloquently put it. He was particularly persuasive when he spoke of his hopes for this Arkansas Basin, of the products of farm and industry moving up and down the Arkansas and on into Oklahoma, "feeding lifeblood into the economy of America and the world." He spoke of the new cities and industrial centers to come "where today," he said, "only a shallow river huts and follows a shifting pathway to the sea."

How entirely fitting it is to have the National Waterways Conference meet with us here in Tulsa, near the headwaters of the Nation's newest inland waterway, the long awaited Arkansas-Verdigris Waterway. For in this region, Bob Kerr's dream of a developed river is at long last coming true.

Across our Nation today, there is mounting concern about economic growth and how best to allocate limited public funds to help achieve it. The country is beset by rising inflation on the one hand and mounting unemployment on the other. These are not just phrases from an economist's textbook. High costs of goods and under-utilized manpower are real. We can feel them; they touch our lives every day, and they hurt.

One of the strangest paradoxes arising out of the nationwide search for solutions to our economic woes is that, even today, there is only a beginning appreciation of the tremendous and lasting influence that water development projects can have upon economic growth. The multiplicity of benefits that such projects provide an entire region receives only limited recognition. The factors of interregional growth and the interregional cooperation which such growth fosters go virtually unappreciated, except by those who work in the water development field and are familiar with the results.

From the Danube to the Mississippi, the contribution of water transportation to the vitality of any region is a matter of historical record. Yet somehow men have always been shortsighted and skeptical about their life-giving rivers. It was just a little more than a century ago that many men scoffed at the idea of the steamboat plying the waters of the fractious Missouri. It was just a little more than a generation ago that learned scholars said flatly that pioneering proposals for multi-purpose development of the Tennessee River were a hopeless pipe dream that it was impossible to develop a major river for navigation, flood control, and power production.

All of us who enjoy the fruits of modern life today can thank the good Lord that, for every prophet of doom who predicted failure, there were other men with wisdom and foresight who said that these things could be done, that they would be done, and saw to it that they were done.

Last year, our country's waterborne commerce totaled 1.4 billion tons. Grain, petroleum, coal, iron and steel, and countless other products moved in huge volumes along our national waterways, comprising about one-sixth of the total ton-mileage of the Nation's intercity traffic. Yet there are still those who would stick the "pork barrel" label on every water project, who would deny the rights of free men to develop their resources wisely so that millions of lives might be improved.

Thus it was that many good men fought long and hard for the Arkansas waterway. Battles were waged, skirmishes were won and lost in the halls of Congress, and at the state and local level. But we never gave up. Navigation made Little Rock a port city in 1968 and did the same for Fort Smith in 1969. By the end of this year, the waterway will reach Tulsa's Port of Catoosa.

Look what has already happened. The first year the river was opened to Little Rock, it was anticipated that 700,000 tons of commerce would be transported. But when the figures were all tallied, the total commerce moved was 2½ million tons! Already, construction of new plants is underway throughout the lower Arkansas Valley. Private industry has announced plans to invest over \$700 million in new industrial starts or expansions.

This is obviously just a beginning. As the waterway stimulates new industrial growth, people will be needed to build and operate the new plants. That means new jobs. More housing and more trades and services will be needed. That means more new jobs.

My distinguished colleague in the House, Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, has estimated that there will be a \$20 billion growth in the Arkansas River Valley over the next two decades. He has stated that increased income to the Treasury from the increased income taxes paid by prosperous Valley citizens would pay back the Government's investment many times.

Can we really expect such results? We need look no farther than our neighboring regions to get the answer to that question.

The Ohio River system, which was built in the early part of this century to carry 13 million tons of commerce annually, today carries well over 100 million tons.

The Tennessee River, on which less than a million tons of commerce moved in the mid-thirties, recorded shipments last year exceeding 24 million tons of high value cargo. Shippers using the Tennessee waterway in 1969 saved about \$45 million, which is reflected in lower prices to consumers, greater earnings for businesses, and ultimately increased income for folks all across the country. Moreover, the Tennessee River experience shows that competition from water carriers stimulates other carriers in finding better ways of doing business at lower cost. For example, studies by the Tennessee Valley Authority have identified over 400 rail rate reductions which have been made to meet the waterway competition. TVA says the annual savings accruing to railroad customers as a result of these reduced rates more than equal the savings realized by the waterway shippers. Nearly \$2 billion worth of private industrial plants and terminals dot the shoreline of the Tennessee, providing direct employment for more than 37,000 people and at least an equal number of new jobs for people in trades and services. These figures are impressive, but TVA reports that the surface of potential progress has barely been scratched. More than 99 percent of the investment in waterfront plants along the Tennessee has been made since the navigation channel was completed a quarter century ago. For those interested in wise water resource development and the benefits it can provide, this fact is of paramount significance.

Again, the major point in any discussion of water development benefits is that they are so widespread as to be almost incalculable. Because of our developed waterways, new jobs are created; new investments help to create an upward spiraling economy; and countless products are available to consumers at lower costs because of the availability of low-cost barge transportation. Take note that we haven't even gotten into the fact that most major water projects are multiple-purpose projects, providing protection from devastating floods, storing water to supply growing communities, creating a source for low-cost electric power and a mecca for growing millions of outdoor recreation enthusiasts.

Here too, it is time for a national understanding of the tremendous social impact which water projects can have upon our country's future way of life. By the end of this century, if present trends continue, 85 percent of the Nation's people will be concentrated in urban areas. Many of them will be crowded together in gigantic clusters composed of extensions of today's already congested metropolitan areas—an accumulation of homes, roads, factories, power lines, and other facilities posing problems that will make solutions to today's environmental difficulties seem tame by comparison.

There is no simple solution to the problems of massive urbanization—housing and ghettoes, mass transportation, noise, garbage disposal, congestion, and all the others. But here is one solution that needs greater promotion and application: Waterfront plants are most often located in rural areas. These employment opportunities created by these plants are being filled in large part by people from the farms and nearby small towns.

Without the opportunities created by our waterways, the drain of people from the countryside to the cities in recent years undoubtedly would have been far greater. How much more of our urbanization problem could have been alleviated if waterway development had been pushed more aggressively in the past? How much can it contribute to better national planning for a decentralized pattern of growth and therefore aid in bringing real quality into the lives of our people in the future? Again, an example from the Tennessee River Valley: There,

studies show that more than 80 percent of the new manufacturing employment since 1966 occurred outside the major metropolitan areas of the region. People go where the jobs are. More importantly, if they are already there, they have the opportunity to stay at home. Navigation alone has not been responsible for decentralized growth in the Tennessee Valley, of course. But when you consider the impressive growth on this developed river, the presence of the waterway has obviously been a most significant factor.

A central theme of this convention has been to emphasize that the availability of low-cost water transportation, as part of multiple-purpose river development programs, provides a foundation for growth on a scale which could not otherwise occur. It has generated major industrial expansion along the country's navigable waterways, providing opportunity for private investment, creating good jobs at higher wages for many thousands of workers, and helping the consumer's dollar to stretch a little farther in these times when he needs all of the help he can get. In addition, as we have just discussed, the social benefits of waterway development may have far-reaching ramifications of greater and more lasting value than any we have previously experienced.

Yet in the full face of such benefits, we still have those who would deny our people the right to the greatest possible use of this development tool. Today, waterway tolls or "user charges" are proposed on the overly simplified premise that "beneficiaries of the waterway should pay its costs." I think our discussion shows that *everyone* in the United States, and I mean that quite literally, *everyone* benefits. Then how are you going to allocate the costs fairly? The end result of waterway user charges can be only this: The burden of cost is going to fall on the small farmer, the small businessman, the young man just out of school looking for a job and a better way of life, and, most of all, on the consumer through higher prices on the countless products he requires in this modern society.

Here in the Oklahoma-Arkansas area, the new waterway—even before its completion—has already led to a rail rate reduction of some 7 cents per bushel on wheat shipments to the Gulf Coast. This is a prime example of the value of waterways as a competitive transportation factor. But the primary point is that the Arkansas Valley farmer gets a little more for his wheat and, if we want to carry the story to the end of the line, the housewife pays a little less for her bread. Conceivably, a user charge would wipe out some or even all of this saving. We also can see that the rail rates moved back upward to adjust to the waterway user charge. The end result is a higher price for wheat products, eventually passed on to the poor consumer. Multiply this one example by the countless commodities transported on the Nation's waterways, and watch the inflationary spiral soar higher and higher.

Another reason often advanced for assessing tolls on waterway commerce is that such charges would tend to "equalize" competitive conditions between railroads and barge lines by requiring barges to pay for their first-of-its-kind costs as the railroads do. But proponents of this argument do not also urge the "equalizing" effect of requiring the railroads to establish joint rates and routes with water carriers as they do with one another. Nor do they deplore the railroads' refusal to move ex-barge traffic on the same basis which ex-rail traffic moves. This is a practice which, although technically subject to legal redress in some instances, requires such lengthy and expensive legal proceedings as to discourage the effort.

In short, waterways are performing a service to the people of the United States. Other transportation systems are doing likewise.

Let's not clip the wings of the goose that's laying our golden eggs. Rather than emasculating the effect of water transportation by levying tolls, it would be far better to strengthen and broaden the transportation network of this Nation by utilizing the power of government to establish a complete system of joint routes and rates so that shippers would have a full range of choices to meet their transportation needs.

Such action would clearly be in the consumer interest. It clearly would be in the national interest. This is not to deny the rights of private enterprise to fair profits. It is not inconsistent with the spirit of competition so vital to sustaining the American economy. In this modern computerized world, it is far from being a task beyond technological capability.

Surely, as this Nation approaches its 200th anniversary, government and industry—and the various competing segments of industry—have acquired enough maturity to sit down together and work for the common good of the country. This is a big and complex job. But as we discussed a few minutes ago, the country can no longer afford to wait in its planning for tomorrow. It's high time we got together and started to do something about our transportation needs on a national scale.

The need for joint effort to solve today's transportation problems takes on new urgency when you consider that the day has arrived when we can actually help create the industrial growth centers of tomorrow through our prudent decisions on transportation matters today. It has been demonstrated that where waterways intersect rail and highway routes a new transport flexibility is achieved which, in company with other assets such as water supply, power, raw materials, and available industrial sites, can have tremendous influence on industrial location.

Such transportation complexes provide new industries with great flexibility in getting raw materials and shipping finished products. Moreover, the economic competition between modes tends to make the whole transportation system more efficient and promotes lower costs for moving the Nation's goods.

The overall effect is to disperse industrial growth. Whereas industries otherwise might tend to congregate in present urban centers—multiplying the problems of metropolitan congestion—with the new growth centers, industrial expansion can be spread to the countryside. Employment and income gains help check migration to the cities.

With these obvious benefits, the well-planned creation of transportation complexes to speed economic growth, and spread it as widely as possible, should become a planned part of national policy.

This transportation complex idea has particular application along newly developing waterways, such as the Arkansas. In this river basin, we have excellent highway and rail connections with the waterway. We have prime land available for large-scale industrial development. We can profit from the mistakes and experiences of other regions. The Arkansas system taps a major portion of the American market, representing a large share of the purchasing power and productivity of our country.

This project is, in one sense, a memorial to the lifetime hopes, work, and dreams of many civic-minded people. The Corps of Engineers has done a magnificent engineering job. The Federal government will have an investment of some \$1.2 billion in the system.

Realizing the great return promised on this investment will require planning. It will require teamwork—at the local level, at the state level, at the national level. This is why joint efforts such as the Interstate committee appointed by the governors of Oklahoma,

Arkansas, and Kansas are so vital to successful development. Here the problems of water use, pollution control, industrial and recreational site preservation—all of the complex issues involving the rights of states, local communities, and individuals—can be resolved.

The proper husbandry of this created resource is a responsibility we must accept.

We must do so in such a manner that the benefits flow from the river throughout the valley and to its cities, to the hinterlands beyond, and to the total of our Nation by creating new and better opportunities for trade and commerce, for dispersal of job opportunities for those now imprisoned in the great overcrowded population centers, and for a better balanced and improved climate for living for all America.

This must be our objective, knowing full well that before this century ends the population of our country will top 300 million. The demand for food and fiber, for more goods and services of every kind, will require wise and prudent use of our expendable fuel, mineral and timber resources, more water of high quality, more of everything we possess.

In this respect, the Arkansas Valley is not unlike thousands of other valleys around the world. In this way they are the same: What happens to the land, the woods, and the water determines what happens to the people. Men are moving on the Ohio, the Columbia, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the mighty Mississippi, and across many other river valleys to assure a lasting, productive resource base for generations to come. I know I speak for the people of the Arkansas Basin when I say, we are proud that our developed river is ready to join in this quest for a better tomorrow.

POWER COPOUT AND AN EXPLANATION TO MRS. MARCOS

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on her recent visit to this country, the charming First Lady of the Philippines, Mrs. Imelda Marcos, expressed interest in familiarizing herself with the whys and wherefores of American electrification. And so a tour of a rural electric cooperative in Manassas, Va., was thoughtfully arranged for her by the White House.

An explanation and an apology for what happened thereafter are contained in a letter composed by the editor of the Rural Electric Newsletter and appearing in the September 25 issue of that publication. I include this composition, together with a related editorial broadcast by New York City's WCBS-TV on September 24, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

APOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Mrs. Imelda Marcos, these words are for you.

We of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association were honored to have you visit the Prince William Rural Electric Co-op in Manassas, Virginia, yesterday.

We sincerely hope that you enjoyed your visit to the co-op headquarters and later to the farm of Mr. and Mrs. William Kiline.

At times it was uncomfortably warm and stuffy in both places.

We wish to apologize for that—and to offer explanation.

Approximately one and a half hours before you and Mrs. Nixon helicoptered in from the White House, Mr. Reuben Hicks, the manager of the co-op, received a call from an official of the Virginia Electric & Power Company, the investor-owned electric company which supplies wholesale power to the Prince William system.

The VEPCO official told Mr. Hicks that due to a power shortage that day his company was cutting back its primary voltage by five percent and asking all consumers to turn off those electrical appliances that were not absolutely necessary. He asked Mr. Hicks to do the same.

Mr. Hicks did. As a result, if it was a bit stuffy in the Kiline farmhouse, that stuffiness occurred because some air conditioners were turned off and others were running at five percent less than the normal voltage.

Mrs. Marcos, as we listened to your questions we were charmed to find that you really and truly wanted to find out the hows and whys of electrification. Knowing that about you, we would like to give you a little background on the power situation in this country, in the hopes that you may be able to avoid similar problems in the Philippines.

The reason VEPCO and then the co-op cut back voltage and asked cut-off of non-essential appliances yesterday was a shortage of power that is becoming every day more prevalent across the United States.

Earlier in the day, while you were dining in the White House, our Northeastern United States were already suffering a power shortage. As a result, the Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO), which serves this capital city, had, by afternoon, begun wheeling power to New York and other northern coast areas.

But it was, as you remember, a notably hot and muggy day. By mid-afternoon companies in this area which had wheeled power to other areas in the morning, were buying power from other producers in other parts of the nation.

The fact is that we have insufficient power in this country. Until recently, it was only a summer problem. Now, with environmental considerations slowing down construction of new generating facilities, and with fuels to power present facilities in short supply, we will have a winter problem, too.

It is a sad situation, Mrs. Marcos, and you would be quite right to ask why it came to exist in a country so rich and scientifically advanced as ours. The answer—that is the primary answer—is: We have built our power industry on a creed of profits and not upon a belief in public service. Had it been otherwise, we would not have been forced to build the cooperative system. And we certainly would not have been subject to the recurring blackouts and brownouts that are becoming a part of American life.

Tragically, many people still do not understand this reason. The head of our Federal Power Commission has stated repeatedly that voluntary regional councils composed of privately-owned power producers are a part of, and have the necessary sense of public service to make sure that there will be always plentiful, reasonable, and reliable energy for our people.

That, as you may see in today's newspapers, is simply not the case.

Perhaps the most ironic event yesterday occurred in our Capitol Building itself. There the members of the House of Representatives, including the majority of Congressmen from New England, voted against money for a big Federal power dam (Dickey-Lincoln) which would have given our Northeastern states a crucially needed additional source of electricity.

But, Mrs. Marcos, the power companies of New England, privately-owned and eager to keep making profits even at the expense of public welfare, do not want a government

supplier of power in their area. Such a supplier would provide cheaper service and that would be embarrassing, and unprofitable, for the companies.

Between 1964 and 1968 these power companies have spent half a million dollars in efforts to fight off a government installation.

They have been successful. Our country has not.

We thank you for listening to us, and we wish you every success in electrifying your own lovely nation. May it escape the mistakes we have discussed here.

POWER COPOUT

On Tuesday, while many residents of eastern states were groping their way through brownouts of electric power, the House of Representatives was cleaning up routine business. Part of that business was to vote down the appropriation for the Dickey-Lincoln federal power project.

The Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in northern Maine was authorized back in 1965 to supply New England with peaking power—the kind of power especially suited to prevent the shortages that cause brownouts. Considering the power emergency on the east coast, you would expect Dickey-Lincoln to have wide support. Well, it does. It has been supported by the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon administrations, by the Federal Power Commission, by the Army Corps of Engineers and by private study groups.

But it has had one powerful source of opposition. That is the private utility companies in New England. These companies—which sell some of the most costly electricity in the country—oppose Dickey-Lincoln, saying New England's power supply should be left to the private enterprise system.

And to make sure that public power doesn't get into the act, 17 major private utilities in New England have organized to block Dickey-Lincoln, mounting what Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine has described as a vicious lobbying campaign.

Another Senator, Lee Metcalf, Democrat of Montana, recently learned from the FPC that these companies spent half a million dollars to influence public opinion against Dickey-Lincoln from 1964 through 1968, the period for which figures are available. And the cost of this publicity was carried on the companies' books as operating expenses, to be defrayed through the electricity bills paid by the consumer.

Well, Tuesday's vote in the House was proof that all this brainwashing and lobbying has paid off. Two hundred thirty-one Congressmen voted against the Dickey-Lincoln appropriation.

If the Dickey-Lincoln case is any example, Congress answer to the brownout is the copout.

CZECHOSLOVAK LANGUAGE NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER ENDS PUBLISHING CAREER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, with the publication of the last issue of the Czechoslovak language newspaper "Novy Domov," a fine, old gentleman newspaper publisher ended his publishing career. Walter Malec owned and edited "Novy Domov" for 40 years. Recently, he sold his interests in several English-language papers, but at 83, does not plan to retire from the newspaper field, but rather

hopes to devote more time to writing short editorials and continuing his important work in locating and bringing recognition to the early pioneering efforts in Texas. Walter Malec is one of the great journalists of your State. I would like to reprint the following article, which appeared in several Texas newspapers, outlining some of Mr. Malec's important crusades on the Texas scene:

MALEC ENDS PUBLICATION OF "NOVY DOMOV"
AFTER 40 YEARS

(By Chuck Schwartzkopf)

The successful integration into society of one of Texas' first "minority groups" was chronicled in Hallettsville recently when veteran newspaperman Walter Malec ceased publication of the state's leading Czechoslovak language newspaper, "Novy Domov", or "New Home".

Established in 1894 in Hallettsville "to adapt immigrants to their new surroundings without loss of their heritage or faith", the oldest Czechoslovak newspaper in Texas had served as the official organ of the Union of Czech Catholic Women of Texas (K.J.Z.T.) since 1897.

The weekly had been owned and edited since 1931 by Malec Publishing Co. who publishes the Tribune-Herald of Hallettsville and other English language papers in East Bernard and Moulton.

Malec sold his interests earlier this summer in English newspapers in Needville, Gansado and Yoakum, but gave the 2800 Novy Domov subscription list to "Katolik" published weekly by the Bohemian Benedictine Order at St. Procopius Abbey near Chicago, Illinois.

Fiercely editorials by Malec as early as the 1930's had given Novy Domov a reputation as one of the first "champions of the small farmer".

At his urging, 10,000 farmers gathered at Hallettsville in 1939 to form a short-lived "Small Farmers Association" dedicated to the promise, "The community and whole country stands or falls with the farmers."

Malec, who was born in Moravia, Czechoslovakia, and came to America at the age of 16, was an early critic of Communist Russia resulting in the paper's investigation for "un-American activities" at the end of World War II. The paper was exonerated and today it is seen how right Malec was. In recent years Publisher Malec had been assisted by Mrs. John (Julia Netardus) Urbish in the publication of the Novy Domov.

He recalls today, "It didn't matter to me because I have always told the people what they should know—regardless of whether they like it or not."

"We would have a better country today if there were more weekly newspapers that followed this rule," Malec believes.

Existing Malec publications still print a complete weekly report on courthouse records and legal action that seldom goes into print in most hometown newspapers.

The experienced crusading editor has never been sued, but reveals several threats have been made to his life during a long career of looking for corruption in both national and local governments.

He remembers walking home one night, years ago, "down the middle of a lonely Hallettsville street, with holstered gun at my side after receiving a threat to be killed if I printed a story on allegedly questionable courthouse dealings."

His leading role as historian and locator of the graves of early Texas heroes earned recognition from five gubernatorial administrations and the commendation of state and national legislative bodies.

A joint Texas House-Senate resolution credits Malec with first pointing out that Texas had never marked the graves of its San

Jacinto Battleground heroes. This fact was soon rectified through legislation that eventually led to the establishment of historical committees today in practically every Texas county.

Malec also pioneered physical fitness programs, organizing the Catholic Sokol, a national movement which had more than 30 clubs in Texas at one time.

He served as editor of the Czech gymnasts' official publication for 21 years.

Malec took his first vacation in forty years recently to visit a brother in Omaha, Nebraska.

On the eve of his 83rd birthday, September 3rd, he remains active and looks forward to being able to devote more time to his "short editorials" and campaign for pioneer recognition.

The Lavaca Co. Soil Conservation District recently honored Malec for his general contributions to agriculture and soil conservation.

"I never looked for public recognition," he comments with typical newspaper editor resignation.

He adds, "Just to do something that should be done has been my satisfaction."

Malec publications have been a family affair ever since Walter Malec came to Texas in 1931 with a family of seven children and only \$100 in his pocket.

His wife, Anna, worked at his side constantly until her death in 1965 at the age of 77.

A daughter, Anna, is Society Editor and bookkeeper for the 6,300 circulation Hallettsville Tribune-Herald which is edited by a son, Richard, who also is managing editor of the East Bernard Tribune at East Bernard. A daughter, Mrs. Lawrence Rothbauer, operates an intertype machine and assists with social news writing.

Mrs. L. T. Biehunko is assistant editor of the Moulton Eagle newspaper. Before her marriage, another daughter, Mrs. William Pearson of Austin worked on the Hallettsville and Yoakum papers published by Malec Publishing Co. A son, Joe, is a public relations consultant in Austin, but learned the newspaper and advertising profession at home and at the University of Texas.

THE GOOD LIFE

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by the distinguished scientist, Dr. Hardin B. Jones, professor of medical physics and physiology at the University of California, Berkeley. The speech, entitled "The Good Life," details Dr. Jones' theory of aging and presents many facts and observations to substantiate his hypothesis. A careful reading of Dr. Jones' remarks will yield much valuable information concerning the factors that contribute to a healthy and productive life. Thus, I commend Professor Jones' excellent work to the attention to this august body:

THE GOOD LIFE

(By Hardin B. Jones, Ph. D.)

"There is a wisdom in this, beyond the rules of physics: A man owns observation, what he finds good of, and what he finds hurt of, is for the best physique to preserve health . . . For strength of nature in youth passeth over many excesses, which are owing

to a man till his age. Discern the coming on of yeares, and thinke not, to doe the same things still; for age will not be defied . . . Examine thy customes, of diet, sleepe, exercise, apparell, and the like; and trie in any thing, thou shalt judge hurtful, to discontinue it by little and little . . ."—Francis Bacon, 1625.

Thousand-year-old sequoias tower above us here and show us the relatively eternal vitality and beauty of their kind of life. In contrast, the generation cycle of man begins with the bloom and inexperience of youth and gradually develops into the mature resources of men as they become increasingly decrepit. This cycle of health is important and must be borne by all. Yet the duration of each generation cycle is determined by the vigor of life and depends upon how that cycle is managed. That is the topic today: The Good Life.

How can we acquire wisdom in the sense of strengthening health and delaying the onset of the degenerative disorders?

There are some amazing contrasts. Let us imagine we were here in 1900. Our adult life expectancies would be a few years less. Our oldsters would be fewer and, less vigorous; they would be shorter, more diseased, and more exposed to experience of disease. Most of us would have the scars of tuberculosis, ravages brought on by the lack of the B and C vitamins; the combinations of gout, rheumatism, bad teeth, and boils; tendency to diarrhea, and to bladder and kidney stones; and other afflictions. In spite of all this burden, life expectancy of the seventy-year-old would be only three years shorter than it is today and health would be twenty-five per cent less vigorous. But in regard to infants in 1900, life expectancy would be twenty years shorter than today's. Many died in childbirth. This is no longer the case, but also many conditions that brought poor health to our generation were consequent to the more prevalent and more severe diseases of our childhood. Children surviving encounters with disease grew to adult life with a burden of poor health; the secondary disorders related to childhood diseases continued to impair health on into adult life.

All of my life, I have been examining the causes of diseases. I have looked systematically into as many records relating to this process as I could find, such as the vital statistics by state, city, and country. In a few instances, interesting records are available representing an extraordinary span of time. In Scandinavia during a visit fifteen years ago, I found that vital statistics records for both Sweden and Denmark extended back in a useful way nearly three hundred years. I used this compilation of information to show that there was a major relationship between the level of childhood diseases and later adult health. This century's unique low level of childhood diseases has added, by my estimate, fifteen years of youthful life to the life expectancy of the adult population of Europe and probably nearly as much gain for us, the United States.

I was able to explain by way of my theory of aging that each disease experience sets the health a little bit lower and makes the next disease experience somewhat more probable. The sum of all the disease experiences predicts the overall risk of the final disease in life.

A part of my hypothesis accounts for the fact that risk of degenerative diseases increases multiplicatively throughout life. In a population of young adults at a certain age, the level of the probability of occurrence of the degenerative diseases is low; during the next eight years, the risk of these diseases increases so that the number of degenerative diseases in the same population would have doubled by the end of that time; and in another eight years the risks would have doubled again, etc. Degenerative diseases

cause most deaths and they reflect the depletion of body vigor brought on by aging.

The animals that live less long than man age in the same pattern, but their rate of aging is faster. For example, the horse doubles his risk of degenerative disease in four years; in the cow the doubling time is but three and a half years; and the doubling time in the chicken, the cat, and the dog is approximately two to three years. In the mouse the doubling time is three months, and in the fly, a day. So the members of the animal kingdom all have the same general characteristics: the risks of degenerative diseases increase with age exponentially; for man this amounts to approximately a twelve per cent annual increase in tendency to be diseased by a new affliction. All humans seem to show the same tendency to have the level of average impairment increase at the same exponential rate. The large systematic differences between populations, which I uncovered through the theory of aging, are apparently the consequence of different burdens of disease of environmental origin.

The facts about health and disease fit well into my theory of aging. Understandable causal events underline the degenerative diseases. My theory of aging is nothing more than this, and in this light the theory is not new. All astute men have known, in some instances for thousands of years, that dissipation of vigor leads to illness. We now understand most of the immediate causes preceding degenerative diseases. The theory has had many practical applications with regard to preserving health and preventing diseases such as cancer, heart attacks, and strokes. One of the stumbling blocks, however, was that, while Sweden fit quite well into the theory for statistics up to 1900, with ever lower levels of degenerative diseases, after 1900 there was a peculiar absence of multiplicative increase in death risks with increasing age. If we follow the Swedish population by individuals who were born in the same year, then since 1900 individuals arriving at the adult ages show no tendency to have the degenerative disease risk increase multiplicatively. Each newly born cohort of Swedes achieved a lower death risk and maintained that low death risk without showing multiplicative increase in death risk.

Extrapolation of this trend led to the supposition that young Swedes are going to live an extraordinarily long time. They reached as low a risk as one chance of dying per thousand including accidents and suicides, with no tendency for the death risk to increase. The statistical inference projected that these individuals would live approximately one thousand years, so that I was in a relatively awkward circumstance of having my theory of aging predict an unbelievable inference that the Swedes might live to be as old as Methuselah of Biblical times.

Intuitively, I had to reject this kind of conclusion, and it cast some doubt on my theory of aging. I stated that I believed the death risk would again increase after some lapse of time, but that I could not tell how long the lapse might be. Each year as more new information has come from the Swedish Office of Vital Statistics, I have been plotting out the trend. During the first twelve years following my discovery of the non-aging of the Swedes, the adult death risks continued to show no increase with aging. But in 1965 there was again a multiplicative upward trend, but from the low mortality risk already gained. Now all the adults in Sweden over age thirty are showing again a multiplicative increase in death risk. A third of those now in their early thirties will live to be at least a hundred years old. The adults under thirty apparently are still gaining more life expectancy through a still improving hygiene than they are losing because of natural aging.

The resultant of the two forces causes the death risk to remain constant.

An earlier trend of this sort is now observable in the statistical records of the country of Cyprus. This island, essentially tropical in climatic conditions, has gained over the past fifty years even more remarkable progress to good health than Scandinavia. I believe this is also due to the application of the germ theory of disease. Infectious disease has declined in Cyprus even below the Scandinavian countries. The risk of dying from degenerative diseases is the least known in any segment of human population.

By extrapolating Swedish life tables, assuming that they will follow the pattern now evident in Cyprus, the Swedes will have a life expectancy for the generation now under thirty of approximately eighty-five in the male and ninety-five in the female. This means a tremendous extension of life relative to what we have known it in the West.

To illustrate the remarkable range of difference in useful life now apparent between countries, I present a comparison of life expectancy relative to the United States, calculated for males at age 50. In the United States: men have a life expectancy at fifty of approximately twenty years. Finland has a life expectancy two years shorter than the United States, so this would be an expectancy at fifty of eighteen. The comparison is:

Finland	-----	-2.0
Mexico	-----	-0.2
United States	-----	0
Australia	-----	+1.5
Canada	-----	+3
Portugal	-----	+4
Netherlands	-----	+5
Denmark	-----	+6
Norway	-----	+7
Sweden	-----	+8
Iceland	-----	+9
Cyprus	-----	+13

Why does our country have such poor health? I don't think that the United States has been cheated of the benefits to our children from having less ravages from childhood diseases, even though childhood diseases are still not quite as reduced as in the Scandinavian countries. These diseases have been going down all the while, and they surely will go down more in the near future. Our proximity to Mexico is possibly one reason for residual epidemics of measles, mumps, and chicken pox, etc.

But I think we have poor health as adults largely because we have taken on many evils in our way of life that are not good for us. For example, those who smoke a package of cigarettes a day have decreased their life expectancy by eight to nine years. This was one of my first discoveries in applying my theory of aging. Those who smoke have more degenerative disease because they age from a high level of disturbed bodily functions—artificially induced by smoking. Also, the years of life they can expect to live are less useful to them than in the case of non-smokers. The person who smokes a pack a day lives his life with half the vigor he would have had, and the life is reduced by eight years. The loss in life span is, therefore, from youthful, useful life, old age simply comes sooner. The smoker not only has more chronic diseases, he has more cancer, more heart attacks, more strokes, because he has exposed himself to severe physiological disturbances.

Another prevalent problem in the United States is with overweight. Every pound overweight costs us a month of life expectancy and about one per cent loss in vigor. Twelve pounds of overweight is a year less useful life, and ten per cent loss in vigor. There is now a measurable trend, especially in our young people, to eat foods less inclined to produce overweight. In a few generations this prob-

lem can disappear altogether as eating patterns are corrected to need.

Most of us don't get enough exercise; degenerative diseases can be induced because various parts become flabby from lack of use. This applies to muscles, joints, the heart, arteries, and to the organs and endocrine glands. Many individually appropriate schedules of exercise are available and likely to be helpful. It's not too late, as long as you're not already affected by overt disease. Exercise tolerance must be built up gradually and in the case of adults long inactive, advice of physicians should be sought.

Often a person may say: "I don't have to worry because I come from long-lived ancestors." That is not strictly the situation because environmental factors, variable by choice, are usually ten to forty times greater than genetic inheritance of good or bad health.

Many of the improvements to life have been the result of broad applications of public health policies, for example, sanitation. The discovery of the germ theory of disease as applied by Florence Nightingale, Louis Pasteur, and Queen Victoria a century ago led to Victorian hygiene: Wash your hands after toileting and before eating or handling food; don't spit or cough openly; sterilize food; etc. All this led to a measurable decline in infectious diseases because the spread of germs was less. Tuberculosis, for example, declined, reducing the prevalence of active cases by half each generation beginning with the application of Victorian hygiene; now it is a rare disease. Many diseases simply disappeared without trace and without other remedy, because the lessened contagion could not maintain sources of the infections.

I'm very much interested in reducing exposure to all cancer-causing substances, not to an impractical zero, but to very low levels. I initiated much of this trend to reduce carcinogens. This means advice against smoked products and smoking. Much of the adverse effect of cigarette smoking is brought about because individuals inhale into their lungs, and consequently take into their bodies fairly large quantities of powerful cancer-inducing substances. I recently reviewed all the evidence that I could find, as I have been doing for the past twenty-five years, on the quantitative relationship between all the carcinogens and cancer. The relationships are so strong and the conclusions so evident that I believe all cancers we see in animals and humans have been caused by them, without need to propose exceptions. The risk of getting cancer is proportional to the exposure to carcinogens. Even if we accumulate small risks, those small risks act over a long period of time. If that small risk acts on a very large population base, the yield of cancers may be evident even though any one person has no appreciable risk. If the exposure is more, the risk is higher, and the ultimate appearance of cancer in the population is proportionately higher. Such risks in any one person may seem very small, but if you happen to be the one who gets the cancer, the situation is nonetheless catastrophic. Cancer-causing substances can be eliminated, and, by reducing exposures to them, we may be able to eradicate a disease which we cannot cure. This principle applies to most degenerative disorders; each has causative factors, equated to poor hygiene, and the risk of that degenerative disease can be reduced, often greatly, by sensible electives in ways of living.

My study of cardiovascular disease showed that there are reductions of blood supply brought on by aging and more so in those who are physically inactive. We were able to understand how excess animal fat and carbohydrate in diet, overweight, lack of exercise, smoking, high blood pressure, and certain metabolic diseases bring about the changes in the walls of arteries that restrict the flow of blood and trigger the blocking

of blood flow in the coronary artery in heart attacks. These same conditions can affect any of the other arteries, too; when these disorders affect the arteries of the brain, the end change is a stroke. All of the information about cause of cardiovascular disease is not in by any means, but in our work at Donner Laboratory over the past twenty years, we have identified some important causative relationships. The most widely known of these is that animal fats in general lead to elevation of the blood cholesterol, replacing animal fats with the unsaturated vegetable oils efficiently reduces the level of blood cholesterol. It appears that the recent popular response to these findings so as to lessen the intake of animal fats and to increase the amount of unsaturated vegetable fats is decreasing the level of cardiovascular disease.

Some of this improvement is likely also to be the result of the similar trend to reduce the intake of carbohydrates resulting in less obesity and in lowering of blood pressure. Both exercise and dietary corrections are linked to lessening cardiovascular disease. Exercise not only stimulates the cardiovascular system, it balances energy cycles within the body and is a benefit to organ and endocrine function in addition to the obvious conditioning of the muscles and connective tissues. Decrease in cardiovascular disease is a pronounced trend in young adults but not for the population at large in older adults. This probably means that most older persons are not taking advantage of the new hygiene information. In selected subgroups of older adults who do follow these principles, improvement in health and decrease in disease risk has been evident. Physical fitness lessens the chance of impairment of the cardiovascular system in many ways. It also improves the sense of physical well-being, and it is the only way to augment sexual capacity by physiologic means.

As we gain insight into the ways of life that may make life longer, without exception they are also the conditions that make health better because the working parts of the body stay in better condition. All the degenerative diseases occur because of understandable causative events, and most of those events can be decreased markedly by making sensible choices of a way of life. This is why I have urged so strongly that if this information is understood, appreciated and used by people their lives can be extended, useful life gained, and a better basis of greater happiness and vigor established.

When I began to study the process of aging in populations, I thought that the common pattern of multiplicative increase in sickness and fatal disease with increase in adult age reflects, on the average, many little steps to health failures. Some such gradual changes do occur; as, for example, the gradual recession of the focus of the eyes and the gradual graying of hair. But I have found much important evidence showing that an individual's health is constant for long stretches of adult life, and the failures of function are likely to come in successive steps following metabolic upsets, each upset accentuating other failures of function, and all essentially triggered by episodes of physiological burdens exhausting the functional reserves. One of the obvious benefits of exercise is that it builds functional reserves well above the sedentary state.

When we are burdened from anxiety, exhaustion, infection, or trauma, the cardiovascular system and various body parts can be forced into sustained work sufficient to exhaust reserves and even to induce new functional failures. Thus in the latter part of adult life there is often a succession of difficulties following an upset. Most individuals who are in good health apparently show very little aging change on a month-to-month or year-to-year basis. More and more individuals are able to reach what was called

old age—sixties, seventies, and eighties—still in relatively youthful or vigorous condition. Hair may be white but bodies can be strong and unaged, still capable of physical work, satisfaction, and clear mental activities.

There is still a myth that mental activity invariably decreases rapidly throughout adult life, as a consequence of aging. Textbooks in psychology and education are full of graphs showing progressive loss of mental skills after age twenty. I hold that this is not caused by aging but by inactivity. The spread of scores for such tests increases and the deduction is that the adult population is a mixture of at least two types of persons: the more prevalent type has a narrow perception of events and lives essentially in more and more isolation; he progressively forgets what he learned in the earlier period of life when he was being educated. The other smaller segment of the population stays informed, alert, learning more and more all the while, and, indeed, becoming mentally keener as life goes on. The lesson is quite obvious: Stay alert and keep active, interested, and useful.

My pattern in study of health and aging has been to rely on quantitative data derived almost exclusively from the physical sciences technique. These methods are accurate, but not always applicable to the important behavioral aspects of health. These matters can be entirely abstract; certainly they are more difficult to define, less measurable, and are more often involved in quarrelsome controversy. But they are surely important. After thirty years of study of health, I conclude the heaviest burdens of disease are not cancer and cardiovascular disease, tragic as they may be. There are the much more prevalent disorders in society that affect behavior and often blight lives for a longer span of time. Anxiety, sadness, loneliness, and irrationality are perhaps the worst plagues of society. In the way I refer here to these problems, they are not related to economic circumstances, and any improvement in the outlook will depend upon a common sense, which is to say, adherence to moral and spiritual principles.

There are gains and risks from use of alcohol. In moderate drinking, alcohol has mild transitory effects: slowing of the nervous system and inducing relaxation. The psychological effects at this level bring pleasurable relief from tension to most persons. Such uses also account for tens of thousands of deaths per year on our highways. This is because alcohol uses up the safety reserve of fast response time needed in tight situations. The other major problem with alcohol is that some of those who use it for relaxation graduate to heavy drinking. About fifty thousand deaths occur each year because of liver damage from alcoholism in the United States.

Dividing the quantity of alcohol sold in this country by the number of persons over eighteen gives an estimated consumption equivalent to six gallons of whiskey per person per year. Since most persons consume little or no alcohol, the drinking minority is quite busy and the frank alcoholics are a common burden. My effort to understand the reasons for drinking lead me to believe that most persons take alcohol to unwind from mental tension at the end of the work day. The brain activity increases progressively during the work day, and after work, a person doesn't want to stay mentally tense. But it isn't easy to relax if a person hasn't learned how; alcohol provides a key for relaxation. It induces relaxation directly and indirectly. The indirect mechanisms are particularly important because they induce such responses in the inner workings of the brain through the autonomic nervous system whose compliance is needed to bring about changes in mood. In this case, the change from action to quiet relaxation. We could, do not, and should give training in the control of

mood through mental effort so as to achieve better control over mood through the autonomic nervous system. Such controls over sleep, relaxation, and anger are as important as the learning of control of the bladder and bowel through the autonomic nervous system. We could learn much more. It is altogether too easy to become conditioned so that alcohol or other drugs are the only means to evoke compliance from this part of the nervous system. Witness the common sequences of stimulants and relaxants: coffee, tobacco, alcohol, aspirin, tranquilizers, diet and pep pills, etc. These aids can be a blessing, but they are better reserved as infrequent supplements to naturally learned control over mood.

Twelve years ago I became aware of the beginning of a tide of irrational behavior in society, seemingly caused by misunderstanding of the very information which could instead comfort and assure those misled to emotional responses. I have studied this social phenomenon as controversy. At the hub of each controversy there is an inversion between facts and conclusions. As the controversies have grown recently, they have taken the form of social unrest, approximating the mental illness of mass hysteria. This tide of irrationality is still increasing; it could surpass all other contributions to ill health, since false conclusions generate emotional response and spread far more rapidly than accurate information.

Drug abuse is a part of the tide of irrationality. A year ago, I predicted that there would be an epidemic of heroin addiction. At that time this was only evident from my measurement of the trend; it was not evident to the public. Now we have only to pick up any newspaper to realize that the leading cause of death among young people in every city in the United States is heroin overdose. Drug addiction has become the disease of the young. The morally strong are much less susceptible, but those following the paths of drug use lose the will to resist and become progressively involved with increased exposure to drugs. This newest crisis of irrationality needs our attention urgently.

In the overall matters of health and life expectancy, I am an optimist. I see the great benefits that have been brought to our children, largely because the childhood diseases have been reduced. Even more can be accomplished, such as reducing the remainder of infectious diseases, which, although not often fatal, undoubtedly have long-term harmful consequences to health. The present crop of youngsters gained the best health the world has ever known. We can still expect to gain in this direction, perhaps as much again for the next few generations as during the past century of spectacular improvement in health.

I conclude by returning our attention to the vigor derived from sound decisions in choice of life style. Personal health and social health are interrelated aspects of these choices. The statement: "We spend our time in worthwhile ways" has multiple implications, but the fundamental inference is that great and healthful life are the same and from the same source—The Good Life.

July 18, 1970.

DRUG ABUSE CONTROL ACT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I commented briefly on some of the more significant aspects regarding the human and social cost of

drug abuse. This afternoon I would like to turn my attention to what the Federal Government is doing to combat the problem and then discuss briefly two of the more controversial sections of the Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

By all indications, the Federal Government has taken a far more active role in combating drug abuse during the Nixon administration than it has in recent years. The Justice Department has instituted special strike forces which have cracked down on drug peddlers and broken nationwide narcotics rings. As a result, organized crime is starting to feel the crush of effectively organized and effectively focused Federal law enforcement activity. The Treasury Department has increased the numbers and upgraded the practices of Bureau of Customs officials charged with policing our Nation's borders against smuggling. The significance of this action can hardly be overstated, because so much of our drug problems exist because narcotics are smuggled into the country. Take heroin, for example. Although heroin is not legally manufactured domestically, and although it is not legally imported, it accounts for more than 90 percent of all narcotic addiction in the United States. Consider then the extent of the smuggling problem when it is estimated that it takes 2 to 3 tons of heroin per year to supply the needs of all those addicted to it in this country. Incidentally, most of the marijuana and all of the hashish consumed by drug abusers is illicitly introduced into the United States, as well. The State Department is actively exploring the possibilities of concluding new international agreements to deter the flow of drugs from drug-producing areas of the world to the United States. And new forms of international cooperation such as the joint United States-Mexico effort to curtail drug smuggling across our common southwestern border are bearing positive results.

One thing is obvious, though, the illegal narcotics traffic flourishing in the United States today is a monument to the failure of existing drug laws. Existing laws are clearly inadequate to control much less stop the mounting drug abuse problem. This then is why so much critical attention needs to be paid to the drug legislation pending before the House. What we need is not change in the laws for change's sake, we need effective change.

As I see it, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 has three broad objectives: First, to deter drug abuse more effectively through a revision of the present Federal law enforcement aspects of drug abuse prevention and control and through better educational programs. Second, to provide improved treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers and an active program of education. Third, to encourage research into the causes of drug abuse and provide a better understanding of the psychological and physiological effects certain drugs have on human beings.

In my judgment, this bill is designed to

provide a vehicle for effective law enforcement and to provide needed regulatory controls over the illicit use and misuse of drugs. I consider this the ultimate objective of the bill. The drug problem that is with us now, and will probably be with us in the future, is a very dangerous one. I believe Congress has a responsibility to the American people to act with dispatch on this issue and provide law enforcement officials with what they need to combat this problem. It is in this context that I would like to comment on two of the more controversial features of the bill; the so-called no-knock provision, and the question of who should make the final determination to bring a drug under control.

In my view no-knock is not a sinister means of providing policemen with the legal right to act like gestapo agents. Many people have been led to believe that if no-knock were to become law, their home would be subject to being invaded any time at the whim of a police officer. Actually, in legal terms a search warrant has always required a showing by the applicant and a decision by a court that such extraordinary authority is required to enforce the law. The only difference with this traditional approach is that under no-knock the applicant has to show, if he can, that the alleged offender will destroy vital evidence if polite exchanges or a warning is given in advance of the officer's entry. Or in the alternative, the applicant for a no-knock warrant must show that lives will be endangered if the warrant is not granted. In either event, though, police officers entering a dwelling under a no-knock warrant must identify themselves and their mission upon entry.

I have difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in viewing this authority as a threat to the safety of the law-abiding citizen or a threat to the security of his home. No-knock has become an emotional issue. And a great deal of this emotion has been generated by those who sympathize either openly or tacitly with the drug users. The House should reject this type of obstructionism and get about the business of putting an end to the illicit traffic in drugs.

A great deal of debate has also occurred over who should make the final determination to bring a drug under control. Representatives of the medical and scientific community in particular have expressed some doubts regarding granting the Attorney General authority to make final decisions on which drugs should be controlled. It should be made clear that this concern has been recognized and accommodated by appropriate language in the bill which requires the Attorney General to seek the advice of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on drug control questions. This same language makes the Secretary's advice with respect to medical and scientific issues binding on the Attorney General. In this fashion I feel the bill makes a realistic balance between the interests of science and the interests of law enforcement on this issue.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to be a solid and

workable piece of legislation. Moreover, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the 91st Congress. I say one of the most important because the problem of drug abuse strikes at the very core of our society and our way of life. It must be rooted out and eradicated, and quickly. The well-being of a whole generation of Americans hangs in the balance.

THANKS TO OUR COMPETENT
POLICE

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. Speaker, in these tumultuous times when there is so much unwarranted criticism of the men in our community police forces who risk their lives, day and night, to protect the personal safety and property of their fellow citizens, I believe that we are obliged, more than ever, to take the time to praise our policemen whenever the occasion merits it. Let us vividly remember that, by far, the very great majority of policemen are honorable and competent in the performance of the most dangerous job in America today and it is well, therefore, to give them, their gallant wives, and children every reasonable encouragement and rightful support. For that purpose I would like to include an editorial from the Framingham-Natick, Mass., News, issue of Wednesday, September 30, 1970, describing the most creditable performance of our area police in the capture, without endangering the public safety, of a person suspected of participating in a Boston bank robbery in which a policeman was killed.

The article follows:

ALL CREDIT TO THE POLICE

In a day when they're known among the radical rabble as "pigs," a well-deserved word for the police is in order.

We're referring to the capture just outside a school in a crowded Worcester square without so much as one person hurt of William Gilday, the elusive suspect in the Brighton bank holdup.

It was State Police Sgt. Thomas H. Peterson of 711 Potter Rd., Framingham, who displayed a shrewdness that led to the capture.

On the Massachusetts Turnpike he spotted a station wagon that appeared to contain Gilday and followed it in his unmarked car. When he found his two-way radio was out, he passed the word along to police through the toll collector at the Millbury turnoff and then commandeered a turnpike truck with a radio to help police keep in touch.

But the skill with which State Trooper Robert Long and Worcester Patrolman Charles Moriarty handled the cutoff in crowded Billings Square deserves credit from an anxious public.

Moriarty's quick cutoff of the suspect's wagon and Long's swift lunge for the door with gun drawn gave the wanted occupant no chance to fight it out.

Even before the dramatic finale, police judgment entered into the affair: a call was put through to the school not to let any of the children out for the noon recess until notified that all was clear. Every concern was given for the public's safety, as well as that of the hostages and the police.

Well, that's the way we expect the police to act. And that is the way in which police work is carried out more often than not.

By contrast, just consider the indifference once again of the Mad Bombers of the Wisconsin campus who murdered an innocent father of three because he happened to be in the building they had decided to bomb as a warning to the rest of us that we'd better shape up.

It was not surprising, therefore, to hear the cries at Boston's Berkeley Street police headquarters of those who shouted "Free Gilday!" They are as much the kooks as those who shouted "Kill Gilday!"

There is a lot to be said for Sgt. Peterson, Trooper Long, Patrolman Moriarty and their superiors for the overall performance in bringing in a man who was not afraid to terrorize unarmed civilians.

We hope that the public will not forget to say thanks.

WING OF EXPECTATION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1898 attempts have been made to refurbish the Peterson House, or the House Where Lincoln Died.

On May 14 and 15, 1970, the Kentucky Society of Washington, with the cooperation of other interested individuals and organizations, cosponsored the benefit performance of "Wings of Expectation" in its premiere presentation at the Ford's Theatre. More than \$2,000 will be donated to the National Park Service toward renovation of the House Where Lincoln Died.

I enclose for the information of Members of this House an account of the achievement by these people who are interested in preserving this historical site:

MARY TODD LINCOLN OPERA

BENEFIT COMMITTEE,

Washington, D.C., September 22, 1970.

DEAR FELLOW KENTUCKIANS: One of the greatest achievements of the Kentucky Society of Washington in recent years was the premiere presentation of the Mary Todd Lincoln Opera, "Wings of Expectation", at the historic Ford's Theatre in Washington, D.C., on May 14th and 15th under the gracious patronage of Mrs. Richard M. Nixon and Mrs. Spiro T. Agnew.

(a) The Opera, written by Dr. Kenneth Wright, head of the Music Department of the University of Kentucky, unfolds the troubled and often misunderstood life of Mary Todd Lincoln and of the bizarre career of William Herndon, Lincoln's law partner for over 20 years, with whom she was in constant conflict.

(b) The benefit performance was co-sponsored by the Kentucky Society of Washington, the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, the University of Kentucky, the National Conference of State Societies, and the National Park Service of the Department of Interior. Proceeds are to be used to assist in refurbishing the Peterson House across the street from Ford's Theatre or better known as the House Where Lincoln Died.

(c) Honorary Chairmen were Senator and Mrs. John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky.

(d) Co-chairmen were Ralph E. Becker, a prominent Washington attorney and Lincoln authority; Mrs. Stuart M. Charlesworth (formerly of Lexington, Ky.), a mem-

ber of the Board of Directors of the Lincoln Group; and Lewis A. Moss, former President of the Kentucky Society of Washington and Deputy Director General of the National Conference of State Societies this year.

(e) The cost of the production was underwritten by the University of Kentucky through popular subscription from supporters of the University, both within Kentucky and in other areas. The Mary Todd Lincoln Opera Committee, composed of members from all of the sponsoring agencies, in its early planning stages established as objectives:

(1) Reimbursement of the University of Kentucky in the sum of approximately one-half of the cost of the production, and

(2) A donation of from \$2,000 to \$7,000 to the National Park Service to be used for refurbishing the House Where Lincoln Died.

(f) Information concerning the proposed production was first disseminated to members of the Kentucky Society of Washington in October 1969. Initial announcement of the production was made at a "kick-off" breakfast on Capitol Hill on December 14, 1969, attended by Dr. Wright, the three co-chairmen, all members of the Kentucky Congressional delegation or their designated representatives, and Representative Fred Schwegel from Iowa. From that time intensive and detailed planning and work was required on the part of committee members to insure successful attainment of stated objectives.

(g) Wide publicity was given to the production through news media, radio, and television.

(1) Mrs. John Sherman Cooper and Dr. Wright were interviewed by Barbara Howar on Panarama (WTTG) on May 12, 1970.

(2) Dr. Wright also appeared on Claire Crawford's program on WRC on May 14, 1970.

(3) Congressional wives, other honored guests, members of the Mary Todd Lincoln Opera Committee, and members of the press attended a tea at the historic Ford's Theatre on April 28, 1970, from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Those attending (over 50 including Justice Stanley Reed and Congressman Schwegel) viewed an exhibit of Mary Todd Lincoln's personal mementos, inspected the House Where Lincoln Died, and enjoyed a delightful tea beautifully served by Mrs. LeRoy Nicholas at a nominal price as her personal contribution to the Benefit Performance.

(4) The newspapers in the Washington area and in Kentucky gave us wide publicity on our endeavors.

(h) A dress rehearsal was held at the Ford's Theatre on May 13, 1970, at 7:30 p.m. to which school children from intercity and Greater Washington area schools were invited to attend free of charge, over 500 attended. This was made possible by contributions from the Potomac Electric and Power Company.

(i) Receptions were held each evening preceding the opera performances at which refreshments and a delicious buffet supper were served to all those in attendance.

(1) On May 14th over 200 persons attended a reception at the historic National Portrait Gallery from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Members of Congress headed the list of dignitaries attending the reception and opera.

(2) We were indeed honored to have Mrs. Spiro T. Agnew attend the Opera Performance on May 14th. We were very sorry that she could not stay for the entire performance due to illness.

(3) On May 15th approximately the same number of persons attended a reception in the elegant John Quincy Adams Room at the Department of State from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. The Congressional delegation again headed the list of dignitaries attending the reception and opera.

(j) We were also pleased to have with us

for the receptions and opera performances persons from the west coast of California to the east coast of New Hampshire, New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. Kentucky was best represented by Colonel Harland Sanders, one of our best known citizens not only in Kentucky but throughout the world for his famous "Kentucky Fried Chicken".

(k) We are indeed grateful for the many contributions received from people who were unable to attend but wanted to support our worthy cause.

(1) While a final accounting has not been made, it is evident from preliminary audits that the Mary Todd Lincoln Opera Committee will meet its objectives and will be able to donate more than \$2,000 to the National Park Service for refurbishing the House Where Lincoln Died.

(m) One-third of the Opera Committee members were members of the Kentucky Society. Our members served as chairmen of the key committees established in the initial organization of the group.

(1) L. Ray Smart, past President of both the Kentucky Society of Washington and of the National Conference of State Societies, served as Chairman of the Invitation and Ticket Committee (see Appendix X for copies of invitations).

(2) Paul Keen, former President of the Kentucky Society, served as Budget Director.

(3) Mrs. J. Gregory Bruce served as Chairman of the Advisory Committee dealing with protocol matters, etc.

(4) Joe DeWasse, Governor Nunn's personal representative in Washington, served as Chairman of the Program Committee. It is to be noted that through his efforts advertising subscriptions for the program netted approximately \$9,000 for the fund in addition to paying for the printing of the programs. We are especially proud of this program and delighted that a copy has been placed in the National Archives for posterity.

(5) Paul Fulk, Treasurer of the Kentucky Society, also served as Treasurer for the Opera Committee.

(6) Charles Fentress, Jr., Press Assistant to Senator Marlow W. Cook, served as Chairman of the Publicity Committee. Robert K. Salyers, former President of the Kentucky Society, also served on this committee.

(1) Miss Mary Breckenridge, former officer of the Kentucky Society, served on the Special Activities Committee and made the final arrangements for the magnificent reception which was held in the John Quincy Adams Room, Department of State on the evening of May 15th preceding the opera performance.

(n) We are very proud of having had the privilege of assisting the University of Kentucky in this worthwhile endeavor. This was the first time for a college group to perform in a theatre in this area before a national audience. All the efforts and hard work on the part of the members of the Opera Committee were more than gratified by the enthusiastic performance of these young people. Our efforts have helped to make this venture possible for them and also to make a long lasting dream of the author and composer, Dr. Kenneth Wright, come true; i.e., to see his opera, "Wings of Expectation", performed in the historic Ford's Theatre.

Since 1898 many attempts have been made to refurbish a little house at 518 10th Street, N.W. . . . the Peterson House or the House Where Lincoln Died. We believe that the publicity incident to the production of this opera was beneficial in the enactment of Public Law 91-288 on June 23, 1970, in establishing the House Where Lincoln Died, the Lincoln Museum, and Ford's Theatre as a National Historical Site.

Sincerely,

Lewis A. Moss,
Chairman.

FOR LACK OF RESEARCH FUNDS
WE MAY BE POISONING OUR
WATERS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to find a substitute for phosphates in detergents, new chemicals and compounds are being brought into the market which may well be more harmful than phosphates. There is theoretical evidence that one of the major replacements for phosphates—soon to come on the market in massive quantities—could cause cancer.

It has long been pointed out that phosphates are one of the major causes of eutrophication and pollution in lakes. They are one of the principal factors in algae blooms. The tremendous harmful effect that phosphates can have on lakes is well described by the April 1970 report of the International Joint Commission on Great Lakes problems.

The Canadian and American Commission members noted that—

The pollution problem requiring the most urgent attention of the Governments of Canada and the United States is the increasing eutrophication of the Lower Great Lakes, particularly the western basin of Lake Erie.

In 1967, the input of total phosphorus from United States municipal sources to Lake Erie was 35.7 million pounds, of which 25 million came from detergents.

On the basis of the foregoing the Commission is convinced that the reduction of the phosphorus input into Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the International Section of the St. Lawrence River will significantly delay further eutrophication and will allow the recovery to begin through natural processes.

It is entirely admirable that the detergent companies are trying to cut down on the percentage of phosphates in their products. The Department of the Interior, Consumers' Union, and others have made available to the public lists ranking detergents by their percent of phosphate content and it is encouraging to see the interest of the public in moving toward products which are less harmful to the environment.

But in our rush to stop one type of pollution, we must not jump from the frying pan and into the fire.

What is being used as a replacement for phosphates? Is the replacement safe—perfectly safe? Are we sure that it does not have harmful genetic effects? Are we sure that the replacement does not lead to mutation over time.

This is a vital question—a question vital to the present quality of the environment and to future life.

There is a replacement to phosphate that both Proctor & Gamble and Lever Bros. appear to be moving toward. It is abbreviated as NTA—which stands for nitrilotriacetic acid.

Already there is some 50 to 100 million pounds of NTA being produced and poured into our waterways. If NTA is accepted as a substitute for phosphates, some 2 billion pounds will be produced

and dumped into the Nation's waters each year.

When we deal with billions of pounds of a material, we must be sure that it is safe.

Yet there are recent indications that NTA, now coming into heavy production, is not safe.

I asked the Library of Congress specialist in environmental policy to comment on the safety of NTA. The specialist concluded:

It is obvious to me from these conflicting reports that further research on NTA is necessary before we can declare it the perfect substitute for phosphates in detergents.

The Library cited a report in Environmental magazine of September 1970, written by Dr. Samuel S. Epstein, which pointed out:

(1) not perfectly biodegradable—that is, capable of being broken down by bacteria. To quote Dr. Epstein, "concentrations of less than eight parts per million in raw sewage are ninety percent degraded in sewage treatment plants under the best conditions of sixteen parts per million, degradation is reduced to approximately 75 percent. In the absence of [favorable] conditions, NTA biodegradation can be reduced or almost nonexistent.

(2) potentially dangerous in concentrated forms, raising the question of its effect over time in less concentrated forms. For example, two year tests on rats seem to demonstrate that NTA does not cause cancer—but there was an increased mortality among male rats and kidney damage in male and female rats. In addition, zinc levels in bone tissue—and waste products was "markedly increased." As Dr. Epstein notes, "The significance of these findings has not yet been adequately evaluated."

(3) NTA is an agent that picks up and joins with metal ions. There are several possible dangers here. NTA may lead to heavy damage of metal pumping and sewer systems. More seriously from a health point of view, NTA may "pick up" heavy metal elements in the sediments of lake and river bottoms and bring them back into the water supply. In other words, poisonous mercury which has settled out of the water could be reactivated by NTA in the water and brought back to our drinking taps.

(4) Finally, and most importantly, it is entirely possible that NTA, as it breaks down and forms and reforms into various compounds, can form into an agent called intrasamines—which is "highly" cancer-forming.

In checking with the Federal Water Quality Administration, and the Bureau of Water Hygiene, I have found that, because of limited funds, the first three difficulties mentioned above are being studied by the Federal Government but that the last problem, the problem of cancer produced by derivatives of NTA is not being studied. Officials at HEW admitted that, since testing for cancer is a long and involved process, that if they had the money they would—and should—begin checking the ways that NTA dissolves and the possibility that some of its forms can cause cancer. The officials pointed out that when it is proposed to dump 2 billion pounds of a chemical into the Nation's waterways, every safeguard and test should be made.

A lack of research funds in this area is so shortsighted as to be beyond belief. We may be literally poisoning ourselves and future generations to save a few dollars today.

In light of this shocking emergency situation, I am requesting the Bureau of the Budget to provide increased water hygiene research funds in a supplemental budget request.

In addition, I believe that it verges on criminal neglect for private companies to bring new chemicals and products into the marketplace without the most thorough testing, not only by the companies involved but by the Government. I am drafting legislation to require that no new chemical product or compound be brought into interstate markets without the prior approval of the Public Health Service and the Environmental Protection Agency that that product is not harmful to the environment or the health of the American people.

PRODUCER PRICE LEGISLATION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, the Honorable Carl E. Bagge, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, spoke before the annual meeting of the American Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors regarding the need to free gas producers from rigid, unrealistic price controls. In view of this Nation's current energy crisis, Commissioner Bagge's talk entitled "Producer Price Legislation: An Alternative to Whistling in the Dark," is especially timely since it goes to the heart of the problems besetting the oil industry today. I hope that every Member of this body will take a moment to review Commissioner Bagge's Dallas speech. It follows:

PRODUCER PRICE LEGISLATION: AN ALTERNATIVE TO WHISTLING IN THE DARK
(An address by Carl E. Bagge, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission)

A speech about gas production and the level of drilling activity to an association of drilling contractors by a member of the Federal Power Commission would always have been fraught with the danger of a possible disqualifying petition filed either by the producers, on the one hand, or by the New York Commission on the other. This is particularly true today when the existing national crisis in gas supply and the Commission's efforts to deal with the crisis has polarized positions and, as a consequence, compounded the problems inherent in the already difficult process of producer regulation by transforming it into an even more adversary process than it has been in the past.

This development, it seems to me, is most unfortunate. The critical problem of producer regulation, as a consequence, has not enjoyed the benefit of the occasional constructive dialogue which forums such as this provide to agency members in other areas of our regulatory concern and responsibility. The absence of such dialogue tends to create a rigidity in the process which compounds an already difficult problem. If the inhibitory restraints which operate in this area could be suspended for a short while, we might be able to ventilate the musty hearing record and illuminate the dark and awesome methods which we have attempted to employ during the past decades as our regulatory tools in the search for a just and reasonable well-head price for natural gas. Until that time,

however, agency members shall continue to be obliged to be cautious and circumspect, invoking bland generalities which inform no one and do nothing to improve the process by questioning its relevancy but nevertheless assure us of the privilege of continuing to participate in the process of producer regulation.

Having said that, however, I think that if there ever was a time, now is the propitious moment for candor even by agency members. Institutions, just as individuals, need occasional periods of introspection to determine whether their performance is relevant to their goals. Governmental policy provides no exception. And since the policy of regulating the field price of natural gas is not sacred, and therefore provides no further exception, it should be critically examined against the standard of relevancy to its objectives. An examination of the policy of producer price fixing should be candid, open, and subject to the characteristics of any other public dialogue concerning any other public policy. It should indeed be capable of critical public examination by the very agency members who are charged with the responsibility for its execution without incurring charges of prejudgment of pending proceedings. This kind of examination of existing legislative policy, it seems to me, is entirely appropriate even within the legal constraints imposed upon agency members by specific rate proceedings pending under such existing legislative policy. Too large a piece of the national interest is at stake in this question to permit the inhibitory restraints of pending proceedings under existing policy to prevent a candid examination of the question of the need for a legislative policy alternative by an agency member.

During the course of the past two years I have attempted to employ the forums available to me as an agency member to generate interest in and establish a public dialogue regarding the problems inherent in the existing method of producer price regulation. I have been sorely disappointed in the total absence of a response. Two years ago at the Annual Gas Industry Seminar sponsored by Oklahoma State University at Stillwater, I proposed that the Federal Power Commission immediately consider extricating itself from the cumbersome and unwieldy existing area rate methodology and consider adopting, as an alternative basis for well-head price regulation, indices reflecting both market and cost factors which would provide both a more responsive and flexible system of producer price regulation.

This proposal was based upon a growing recognition of the essentiality in fixing just and reasonable rates to be appraised not only fully and more immediately of the economic dimensions of the problem—specifically of the supply and demand dynamics of the marketplace. For it was clear to me then that functionally effective prices depend, in the final analysis, upon economic factors rather than accounting costs, no matter how sophisticated the costing methodology.

It seemed to me at that time that the Commission was obliged to evolve a more responsive method to determine the field price of gas than that employed during the past decade. There then appeared to be an urgent need for a method which gave greater weight to the inexorable laws of supply and demand than to costs as employed in the traditional cost of service utility approach to regulation.

But it also seemed clear at that time that broadening the rationale for our producer price decisions to rely upon market factors would be a response to only part of the problem. It was also apparent that such an alternative must not only respond effectively to changes in supply and demand, but that it had to respond swiftly enough to avoid

serious national consequences. This brought me to the question of how this objective could be achieved. I then concluded that the Commission needed a more effective reporting system than that which currently existed—a reporting system that was timely, continuous, relevant, comprehensive, and one oriented to the future rather than to the past. For it seemed to me then that the Commission could never again be afforded the luxury of gathering multitudinous volumes of historic cost data during unduly time-consuming area rate proceedings.

This provided the basis for the proposal advanced at that time, for the Commission to consider adopting, as a substitute for cost-based area price regulation, a review of individual producer contracts against a test of suspension based upon a Commission prescribed index similar to that employed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in rail and motor carrier rate regulation. The proposal called for a reexamination of whether a continued wooden translation of costs, including a return allowance, into ceiling prices was a dependable solution to the problem of producer regulation. For the real test of a regulatory approach in this unique area is not whether it conforms to an economic or legal theory, but whether it achieves the intended results. Does it work? Does it yield ceiling prices that are high enough, but no higher than necessary, to bring forth development of adequate supplies of natural gas?

My colleagues who participated in the *Pernian* decision contemplated that such a critical examination of the efficacy of the process would subsequently be made by the agency members, for in *Pernian* the Commission stated:

"The separate price we fix herein for new gas well gas in the Permian Basin should serve to furnish a practical test of whether in fact it will result in bringing forth additional supplies." (34 F.P.C. 188)

If we are candid, as we should be, we must acknowledge that the Commission apparently has failed the "practical test" which it established for itself in *Pernian*. Individual company rate making which provided the Commission's initial attempt at producer regulation in the decade of the fifties was held to be unworkable by the Commission in turning to the alternative of area price fixing. Area price fixing has now, after another decade, been demonstrated to be questionable. The necessity for squaring producer prices in the light of the inexorable forces of the market should now be considered. Indeed, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in recently affirming the *Southern Louisiana Area Rate Proceeding* recognized this fact. The court stated that it would not have had such serious misgivings about affirming the Commission's opinion until all of the details of the pricing method if the Commission had adequately considered the result of its price fixing in the context of the reality of market forces. The court warned that by continuing cost based price fixing without considering the market the Commission's efforts will amount "only to so much whistling in the dark." The court stated:

"From the Commission's findings we cannot know whether the demand for Southern Louisiana's gas is going to double, sextuple, or increase tenfold over the next decade, or whether it is going to remain stable or even decline. . . . Predictions along this line are subject to obvious infirmities, but at least the possibilities can be identified and probabilities assigned to them.

"Such predictions are necessary because the supply of natural gas must be considered in light of demand. Some areas are more promising than others. The Commission appears to assume, without so stating, that a rate that gives adequate returns will stimulate enough drilling to satisfy future demand even though some reservoirs are harder to

find, but we find somewhat more persuasive the producers' argument that producers will meet demand only if there are enough reservoirs that promise sufficient returns. At the rate set, The Commission should make findings as to the increased difficulty of finding greater volumes of gas. From this finding, it should estimate the supply that a given rate will elicit. (Emphasis added)

"These are difficult matters to predict, but that is more reason why a reviewing court should not be required to guess at them. More importantly, if the Commission sets a rate on a cost basis and does not itself consider these questions carefully, its conclusory statements to the effect that the rate is adequate or that there will probably be no need for changes in the future (these are statements that the Commission has made here) amount only to so much whistling in the dark." (Emphasis added)

To admit the possibility of failure under the "practical test" of *Pernian* or to concede to the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit that the Commission's effort may have indeed amounted to only so much "whistling in the dark," is not a reflection upon the participants in that decision. It merely acknowledges that market forces beyond the control of regulation intruded themselves into the symmetry of the pricing structure contemplated by that decision—forces which brought it swiftly crumbling down in a crescendo of sound which only those that are deaf to reality have not already heard. For immediately following the *Pernian* opinion, the construction of a competitive intrastate pipeline into this area of west Texas, free of the regulatory inhibitions and constraints of the then recently established just and reasonable rate of 165 cents, had an economic impact which was no less significant than that which occurred with the introduction of the initial pipeline into that area. Then, gas which had been flared as late as the 1940's suddenly assumed an economic value with the introduction of the initial pipeline. The introduction of a nonjurisdictional pipeline purchaser serving the insatiable needs of the Texas Gulf Coast had precisely the same effect upon the value of the commodity since its "price" could simply no longer be determined by the costing methodology and regulatory theories of the *Pernian* decision. And, as a result, although drilling activity increased in Permian, less and less gas was committed to the interstate market until now when the interstate pipelines report that they have been wholly unable to contract at the existing area prices for any significant quantities of gas in this area. Only recently, an interstate pipeline serving Permian was obliged instead to contract and the Commission was obliged to accept several such contracts for the same gas from Permian from the intrastate pipeline suppliers at a price which exceeded the existing regulated area price by 12 cents per Mcf. The principal beneficiaries of continued well head price regulation in the Permian Basin under these circumstances are the shareholders of the intrastate pipelines. Certainly no one can reasonably contend that the general public and consumers are benefiting from the regulatory fruits of such irrationality.

What has happened in the Permian Basin by the intrusion of dominant market forces before which regulation is impotent and over which it can exercise no control merely illustrates what has been gradually occurring nationally. Precisely the same forces which now have transcended the costing methodologies and economic models of Permian are also now toppling these same underpinnings of area rate fixing nationally. It has not taken the same form of a new intrastate pipeline in all areas but has assumed a multitude of forms. Its consequences, however, are precisely identical. The intrusion of transcendent market forces into the symmetry of cost based area rates is in the pro-

ess of overwhelming the structure of gas pricing nationally.

Early this year in a paper delivered before the Midwest Gas Association, I attempted to initiate a public dialogue regarding the need for examining policy alternatives to continued producer price regulation. The public response to that address was disappointing since the only response has been personal criticisms which were wholly unrelated to the merits of the arguments. I attempted to demonstrate that in the event the existing available supply and demand imbalances should require, in the public interest, the importation of substantial quantities of gas in both vapor and liquid form at significantly higher prices than those presently permitted under area pricing, we will then be obliged to acknowledge that the forces of the market will have effectively swept away the dike of producer regulation which was instituted to immunize interstate gas from those very market forces.

Since the time of that address last February, the Commission has in fact authorized the importation of significantly higher priced Canadian gas into the Midwest and West Coast markets. It has also certificated imports of even higher priced gas in liquid form to the East Coast and New England. Several major LNG import proposals are now also pending before the Commission and several vast projects to obtain gas from Prudhoe Bay and the Northwest Territory of Canada have gone far beyond the conceptual stages. All of these projects, both pending and projected, involve substantially higher prices than those which presently are permitted to domestic producers of gas.

In view of these developments, regulatory policy cannot now continue to operate as it has in the past with or without more rational alternatives to cost based pricing. Regulation cannot now escape the fact that it is in the process of being deluged by the very market forces for which it was intended as a substitute.

Can regulation now effectively respond by acknowledging the existence of the higher priced alternative sources and basing the domestic producers' price upon those sources with an appropriate discount for the cost of transportation? Can regulation now effectively respond by instituting a basing point form of regulation predicated upon the market price of the highest or the average price of the alternate increment of gas? Can regulation now effectively respond by employing indices to reflect the impact of these intrusions of the market? Is there any rational way in which the field price of gas may be effectively regulated when, for reasons of continuity of service, the market price not only is acknowledged but is affirmatively sanctioned by the Commission in the form of imports of substantially higher priced increments of gas.

The process of well head price regulation is no longer viable because a competing market-oriented gas supply is now being introduced into the fabric of the regulated interstate gas market. Any response which regulation attempts to make within this context can no longer honestly be regarded as "price" regulation. Now that we are presently required to acknowledge that the inexorable laws of supply and demand require our sanction of market prices for imports in the public interest, we can no longer honestly characterize the process as price "regulation". Although other public purposes may be served by the continued regulation of producer contracts, we must now face up to the reality that the existing area rate methodology is no longer effective in determining the price of gas.

What then is the alternative for national policy in the decade ahead as it seeks to provide continuing protection for the public and gas consumers? The Supreme Court

held that price regulation must substitute for the lack of competition in field sales of natural gas. But neither that decision nor price regulation nullified the long-term forces of the market. The impact of the market may have been delayed by regulation but it is the market that is controlling in the end.

Hence, unless an alternative policy is developed we are on the verge of entering into the worst of both worlds. We are confronted on the one hand by a demand apparently stimulated by regulation which at the same time has apparently inhibited expansion of the base supply. And we are confronted on the other hand by a market that is bringing forth alternatives into the supply vacuum at prices much higher than present regulated levels.

Since price regulation is now ineffectual in this context, the challenge is to harness the market so that it will work for the consumer. To meet the challenge will now require a reversal of government policy—of the role originally ordained for regulation. When federal price control was imposed, the base supply was surplus to short-term demand. Even at unregulated prices, gas had been a devastating competitor, rapidly taking over markets long dominated by other space-heating and industrial fuels. Regulation substituted for the lack of competition among sellers of gas at the wellhead. But that is now academic when those sellers do not have an available supply with which to compete for incremental business. And the overriding fact today is that the available base supply, being inadequate to meet current potential demand, can no longer perform its competitive function.

It appears that gas is not presently available in sufficient quantities, for instance, to moderate the market price of new supply sources that are moving in to satisfy unmet demand. In this situation, therefore, the role facing government policy in this decade is not so much to nurture the competitive vigor of base suppliers, which was the goal of regulation in the 1950's and 1960's, as it is to reinvigorate the base supply itself. Without a dynamic base supply of natural gas, the interstate market will not be able to compete for supplies with the unregulated intrastate market. Nor will there be any effective price competition for the unconventional higher-priced supplies that are knocking at the market door. But a base supply, reinvigorated, can be the key to the price levels at which these new sources enter and can place the consumers less at the mercy of the supplementary sources where they are today and where they will continue to remain under a policy of price regulation.

In the future, government policy must consciously seek out ways to strengthen the elements of a free market and reinvigorate the base supply by attempting to ensure that there are many competing sources of gas supply, that the supply base is broadened, that entry into the supply phase of the industry is both unrestricted and affirmatively encouraged and that price levels are permitted to be responsive to demand. A government policy implemented along these lines would provide an effective alternative to producer price regulation in the long run, while holding forth the promise of relief for the present apparent supply-demand imbalance at the lowest possible cost to the public.

This will require a significant research commitment to drilling technology and coal gasification by both the private and governmental sector, the encouragement and involvement of the distribution sector and the pipeline industry in exploration and development, the establishment of adequate tax incentives, and a reappraisal of leasing practices in the Federal Domain. But it seems to me that what is now required fundamentally

is a reappraisal by Congress of the relevancy of continued producer price fixing as it presently exists and a remedial restructuring of producer regulation if a satisfactory solution is to be achieved.

It is most important that we do not ignore the admonishment of the Court of Appeals in reviewing the Commission's South Louisiana Area Rate Opinion. Justice Thornberry clearly indicated that blind adherence to the existing area rate methodology without giving consideration to market forces is unrealistic. I am in full agreement with the Court's reasoning but the question that still must be answered is how these market forces should be considered. Indeed the Commission has recently taken constructive action in this regard with respect to its proposed Permian Basin and nationwide rulemaking proceedings. I have joined without reservation in these efforts to repair the present regulatory scheme so that at least a responsive pricing method can be achieved. For regardless of any legislative amendments to the Natural Gas Act that might be proposed, we agency members are, of course, obliged to continue to work within the present statutory framework and should, therefore, take every step necessary to make it as effective as possible.

However, in my judgment the problem of producer price uncertainty and the problem of the protracted delays inherent in area rate regulation can be most effectively remedied by legislation. One approach to remedial legislation has been characterized as "sanctity of contract" which assures the producers that once a contract is approved and the sale certificated by the Commission there can be no rollback in any contract price, whether it be an initial or permissible escalation price. In this regard it appears quite unlikely that cost based regulation would ever justify a reduction in an approved price level. Thus consumers could not be harmed by an assurance not to do what appears would never be done in any event. The benefits of such assurance in eliminating uncertainty to the producing industry would, however, be substantial.

Protracted area rate proceedings extending over a period of five to seven years have created an unprecedented regulatory lag which has prolonged and therefore added to the existing uncertainties regarding price. These long delays and uncertainties also tie up funds collected by the producers which could be used for exploration and development. All of these uncertainties have inhibited the search for essential additional supplies.

Any remedial legislation must, therefore, eliminate such regulatory lag and provide the degree of certainty regarding price which is essential to the development of critical new supplies. Both of these elements have been discussed for several years and have been incorporated in various forms of "sanctity of contract" legislative proposals. I am informed that last week the American Gas Association, after several years of debate, has now endorsed a type of "sanctity of contract" proposal which also incorporates certain market criteria, rather than cost, as the Commission standard for determining producer prices. As a result, at the present time the entire gas industry, through their respective associations, support this amendment to the Natural Gas Act.

This proposal for reform of the current regulatory method is most constructive. Unfortunately, it should have been introduced when it was proposed more than four years ago. The majority of the Commission publicly endorsed one such "sanctity of contract" proposal more than three years ago and its enactment at that time by Congress would have contributed substantially toward averting many of the problems now confronting us. In principle I endorse "sanctity of contract" and the need to permit market forces to determine the price. However, in my opin-

ion, the market forces should function outside the regulatory process so that producer prices can be arrived at unfettered by regulation.

Whether imposed by statutory amendment or by Commission election to alter the existing area rate methodology, any approach requiring the determination of producer prices by the Commission on the basis of some subjective market standard or criteria would fall far short of a satisfactory solution. Such standards are extremely difficult to define and thus are usually couched in general terms and, as a result, the Commission would be compelled in all likelihood to define, qualify and quantify the innumerable factors that could affect the market and might have to be considered in each instance. To submit market forces to the subjective interpretation of a regulatory body, regardless of its expertise or good intentions, can only lead to a distortion of their effect with imprecise and unresponsive results. In the final analysis, at best, the prices approved by the Commission should approximate those that would have been derived in a free market without the need for regulatory anguish and the inherent delays. In addition, a strong tendency would probably exist to approve the proposed contract prices without modification because of the difficulty in justifying any change. The basic objective of this approach is the establishment by the Commission of a market value as the permissible price level. However, it is my opinion that this can be more readily and more accurately achieved by the free interplay of supply and demand dynamics unencumbered by any futile regulatory attempt to decipher the complicated considerations and the subtle interrelationships involved in a free market. Inject market forces into the administrative crucible and no one will recognize the results.

It appears to me that sound public policy toward the natural gas industry today demands something more than remedial legislation which requires the Commission to approximate the dynamics of a free market. What is necessary in the context of the current available supply disequilibrium is something more satisfactory than a reform of the current regulatory method. Today Congress ought to consider a basic restructuring of regulation which will reflect the market value of gas by eliminating the Commission's rate determination and review powers with respect to new sales by independent producers while retaining regulatory control of contract terms in order to effectively monitor market structure and market behavior. Until the Congress acts, of course, I shall continue to apply the present Natural Gas Act, as interpreted by the Courts, to the cases which come before the Commission.

Permitting the market to determine the price of new gas does not require the dismantlement of all aspects of producer control. The major elements of an appropriate regulatory scheme under this proposal would include:

1. Only the contract prices for the sale of new gas by independent producers will no longer be determined or reviewed by the Commission.
2. Flowing gas will continue to be regulated by the Commission and, consequently, any rate impact on existing customers would be very gradual since it will take many years for new gas to become a significant portion of their gas supply.
3. All other contractual provisions and aspects of the sale, regardless of their effect upon the contract prices, will continue to be subject to Commission approval and review. It is essential that the Commission continue to pass upon such aspects as the quality standards, delivery pressure, rate of take, billing and prepayment arrangements as well

as other provisions, which so significantly affect the ultimate consumer.

4. Indefinite price escalations, except for certain taxes, will be prohibited and the contract prices, including any escalations, must be set forth as a definite price per unit since the consumer must be able to determine what price will be charged. If the producer believes that certain aspects of his contract have a value, it will be incumbent upon him to reflect that value in the unit price specified in the contract.

5. No unit price can be changed by subsequent amendment to the contract after acceptance of the certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission.

6. Any proposed abandonment of service will continue to be regulated by the Commission.

The enactment of a bill permitting the market to establish the price for new gas but which contains these elements of continuing regulation will assure continuity of service and permit the retention of control over the conditions and quality of service as well as the mechanism which translates costs into rates to the ultimate consumer. It would also allow the Commission to effectively monitor market structure and market behavior.

The recently released Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisors to the President urged a greater reliance by regulatory agencies upon market mechanisms. The report states:

"[M]ore reliance on economic incentives and market mechanisms in regulated industries would be a step forward. . . Industries have been more progressive when the agencies have endeavored to confine regulation to a necessary minimum and have otherwise fostered competition. When regulation has stifled competition, performance has deteriorated. The clearest lesson of all, however, is that regulation should be narrowed or halted when it has outlived its original purpose."

The policy of producer price regulation has now outlived its original purpose. The market has finally prevailed. We are obliged now, therefore, to establish policies which are relevant to the protection of the public interest. The public interest today can be most effectively protected by permitting market forces to operate in such a way as to work for the consuming public as they do in most other areas of our economic life. This, in the final analysis, can be best achieved if the market is permitted to operate unfettered by regulation and if government will foster competition in the energy field by instituting policies which will affirmatively enlarge the supply base by broadening the base supply and increasing the supply sources. This, in my opinion, is the new goal of government policy toward the natural gas industry.

In an effort to achieve this goal, I intend to immediately submit to Congress for consideration a proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act.

DR. JOHN H. BUNZEL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with you the text of an address given by Dr. John H. Bunzel, recently appointed president of San Jose State College. College presidents today are being called upon to fulfill an increasingly complex role. They are, in the words of one administrator, expected to

achieve peace, clean up pollution, educate twice as many students, reform the corporations, and extend the frontiers of knowledge. Certainly the job carries awesome burdens. And certainly it is important to stay attuned to what college presidents, themselves, are feeling today.

The following, then, are the thoughtful and eloquent reflections of a man deeply committed to American higher education. I know you join me in wishing him the best of success:

ADDRESS TO THE FACULTY BY PRESIDENT
JOHN H. BUNZEL

We begin this academic year at a most unhappy time in California higher education. There is no reason to pretend otherwise. Our list of grievances is long and real. The faculty has been denied a cost of living salary increase, which is only a small part of the harassment it is suffering. We have seen cuts in sabbaticals and other leaves, the withdrawal of funding for the enrichment of our graduate programs, a continuing disregard for the need to obtain a reduction in an excessive teaching load, a diminishing interest in the future of scholarly research, to mention but a few. The general tone on our campuses is tense, worried, dispirited, frustrated. Stated simply, our colleges and universities have been dealt a severe blow by the state legislature, and all of us are going to pay a terrible price for this kind of punitive economy. Many of our representatives in Sacramento have not yet learned the meaning of H. G. Wells' warning that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

I make one pledge to you now. I shall take advantage of every opportunity afforded me to remind the Chancellor's office, the Board of Trustees, the Governor, the members of the Legislature, and the people of this State that our goal is a free community of scholars, teachers and students, that we do not look upon academic freedom as a minor conceit, and that we will resist unwarranted political interference from outside the campus as strongly as we will oppose those who would use power, pressure and muscle from within.

If I stand before you not overwhelmed with optimism—underwhelmed is perhaps the better word—I nonetheless believe there is reason to be hopeful. The basis for this belief stems from what I have already seen in the four short weeks I have been here: a deep sense of loyalty and attachment to this institution, a tradition of academic excellence, and a remarkable richness of talent and human resources.

This tradition spans more than a century, yet has always been marked by change. Responsive to needs of the state and community, the college has evolved from a normal school to a multi-purpose institution with a wide range of professional programs in the liberal arts while retaining its teacher education and vocational area strengths. This evolutionary process continues as we move into new areas of curricular concern.

I am pleased to be associated with the institution of higher education which has established the first graduate department in the nation which confers a Master of Arts degree in Mexican American Studies. I expect that the department will contribute important leadership in the continuing search to find better methods to link our educational efforts to community educational needs. The Committee on Mexican American Affairs has helped in planning for a Master's program in Social Work with a Chicano emphasis. I know that the Department of Black Studies is well on its way to becoming one of the most highly respected degree programs in the country.

We should recognize that these efforts are but a beginning. But they deserve our sup-

port not only to help assure their academic success but because the time is late in providing for the educational needs and opportunities of minorities in our country. If we are successful in our response to the revolution of rising expectations, then perhaps we will be able to thwart those who thrive on the expectation of rising revolutions.

It would be a hazardous undertaking to predict what lies ahead this year on our college campuses. It would also be foolish. I am therefore heeding the advice of a certain Episcopal Bishop in Virginia who was asked by a parishioner whether a non-Episcopalian could enter the Kingdom of Heaven. "Frankly," he said, "the idea had never occurred to me; but if he is a gentleman, he will not make the attempt."

Having just arrived, I am aware that there are many people in this audience who are better informed than I am about the complex problems which lie at the level of Schools and Departments. There will be other occasions to talk about them. We will meet on other grounds, and I look forward to it.

Today I would like to share with you what is more a statement of personal credo. I thought I might begin by bringing to your attention three of the many questions which, in being interviewed by different committees during the weeks I was under consideration for this position, regularly vented the most urgent concerns. It also gives me a chance to collect some of my thoughts on matters in which we have a common interest.

1. One frequent question was stated with an unusual economy of words: "What are your ideas about academic authority and responsibility?" On more than one occasion there was an additional request: "Please be specific about the role of the faculty."

I am not one who believes that freedom is automatically increased as a consequence of eroding or shattered authority. What emerges is not more freedom, but power. What kinds of power, who will use it, and for what purposes are serious and disturbing questions. During the long spasm at San Francisco State two years ago the student militants kept shouting, "Power to the People!" I remember how depressed I got when I thought of the people who really have the power.

I am very much the product and proponent of a faculty academic tradition and therefore sensitive to faculty attitudes and values. I have been a persistent advocate of institutional protection against the intrusion of outside forces. But I also believe that the decreasing esteem for higher education in California and elsewhere is traceable in part to adverse public judgment about administrators and faculty—in short, about how we have governed, or mis-governed, ourselves. It seems an inescapable conclusion that faculties have not always shown themselves capable of formulating and enforcing the standards of professional ethics and performance. I am beset by a grave apprehension that in my default in our own responsibility to rising outside pressures, including Boards of Trustees, will take over that job—and presumably will do it in less enlightened fashion than faculties would prefer.

There has been much confusion about the role and limits of academic administration. Too often administrators are dealt with in an irresponsible way by opportunistic critics who oppose them in the interest of "majority rule" or "equality." Many decisions, certainly most of those having to do with scholarship, teaching and research, do not lend themselves to the plebiscitary process. In times of crisis there is a paramount need for rapid and expert administrative judgment.

After years of struggle to achieve some degree of autonomy and power, faculties are

right in jealously guarding their prerogatives. Further, a collaborative and cooperative role for faculty and administrators is the only sensible alternative to an increasingly fragmented institution subject to enlarging external and internal pressures. My concern is that faculties do not seek to take on executive, legislative, and judicial roles to the detriment of the sound exercise of legitimate executive leadership.

None of us can afford to be entrapped by cliché-ridden biases against authority itself. The clamor of extremists for instant solutions to impossible demands must not be allowed to exhaust and destroy the responsible leadership of a college community by creating rampant mistrust and interecine denunciation. It is my own conviction that a division of labor is appropriate to the conduct of academic affairs as long as principles of accountability can be exercised to guarantee the responsiveness of the administration to basic faculty priorities and values.

2. I was asked many times about my attitude towards the police. Within the last month I received a telephone call from a member of this faculty urging me to announce that under no circumstances would I call the police onto this campus. "Tell them," he said, "you will not dance to the Governor's tune of repression." I reject that advice, but I would not want this to be taken as an argument that we encourage governmental authority to intrude into the affairs of the college.

One of the difficult questions facing our universities today is how they can defend themselves against the tactics of violence. Officials who must deal with this problem face a real dilemma: If they take the attitude of benevolent suzerainty, they know the violent elements on campus will run rampant; if they call in the police, they know they run the risk of radicalizing the student body and swelling the ranks of the student militants. There are some indifferent faculty and students who are willing to let the militants have their way, either because they want to get on with their work or because they feel the issues at stake are not of concern to them. I am not in sympathy with that position. It occurs to me that to refuse to take whatever action is necessary would mislead the militants into believing that violence succeeds.

I do not like to see the police on a college campus. It is not their natural habitat. But I must tell you that I have no ideological reservations about calling them if they are needed to make secure our belief that ideas are our most potent weapons.

There have been (and presumably will continue to be) instances of police excesses. This should not obscure the fact, however, that the police are not the criminal elements in our midst who have tried to justify the use of the campus as a sanctuary for vandals and terrorists. Police presence on a campus is almost invariably "reactive" occasioned by acts of force against individuals or property, threats of coercion or intimidation, or actual outbreaks of physical violence.

It is time to reaffirm some basic truths about police power in a democracy. It is not designed to enforce a particular solution to a problem, but rather to help preserve the basic rules of law without which any solution is impossible. If the police are called, it will not be to settle intellectual, educational or other issues, but to preserve the college so that the processes by which decisions are arrived at in an academic community can be made to work.

Once and for all, let it be established that violence, terrorism, and illegal activities on the campus will not be condoned and will be met with appropriate measures of self-defense. If force is temporarily necessary to protect our needs for order and freedom, we must assert that this use of force, far from

being used as an instrument of repression, exists solely in order to insure our survival.

We need also to say, to ourselves and to the public: in the fate of one institution lies that of each of us.

3. I come now to the question which transcends all others in importance. In its most succinct form it comes to this: "Higher education in this country is in serious trouble. There are mounting signs of student unrest spilling over into mindless behavior. The public is increasingly impatient and angry. The political atmosphere is highly combustible. What, then, is the future of the University?"

It is appropriate, I think, to begin an answer by putting before you in broad outline two different views about what a university should be.

(a) The first is of a politicized university whose role is to perform as an institution of social activism to bring about change in national policies. Its primary concern is with political action and social reform. It is committed to using its total resources as a university for what it deems to be worthy political goals—to stop the war, to oppose racism and injustice, and so on. Repelled by the surrounding culture, it rejects its fundamental character and seeks to transform it, or, if need be, destroy it. Its stance is political because it believes that the time has come for the university to become a base for decisive action for those of high moral purpose who reject our corrupt society.

Internally, the "new university" wants to become an egalitarian political institution. All distinctions of rank and status would be removed. Teachers and students would be "mutual learners." There are differences over details. For some, degrees and grades would disappear. For others, questions of course content, the granting of faculty tenure and promotion, and other academic matters would be decided in open assemblies of students and faculty on a one-man, one-vote basis.

(b) There is another view of what a university should be. Its primary focus is its major concern—the life of the mind. Among the special values it represents none is more paramount than the right to free intellectual inquiry in the pursuit of truth and knowledge. It is not to be mistaken as an institution solely concerned with social activism, and it will resist those who want it to become exclusively an instrument of political action or revolution. Its tasks are more varied because it is many things. It is a place for people who want to teach and learn, where people can do research and speculate about the past and look into the future, where ideas are sometimes explored and exchanged for their own sake, and where current fashions of social reform can be criticized.

It is not a political democracy. Its essential role is to discover and transmit knowledge and develop powers of criticism and judgment, not to represent the people or to govern. The relationship between students and faculty is not completely or inherently equal. The faculty has the major responsibility to maintain control over academic matters.

These are sketches, admittedly incomplete, of two different models of a university. Neither of them comes in pure form. The differences between them, however, are profound and serious. The question before us, and, in my judgment, the critical question before every faculty in the country, is easily stated: Which university do we choose for ourselves?

I must speak for myself. I worry about politicizing the life of a university. If it is said that the university is already a political instrument of the establishment, it must be repudiated that the way to diminish this harmful situation is to refuse to contribute to it by more actions of the same sort.

No college or university can be completely non-political. There is a political dimension to all human institutions and to most human problems. But it does not follow that all basic problems are essentially political, and we must reject out of hand any notion that the issues within the university must be settled by power. It is simply not the case that power is the root of all our problems and must be the solution to them. If the university should become the plum for those who are struggling for power, it will be dead in a very short time.

A democratic society requires all of its institutions, including the university, to be responsive to the needs of the people. But the pressures of democracy which are welcome in the political arena must be distinguished from those which operate in the university. In civil society people join pressure groups, support political parties, and vote to indicate their demands and preferences. These are not the methods of the university. Further, a university cannot simply "reply" to people's demands as a city Mayor might in a hastily called press conference. It has its own special manner of response. The university is not merely another pressure point in the political community.

The university must always welcome pressures. It needs to know them and must demonstrate a willingness to have them registered. But it cannot permit its response to those pressures to violate the integrity of its principal function. In the university community important decisions are regularly made through established consultative procedures and by responsible authorities, not by a show of hands. We need to remind the public and ourselves that while the university is part of the civil order, it is not continuous with it.

It is easy to anticipate at least one argument that will be made in dissent from this view. It has many variations, but its central theme is this "In your university the 'real needs' of students will not be met. They want a curriculum which will see to it that 'a human being can become more human and more himself.' In your university education will not be relevant."

I would wish that "relevant" could be struck from the English language. The prospect, however, is not good. The alternative, then, is to set our thinking straight on what education is all about. I submit the following items:

(a) The classroom should not be a place where we simply discuss the student's inner life or what he may feel are his immediate needs. This is not to suggest that emotional responses to experience are unimportant. It is simply to say that group therapy or encounter sessions are not a substitute for rigorous and rational thought. Education must be something more than a "happening."

(b) The criteria of relevance is often a thinly disguised contemptuous attack on virtually any study of the past. Yet the truth is that none of us has any existence or reality without a past. One function of the university is to help discover what is new. But another is to preserve and reclaim the old for each new generation. These dual tasks create continuous tension between the demands of continuity and the demands of change.

(c) The university cannot be immediately relevant like the morning newspaper. That would be its ruin. Let the news media take care of the headlines and the fast-breaking story. A college education should be relevant in providing the perspective necessary to sort out what is trivial or momentarily useful. It should provide the grounding by which grievances and needs can be scrutinized and understood. Our concern as educators should be to make the

pursuit of knowledge as objective as possible so that we come to see relevance not simply in personal terms but as part of the larger world in which we live. It is in this sense that relevance should show us our common humanity.

(d) The university cannot permit questions of scholarship or aesthetic taste to be resolved by popular vote. I have heard it said that if students in English voted to remove Shakespeare from the curriculum because he is no longer relevant, the faculty should go along. There are a lot of things wrong with that sentiment. Putting Shakespeare to a vote indicates confusion not only about democracy but the ballot box. Asking students to vote on something they have not thought very long or hard about is to put ignorance on a par with knowledge and the inexperience of youthful judgment against the experience of professional and cultivated taste. Furthermore, the principle, once legitimized, will not stop with Shakespeare. In Mississippi the plebiscite will damn Walt Whitman and Carl Sandburg; in Orange County it will damn John Stuart Mill and Bertrand Russell.

The smug conventionalism about this position is the most obvious thing about it. What may not be quite so obvious, when it is advocated by a university scholar, some one (in this instance) who presumably is a professional student of literature, is its special character: it is a way of betraying knowledge for ideology, the universal for the particular, the relatively timeless for the merely fashionable. In short, assertions about the "irrelevance" of Shakespeare, Beethoven or whomsoever might well be seen as a sectarian blow against part of the idea of the university itself.

I believe in the university which feels it has an obligation, not just a right, to protect the fragile understandings upon which it rests and depends. In the eloquent words of Professor Robert Rosenzweig:

"The university as the place of openness, of reason, of persuasion, of the sharpened mind, and the free imagination. I believe the continued strength of the university to be more important to the future of man than ROTC, low-income housing, student power, faculty power, trustees responsibility, or any particular issue or set of issues that confronts us now."

I believe in the university which also recognizes how closely our freedoms resemble our obligations. The idea of academic freedom is a delicate and complex notion. Because of university violence it is now endangered. Because it is in danger many other things are endangered than just the university.

Academic freedom is not simply a college right. It is also a social right from which every one benefits. No one is entitled to be cavalier about it. Academic freedom is the right to free intellectual inquiry in the pursuit of truth, and all of us have a responsibility to preserve it, not just because it is good for us, but because it is the process of inquiry itself that is essential to the maintenance of democracy. It is the method by which a society looks critically at its own values. No free society can afford to do without it.

Colleges are one place where the free pursuit of truth is a primary obligation. None of us has a right to abandon it. We who believe in academic freedom will defend it against attacks by the extremists of the far left and the far right. We will be tolerant and long-suffering in its defense, but we will not give it away. We do not have that right.

It is a time of decision. I think we can—and must—choose. I have described the university to which I am deeply committed and for which I have the most tender regard. In the final analysis: what will count is the choice we are prepared to make. The un-

pardenable crime will be to make no choice at all. Should that happen, someone else will make it for us.

Here, at the end, but also at a beginning, you will understand perhaps why the opening lines of Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* have come back to me: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness . . . it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

The trouble with the dense of the university is the same as with defending freedom: it takes up so many of one's mornings.

I thank you for permitting me to spend this one with you.

POSTAL AUTHORITIES OPERATE UNDER DOUBLE STANDARDS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, double standards among bureaucrats are becoming the rule rather than the exception.

The Post Office authorities have now junked 56,000 ZIP code promotion posters after receiving complaints that the comic strip character "Amy," whose picture was on the poster dragging her doll baby by the hair appeared to be mistreating a black doll.

Yet, the same Department authorities completely ignoring complaints last month, authorized UNICEF committees to use post office lobbies for the sale of greeting cards over the period of November 16-December 4. No acknowledgement was even made that many of the so-called greeting cards have in the past been designed by Communist artists and atheists.

A blatant double standard; concern over so-called racism, but calloused disregard for atheistic communism. Perhaps Chairman Earl Warren of the UNO Association has brought his tremendous legal talents to justify another double standard.

I include the related clippings and the latest Pitney-Bowes postal meter honoring U.S. draft dodgers in the RECORD: [From the Postal Bulletin, Sept. 24, 1970]

ALL POST OFFICES: SALE OF UNICEF GREETING CARDS

Local representatives of the U.N. Committee for UNICEF may request permission from postmasters to set up a desk and chair in the post office lobby for the sale of greeting cards, to begin on November 16, 1970 for a 3-week period ending December 4, 1970. Postmasters are encouraged to assign an area 6' x 8', provided such space may be made available without interference to regular postal operations.

Arrangements have been made with General Services Administration to allow space in buildings under their control to be assigned at the discretion of the local building manager who will coordinate his decision with the postmaster.

Space can be authorized provided (1) that there will be no active solicitation of postal customers by the UNICEF representatives; (2) that the sale of the cards will be limited

to the space assigned; and (3) that the U.S. Postal Service will not furnish any equipment necessary for the sales effort—Special Assistant to the Postmaster General for Public Information, 9-24-70.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1970]
ZIP CODE COMICS: CAMPAIGN POSTER GETS NO SMILES, JUST RILES POSTAL OFFICIALS
 (By Sanford J. Ungar)

Amy and Agnes, who appeared briefly on mail trucks around the country earlier this month, have been recalled.

The Post Office Department acknowledged yesterday that it withdrew about 56,000 Zip Code promotion posters from circulation after complaints that their star, comic strip character Amy, appeared to be mistreating a black doll.

The cost of the posters, including delivery to post offices, was estimated at \$10,044.30.

Amy's constant companion, a rag doll named Agnes, is normally ochre-colored in the Sunday comics of about 60 newspapers. But when the Government Printing Office prepared the specifications for printing a poster design contributed to the Post Office by Amy's creator Jack Tippit, it mistakenly specified a mix of yellow, red and black ink.

As a result, Agnes's complexion came out dark brown. In the poster, she is being dragged on the ground while Amy mails a letter complete with Zip Code.

James S. Cline, executive director of creative services for the Post Office Department, said yesterday that the truck poster was dropped after complaints—apparently from a few-ranking postal officials—that "it could be interpreted as having racial overtones."

"I cannot see (that interpretation), and I will never see anything wrong with the poster," Cline said.

But he added that the Post Office is anxious to avoid any "derogatory" implications in its campaign to increase use of the Zip Code.

The Sept. 17 issue of the "Postal Bulletin," a weekly instruction sheet for postmasters, said the Amy poster "was delayed because of mechanical difficulties" and should not be used "due to prior commitments" to posters promoting the Peace Corps and community charity drives.

In many communities, however, Amy and Agnes had already been posted—including Tippit's hometown, Lubbock, Tex., and his current home, Westport, Conn.

They also are still in an exhibit of the 30 comic-strip Zip Code posters at the Smithsonian Institution here.

Tippit was one of 20 cartoonists who donated their time and designs to the Post Office through an arrangement with the Newspaper Comics Council.

Reached in Westport yesterday, he refused to discuss the suggestions of racial overtones in the poster, but said he would be meeting here with postal officials next month to discuss "some adjustment."

Both Cline and his assistant, Murray D. Kramer, admitted that the Post Office is "embarrassed" about the poster recall.

"We put (Tippit) in a precarious position because of a mistake we made," said Cline, a former vice president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.

He explained the mistake in Agnes's color this way:

The Amy poster was selected for early use on trucks in the Zip Code campaign because it contains few words and is easy to read. GPO sent it to a frequent subcontractor, Western Publishing Co. in St. Louis, for a rush printing job.

Western telephoned Cline to ask if he would forego using "color proofs" in order to have Amy ready for September use.

"The guy said, 'The doll's a little darker than on the original,' but we said, 'That's O.K.; go ahead,'" he explained.

It was only after the posters had been distributed that copies arrived at Post Office headquarters here and Cline and Kramer heard the objections.

At about the same time, the Post Office received requests for its annual help in advertising charity campaigns like the United Givers Fund. "That got us off the hook," Cline said.

Later, other questions were raised about the Amy poster. It was discovered, for example, that the mailbox where she was mailing her letter was red and blue; the Post Office recently began converting its mailboxes to solid blue.

Although some copies have been destroyed, the Post Office now finds itself with a huge surplus of Amy posters. Cline said they are being given away to local employees "who like posters."

His office has undertaken, however, to use Amy—with an appropriately shaded Agnes—again in the future.

A spokesman for The Register and Tribune Syndicate which distributes Amy to subscribing newspapers, said that "Little Agnes accompanies Amy everywhere, and there is never a question of her color."

The Zip Code campaign that Amy was recruited to help seeks to convert the senders of about 25 percent of first class mail—about 13 billion letters annually—who forget to write the number on the envelopes.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Washington, D.C., October 1, 1970.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: This will have reference to your recent inquiry concerning the use of post office lobbies for UNICEF greeting card sales.

For a number of years the Post Office Department has cooperated with a variety of civic and charitable organizations on worthy programs not involving the expenditure of federal funds, and where there was no interference with governmental activities. In furtherance of this policy, the Department has made lobby space available to a variety of worthy activities. In more recent years, lobby permission has been extended to UNICEF for selling greeting cards.

UNICEF has the support of the United States Government. As you know, UNICEF has consistently received support from the United States Congress in the form of appropriated funds. Therefore, after a re-examination of this matter, it has been determined that we will follow the same policy again this year that we have in the past with respect to UNICEF's requests for lobby space. Essentially, this policy has included a general approval from Headquarters, with the final disposition left to the individual post offices based on space available for such requests.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER D. HARRIS,
 Congressional Liaison Officer.

[From Human Events, Sept. 5, 1970]

PITNEY-BOWES' DOUBLE STANDARD

Last year Human Events wrote of a Louisiana lawyer's year-and-a-half fight to get the Pitney-Bowes postage meter company to insert the message "Fight Communism" on his personal mailing meter (December 8). Even when the courts finally ordered the company to provide the slogan plate, it added the words, "Maller's Adv." below the anti-Communist message. Apparently Pitney-Bowes has no such qualms about providing anti-Viet Nam message plates to customers, as the below metered envelope attests. (Not printed in Record.) That message—"In the Service

of Their Country: War Resisters in Prison"—implies that young men jailed for refusing military service are somehow serving their country. Also interesting is that the outfit using the slogan is "Discovery," a children's show televised by the American Broadcasting Co.

THE TRUTH ABOUT UNICEF

(By William E. Dunham)

(ITEM.—From a form letter circulated by the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. in June, 1969: "We feel that you are deeply aware of the needs of children all over the world, and of the worth of U.N.I.C.E.F. It and other fine UN organizations contribute to the international understanding and hope for a better world.")

Correction: Providing for the welfare of children in need is without question a most worthy project—but not when such efforts are used as a facade by the International Communist Conspiracy. Any one would expect from any agency connected with the United Nations, U.N.I.C.E.F. has had more than its share of Communists on the payroll. The first chairman of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund was Ludwig Rjachmann, a Communist from Soviet-controlled Poland. When he was subpoenaed in 1957 by the Senate Judiciary Committee to answer questions about his connections with Communist agent Alger Hiss, Rjachmann fled this country rather than appear before the Committee.

In 1952 the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee published a 434-page document entitled *Activities of United States Citizens Employed by The United Nations*, in which it revealed that: "startling evidence has disclosed infiltration into the UN of an overwhelmingly large group of disloyal U.S. citizens, many of whom are closely associated with the International Communist movement. . . . Their positions at the time we subpoenaed them were ones of trust and responsibility in the UN Secretariat and in its specialized agencies." One such subversive was a woman named Ruth Crawford, a publications officer for U.N.I.C.E.F. She declared under oath that she had been a member of the Communist Party and was still in sympathy with it. There was also Joyce Campbell, who admitted that she had been employed by the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, an officially cited Communist front organization, and that her position with that Front was the reference that obtained for her a job with U.N.I.C.E.F.!

In 1969 Lenin emphatically stated that "Maxim is materialism . . . it is . . . relentlessly hostile to religion." And in 1957 Nikita Khrushchev said: "We consider that belief in God contradicts our Communist outlook." In the face of Communism's consistently hostile attitude toward Christianity, U.N.I.C.E.F. shows where its allegiance lies by constantly choosing artists who have collaborated with Communist causes to design its Christmas cards.

Pablo Picasso, perhaps the best known of all the artists chosen by U.N.I.C.E.F. designed a card for them in 1961. The following year he received the Lenin Peace Prize from a spiritually sensitive soul in Moscow named Nikita Khrushchev. Did you know that Picasso has belonged to the French Communist Party since 1944? And that the December 1966 issue of the Marxist magazine *New World Review* praises him as a "life-long Communist"?

Consider also some of Picasso's stable mates, Hans Erni, artist of two U.N.I.C.E.F. cards in 1957, was refused admission to the United States in 1950 because of his Communist activities. Ben Shahn, artist of a 1958 U.N.I.C.E.F. card, has been connected with at least twenty-one Communist front organizations. Antonio Frasconi, artist of another 1958 U.N.I.C.E.F. card, was a signer of

the Artists Front to Win the War, an officially cited Communist Front. Doris Lee, a 1959 and 1960 U.N.I.C.E.F. card artist, has been affiliated with four officially cited Communist Fronts. She also signed a statement requesting U.S. aid for the Soviet Union and for Red China.

Arnold Bianchi, artist of 1962 and 1963 U.N.I.C.E.F. cards, has been connected with at least four officially cited Communist Front organizations. He has also regularly contributed cartoons and illustrations to Communist publications. Karel Svobinsky, artist of a 1963 U.N.I.C.E.F. card, is a Czech Communist. In 1966, Lajos Vincze, a writer and artist from Communist Hungary, did art work for some of the cards, while the biggest and most expensive card in the 1966 line was a painting by a French artist named Jean Lurcat—described by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "reportedly a member of the French Communist Party and an active member in numerous Communist Front organizations." Small wonder that Florence Fowler Lyons wrote in her column for September 11, 1968: "The Communist Party bookshop in Los Angeles has just informed me that 'soon' they will receive their annual supply of UNICEF greeting cards."

The Communist permeation of U.N.I.C.E.F. also explains the many strange ways this "charitable" organization spends its money. The newsletter of the McGraw-Edison Company's Committee For Public Affairs of December 1961 pointed out: "The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund . . . appropriated \$59 million between 1947 and 1958 to Communist countries. In a ratio not unlike that of other UN ventures, the United States has furnished approximately \$42 million of the money. Also, as with any 'aid' program, the assistance does not go to the needy but is administered through governments." And as any student of the Communist Conspiracy can tell you, food and medicine are used as political weapons to keep enslaved peoples under subjection. Witness the systematic, intentional starvation by the Reds of 10 million Ukrainians in the 1930's, and the Communist brutal use of U.N.R.R.A. supplies in the late 1940's in Poland as described by Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane in *I Saw Poland Betrayed*.

Do you remember the U.N. aggression in Katanga in 1961, when hospitals were bombed and civilians were indiscriminately killed? Well, U.N.I.C.E.F. helped finance it. We quote from Stanton Evans' column in the *Indianapolis News* for January 26, 1962: "When the UN was out of money for its Congo aggression, it borrowed \$10 million, earmarked for UNICEF, from the U.S. government. This was UNICEF money—handed over with UNICEF's express consent . . . In short . . . UNICEF moneys were used to subsidize the Katanga aggression."

In March 1960, only a few months after the bloody takeover of Cuba by Fidel Castro, U.N.I.C.E.F. voted to send this Communist regime \$170,000 for "health services," and for "environmental sanitation." In 1964 U.N.I.C.E.F. sent Castro another \$125,000 to spend, among other things, on a fleet of trucks and jeeps, plus the spare parts to keep them in condition. This was in addition to U.N.I.C.E.F.'s emergency appropriation to Communist Cuba that same year of \$205,000. The *D.A.R.* magazine for April 1969 contains an article about U.N.I.C.E.F. which notes: "the general public looked with jaundiced eye on UNICEF gifts of \$51 million worth of food and drugs to Cuba, where 'underground sources in that unhappy island' reported that the drugs are already aboard a Russian ship on their way to the Soviet Union."

In 1962 an important national Catholic weekly, *The Wanderer*, prepared a flyer about U.N.I.C.E.F. In it was the following: "As for Catholic spokesmen who in recent years have taken a stand against participating in UNICEF 'trick or treating,' only a few weeks

ago we wrote to Msgr. Edward J. Goebel, Milwaukee archdiocesan superintendent of schools, asking him whether Milwaukee schools still do not participate in the UNICEF Halloween program, and, if not, would he please state his reasons. Msgr. Goebel's reply, dated September 8, 1962, follows. He writes: "Our opposition to the UNICEF organization was based on the protest of our former Catholic Army chaplains who maintain that UNICEF proceeds were not contributed to youth in need, but rather they were taken up by the Communists in the (Communist-controlled) countries." "In short, U.N.I.C.E.F. supports the policy of submit or starve!"

Even without considering the Communists' exploitation of U.N.I.C.E.F., we would want to caution Americans against supporting it purely on grounds of its incompetence. One can do far more good with his money by supporting bonafide religious and charitable causes. The U.N.I.C.E.F. publication *Children Of The Developing Countries*, for example, admits that in 1961 U.N.I.C.E.F. had 875 employees and distributed about \$25 million. In typical contrast, the Catholic Relief Services for that same year distributed \$125 million in aid with a staff of only 130 employees.

To see how financially irresponsible U.N.I.C.E.F. can get, note the following from *National Review* for June 14, 1966: "Twenty million cents will permit UNICEF to occupy quarters on the sixth floor of the swank United Nations Plaza, instead of the unspacious second floor. Yes, last week UNICEF was offered the second floor—identical in layout to the sixth, except for some additional space—at a saving over five years of \$150,000 to \$200,000, plus a large contribution from a New York company that wanted to rent the sixth floor. The executive director, touring in Africa, telegraphed to the real estate agents that under no circumstances would he accept second-story space but insisted on the sixth; so, since ALCOA, the building owner, had a 'moral agreement' with the UN, that was that." U.N.I.C.E.F. claims that for one penny it can provide five glasses of milk. By such figures, its fancy quarters are depriving needy children of 100 million glasses of milk.

Consider also how adept U.N.I.C.E.F. is at squandering money in its everyday operations. G. Edward Griffin includes an excellent illustration of this in his valuable book *The Fearful Master, A Second Look At The United Nations* (Western Islands, Belmont, Massachusetts, 1964, \$1.00) where he writes: "UNICEF received one dollar for two teachers' manuals advertised in one of its promotional pamphlets; it sent not only the manuals, but a large box containing hundreds of expensively printed brochures glorifying the purposes and accomplishments of UNICEF. This unrequested and unwanted material was shipped first class airmail at a total postage cost of \$10.40. According to UN statistics this could have purchased 5,200 glasses of milk."

What must be especially galling to the untold thousands of Americans whose loved ones have been killed or wounded in the war in Vietnam is the recently announced plans of U.N.I.C.E.F. to funnel money to the government of Communist North Vietnam. As *Human Events* for June 28, 1969, reported: "The United Nations' International Children's Fund—UNICEF—will shortly begin negotiations to inaugurate an aid program for children in North Vietnam, marking the world body's first official contact with the Hanoi Communist regime. Discussions will be carried out by a UNICEF vice president, Dr. Boguslaw Kozusznik of [Communist] Poland."

Because of its simply monstrous record, U.N.I.C.E.F. hides behind a mask of alleged charity, for fear that the American public will come to realize that it is just one more "front" which the International Communist Conspiracy is using in its drive to enslave the world.

ON CALL FOR LAW

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to a most thoughtful constituent, Mr. Allen B. Chaney, of Rocky River, Ohio, for sending to me a copy of a very timely address given at the graduation exercises of the 87th Ohio State Patrol Academy, by Dr. Norman H. Dohn, professor of journalism at Ohio University.

Dr. Dohn's remarks contains truths that need to be spoken, and, once spoken, shared with the greatest possible number of Americans. It is an inspiring and important message.

The address follows:

ON CALL FOR LAW

(Address by Dr. Norman H. Dohn)

I know you want to get this thing over with, grab your certificate and get out of here. But you've got to listen to me for a few minutes. I don't know why. I guess it's because no graduation exercise would be complete unless someone told the graduates that this is the beginning and not the end. And challenged them to great and noble purpose.

Off hand, I can't think of another speech occasion in which so much preparation goes into saying so little in such a brief time . . . to so many who so quickly forget, half-hear, and become bored.

Now that the preliminaries are out of the way . . . I'm going to say some things that may startle you . . . particularly coming from a college professor. My remarks may seem a bit unusual because I'm going to depart from the customary graduation speech. I'm going to talk about something that is troubling me deeply . . . and I feel sure is troubling you . . . and that is . . . what in the world is happening to this country of ours?

Everywhere there seems to be a surrender of the ancient values that have sustained and restrained the human race upon this earth. The old virtues which we were brought up to respect and copy in our daily lives, are now derided and called, at best, old-fashioned and out-of-date.

And here is what disturbs me the most of all. Instead of being outraged by what has been going on, our leaders seem to be spending most of their time making up excuses for behavior which we were brought up to consider obscene, illegal, perverse, irresponsible, and even treasonous.

We hear a lot about freedom these days. But we hear very little about responsibility. We hear a lot about the right to express one's self . . . but very little about the right of the other people to avoid being offended by such expression.

We pussyfoot among a lot of high-sounding names. We call drunkards, "alcoholics." We call homosexuals "deviates." We call draft dodgers and slackers "pacifists." We call dope addicts "experimenters in personality extension." We call criminals "victims of society."

Some of this may be all right. Some of it may reflect a more compassionate attitude in our society. But I think the time has come when we should and must draw a line separating compassion from soft-headedness, permissiveness and timidity.

Near the end of his great book on the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, Edward Gibbon lists the reasons for the dissolution of the great political force which had held the civilized world together for more than 500 years. The principal reasons included:

Excessive spending by the central government.

Unwillingness of the young men to bear arms in defense of their country.

Overindulgence in luxury.

Widespread sexual immorality and easy divorce, which destroyed the integrity of family life.

The spread of effeminacy—girls looking and acting like men and men looking and acting like girls.

And disregard for religion.

That was Rome 1400 years ago. See any similarity with that picture and what is going on in the United States today? I do.

I have no patience with those who pooh-poo the idea that our moral fabric is falling apart, and who claim that conditions are no worse today than they were 50 years ago.

When most of us were young, women did not live in constant fear of assault, robbery and rape. Parents could send their children down to the corner store without dying a thousand deaths until they returned. A man could walk his dog around his neighborhood at night without fear of being mugged, or beaten up, or murdered just for kicks.

The decay of standards, of morals and of values is worse today than it ever has been . . . and we're not helping the situation if we try to hide our heads in the sand until it passes away. It's not going to pass away, unless we make it pass away.

Whose fault is it? In a way, it's everyone's fault. Too many of us have been talking about freedom without really knowing what freedom is all about.

Educators, politicians, clergymen, businessmen, and almost everyone else . . . have been demanding more and more freedom for more and more people. But they have failed to emphasize the responsibilities of freedom.

They have failed to make it clear that freedom is meaningless if it interferes with somebody else's freedom. Freedom is something you earn and deserve and build and create for yourself.

For too many of our citizens, freedom means freedom from unpleasantness, freedom from work, freedom from discipline, freedom from sacrifice, freedom from duty, freedom from responsibility, freedom from concern for one's neighbor.

That isn't freedom at all.

Too many of our citizens demand the right to determine what is moral and what is not. They end up determining that nothing is immoral . . . that everything goes.

They feel no obligations toward others who maintain traditional moral standards.

We are appalled when we see rioting in our streets and on our college campuses . . . especially when we are told the riots are instigated in the name of freedom.

What happens to the freedom of the innocent bystander who is killed or maimed in the riot? What happens to the freedom of the widow and the orphans of the police officer who was killed in the performance of his duty? What happens to the freedom of the man whose car happened to make an attractive target for a Molotov cocktail? Or the owner of the store whose windows are smashed and whose goods are looted off his shelves? Where are their rights? Who is standing up for them?

Riot is the absolute opposite of freedom. It is chaos. And chaos and freedom cannot exist side by side. Freedom implies order. It implies law . . . a common law to protect people, to sustain all rights, all ideals. Freedom is not selective. It is universal.

When men take the law into their own hands . . . when men, acting as individuals, decide for themselves which laws they will obey and which they will disobey, then we don't have freedom. We have a direct and aggravated assault on all freedoms.

In every society of free men there must be law-givers and law-abiders. And there must be penalties for those who will not abide.

The supreme court has preoccupied itself, it seems, with the rights of the accused. It

has all but rendered our police helpless. But let us examine the situation. Do we have a serious problem with innocent persons being wrongfully convicted? Do we really believe that our police are seizing every opportunity to brutalize suspects? Is this really the problem?

Of course it isn't.

The real problem is the abuse of thousands of innocent, helpless people by hardened criminals. For every case of police brutality, there are ten thousand cases of criminal brutality to innocent victims. Why, then, cannot the supreme court address itself to this problem, rather than destroying the effectiveness of the police who are trying to protect us?

The violence, the license, the lack of responsibility which infest our land have caused great divisions among our people.

The extremists of both sides have been guilty . . . equally guilty . . . of opening in our culture gaping wounds without stopping to consider what medicines are available to heal such wounds . . . or even whether such medicines actually exist.

What can we do about it?

There is no quick solution. We are a nation in trouble. It took a long time for our society to grow sick. It's going to take a long time for it to get well.

We can start by taking our heads out of the ground and recognizing the growing crisis around us for what it is. We can start relearning the art of self-discipline . . . and insisting that all elements within society learn it, too.

We must relearn and teach others that "there is no such thing as a free lunch." Our democratic society is based on a system of earned rewards and earned punishments. There is no place in our society for rewards and punishments that are not earned.

We must learn to call things by their right names. Violence is violence . . . no matter what the cause in which it is perpetrated. Violence is a serious breach of the law and must be treated as such.

We must stop coddling the breakers of our laws . . . making up excuses for them . . . looking complacently the other way because it is safer to ignore them.

We were a good society once . . . and though human nature didn't become perfect because of the knowledge of certain punishments . . . human wickedness was at least kept within reasonable bounds.

Then we tried the soft approach, in the hope it would make conditions better. This has failed. Conditions have become worse . . . not better . . . with each passing day.

We must grow tougher in our approach.

Treason is still treason and should be treated as such. Anyone who gives aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States is flirting with the very essence of treason. The same goes for sedition. And for all those who preach sedition . . . who teach it to their students . . . or who seek to arouse sedition in others by burning their draft cards or defaming and disgracing the flag.

If America, which was founded on a wise and carefully ordained balance of freedom and restraint, is to survive, we must return at once to the philosophy of that old "Rough Rider," Teddy Roosevelt, who declared nearly three-quarters of a century ago:

"No man is above the law and no man is below it. Nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it."

We know what we are opposed to. But do we know what we stand for? It is not enough to simply oppose evil. It is necessary to stand up and be counted . . . to become personally involved. *Either we stand for something, or we fall for anything.*

I congratulate you who are about to launch a career with the State Highway Patrol. You are a member of a proud, elite Law Enforcement Agency which commands public respect. This is a real distinction at a time

when most Law Enforcement Agencies are being abused and maligned for carrying out their constituted duties and responsibilities.

Even the most violent of the dissidents on the college campuses where the Patrol has been summoned respect you . . . even though they may hate you because you represent law and order.

You will be cursed, spat upon and harassed in all sorts of manner. But you must keep your "Cool." You must be ever mindful of the proud tradition that has been developed for the Patrol by the hundreds of fine officers who have served before you.

Be ever mindful that as freedom must be accompanied by responsibility . . . so must authority be in tandem with fairness and understanding.

Some weeks ago I heard a British Clergyman preach on the topic: "Be odd for God." The message, simply put, was that it takes courage and guts to serve God today when it is much more popular to be a disbeliever and revel in all that is immoral and base.

Similarly, it takes fortitude for those of you who have stood up to be counted . . . to stand for something . . . by electing to serve in the State Highway Patrol. Yours certainly is not a popular profession, particularly when it seems to be more fashionable and acceptable to break the law than abide by it.

So, just as the British clergymen implored his parishioners to be odd for God, I call upon you to be on call for law . . . and be peculiar for peace and order.

And let us all rededicate ourselves to the rebirth of courage, of ideals and principles, and the will to defend this nation both at home and abroad from all her enemies whomsoever.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have spoken out repeatedly about the plight of American prisoners of war, being held by the Hanoi Communists. We have made every overture that has been available. We have approved resolutions. We have spent hours during debate periods in the House of Representatives expressing our solicitude and urging the President to seek more contacts with the enemy through diplomatic channels. These efforts have brought no tangible results.

I was disappointed when our Paris negotiators dismissed as propaganda a suggestion by enemy spokesmen there that the POW's might be discussed, conditioned on certain term which our negotiators considered actually ruled out good faith and sincerity on Hanoi's part. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is so vital that nothing should be ruled out. Perhaps there has been some negotiation on the subject which has not been publicized. In any event, if the door is opened for even a half inch, the subject should be pursued.

In addition, I would hope the President will insist upon the disposition of prisoners of war being included in the withdrawal plans of American troops from Vietnam. The President has repeatedly expressed deep concern and has, I am sure, pursued every possible

diplomatic source in behalf of these prisoners. But there should be a relationship between the rate of withdrawal with the release of those men who are languishing in POW camps.

The enemy should be made to know, in no uncertain terms, that unless those prisoners are properly treated and released the repercussions will be awesome.

Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday evening in San Antonio I attended a function attended by some 1,600 people, including a number of wives of prisoners of war. The occasion was to hear a speech by Mr. H. Ross Perot, who have given so much and worked so hard in efforts to bring about the release of those men. It was a great speech and it had solid support from that audience.

Let us hope and pray new approaches, fresh methods, and more positive plans will be contrived in behalf of those patriots whose plight should be treated as the highest of priorities.

THIEU'S REPRESSION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as long as the U.S. Government gives the repressive Thieu-Ky government unqualified support, the war in Vietnam will go on and on. President Thieu's relentless opposition to realistic steps toward a negotiated peace has been made clear again and again. The latest instance was reported on September 30 in the New York Times, as follows:

DEPUTY DEFTING THIEU, AGAIN ASKS INTERIM REGIME

(By Alvin Shuster)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, September 29.—A 34-year-old member of South Vietnam's National Assembly defied President Nguyen Van Thieu today and renewed a call for the formation of a provisional Government as a step toward peace.

The proposals of the legislator, Ngo Cong Duc, and the response to them from the Thieu Government, have stirred excitement since they were just made several days ago.

President Thieu implied that Mr. Duc was a traitor and said he would be in jail if not for his legislative immunity. A petition seeking the possible removal of Mr. Duc's immunity is being circulated in the House of Representatives. At least two advocates of peace proposals opposed by Mr. Thieu have been jailed.

The Government's harsh response to the cautious proposals, which fall short of suggesting the inclusion of Communists in a provisional Government, reflects the intense sensitivity of Mr. Thieu to any suggestions that even hint of concessions to Vietcong demands for the removal from power of himself, Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky and Premier Tran Thien Kiem.

Mr. Duc, who called a news conference today to explain his proposals, has been careful to avoid urging the immediate abolition of the present Government. He says he believes he is speaking for many war-weary South Vietnamese who are searching for an end to the present impasse over a political solution at the Paris peace talks.

President Thieu, who has often been attacked by Mr. Duc and his small bloc of anti-

Government Deputies, said last weekend that political opposition "is a good thing in a Democratic country." But he added that Mr. Duc had gone too far.

He said the Duc proposals "were beneficial to the Communists" and urged the House to adopt a "clear attitude" toward Mr. Duc.

After Mr. Duc's explanations today, the Government continued to show its unhappiness by confiscating all copies of tomorrow's issue of Tin Sang, a newspaper published by Mr. Duc, who also is chairman of the Vietnamese Newspaper Publishers Association. The police came to the office tonight to prevent distribution.

More than 70 issues of the newspaper have been confiscated in the last nine months. Editors of some of the other newspapers here—there are 32 in the Vietnamese language in Saigon—said they had been told to drop reports of the news conference or face confiscation.

At his news conference, held in a crowded room of the House of Deputies, Mr. Duc said the proposed provisional Government should be "without members of the Thieu Government."

He said it should be composed of non-Communists who are "not servants of foreign interests."

"National reconciliation can only be achieved through mutual compromise, not through mutual accusation or demands of surrender," Mr. Duc said, adding that the war cannot end by a decisive military victory for either side. He called for a cease-fire and the total withdrawal of all foreign troops.

He said: "Those who have accused us of being traitors must look at themselves. I have condemned the Liberation Front for indiscriminate killing of innocent civilians. I have also pointed out that while the South Vietnamese do not like the Americans and are opposed to the Thieu Government they also fear a Communist takeover of South Vietnam."

A BRIEFING ON THE FCC'S FAIRNESS DOCTRINE AND THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES PROVISION OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the newly elected president of the Capital Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, an organization composed of lawyers who are Members of Congress, congressional staff aides, committee counsel and Library of Congress attorneys, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a briefing sponsored by the Capitol Hill Chapter and the Communications Law Committee of the Federal Bar Association on the equal opportunities provision of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the Federal Communications Commission's Fairness Doctrine. This subject is of unusual timeliness and significance in view of the impending congressional and senatorial elections and the FCC's recent adoption of several landmark decisions on Fairness Doctrine questions. The briefing will be held on Tuesday, October 6, 1970, 3:30 p.m., at the Select Committee on Small Business hearing room, 2361 Rayburn House Office Building. I extend an invitation to all Members of Congress and their staffs to attend.

Key members of the staff of the Fed-

eral Communications Commission will present a brief review of the latest developments in this area and will be available to answer questions concerning application of the equal opportunities and fairness doctrines to specific situations. Among the FCC staff members present will be Max D. Paglin, executive director and cochairman of the Communications Law Committee, Henry Geller, special assistant to Chairman Dean Burch and former general counsel, and William B. Ray, chief of the complaints and compliance division. Staff members of the Senate and House Communications Subcommittee will be on hand to answer inquiries concerning S. 3637—equal time for broadcasting—which was passed by the Senate and House. Erwin G. Krasnow, cochairman of the Communications Law Committee and former president of the Capitol Hill chapter, is chairman of the program.

Everyone attending the briefing will be given copies of the FCC's most recent primer on "Use of Broadcast Facilities by Candidates for Public Office" and the handbook prepared by the National Association of Broadcasters on Political Time and the Fairness Doctrine.

A SUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENT IN POLICE DEPLOYMENT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the October 1970 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Chief Earle W. Robitaille of the Huntington Beach Police Department in California has written an article on a novel system of police deployment.

Basically, Chief Robitaille points out that the use of 10-hour instead of 8-hour shifts has had a remarkable effect on the efficiency of his department and the morale of the officers.

So that others might have the benefit of the Huntington Beach experience, I am including the article in the Record at this point.

MANPOWER WHEN YOU NEED IT

(By Earle W. Robitaille)

Police administrators have long recognized that the hourly fluctuation in law enforcement workloads has not coincided with the normal 8-hour patrol shift, and they have tried to develop new systems of deployment to meet this problem. Several effective solutions have been offered; however, many of these proposed solutions have their own corresponding problems.

In analyzing the workload of the Huntington Beach Police Department, we found two periods of time in which there are sharp changes. During the first period, between 9 p.m. and 3 a.m., the rate of criminal occurrence is high and most of the calls require dispatching two police units. The second time period is that between 3 a.m. and 7 a.m., when we experience a sharp drop in the number of calls for service and the police task becomes one of basically inspecting police hazards.

Under the regular system of patrol deployment where each watch was on duty for 8 hours, we were experiencing large fluctuations in workload during the shifts. Typical

of this problem was our "graveyard" shift. During the early portion of the shift, which started at 11 p.m., the level of calls for service was high. At approximately 3 a.m., there was a sharp drop in the number of calls for service received. During this latter period, the number of officers on duty exceeded that necessary to perform the police services required.

We have studied methods of manpower distribution which would result in the assignment of the maximum force during the late evening hours and the minimum force during the early morning hours. After considering several alternate methods, we arrived at the decision to abandon the 8-hour shift in favor of a 10-hour day.

This "Ten Plan" reduced the work-week to 4 days. This system resulted in a shift overlap during the late evening hours increasing the number of beat patrol units by 45 percent. During the low call-for-service period between 2:30 a.m. and 7 a.m., the number of beat patrol cars was reduced by 30 percent. This plan resulted in the assignment of personnel in a closer ratio to the departmental workload.

We were of the opinion that the Ten Plan would not only increase the efficiency of the police department, but would also serve as an employee benefit. This plan allowed us to reduce the workweek by 2½ hours. This was accomplished by incorporating the briefing period into the base 40 hours, which resulted in a workday increase of only 90 minutes. This scheduling had not been possible under the 8-hour shift. Our initial poll of the officers indicated that they were in favor of having 3 days off each week. However, our proposal, to our knowledge, had never been tested. We were of the opinion that, in order to effectively evaluate the merits of the Ten Plan, we should institute the program for a 90-day test period.

During early stages of the test period, which was instituted on February 2, 1970, we found officers having a difficult time adjusting to the new shifts. One of the primary complaints was that they could not find activities to occupy their 3-day weekends. It was not uncommon to find officers returning to the police facility on their days off.

After the initial 2 weeks, the men became accustomed to the new shift assignments and generally expressed the opinions that they would like to continue on a 10-hour day.

OBJECTIVE EVALUATION

At the conclusion of the 90-day test period, a questionnaire was circulated to those patrolmen affected by the plan. The men were asked whether they felt the 10-hour patrol shift had increased the department's efficiency, whether they wanted the longer shift continued, and what problems the 10-hour shift had created.

After reviewing the questionnaires returned by the officers, which overwhelmingly reflected their desire to continue with the Ten Plan, we attempted to conduct objective evaluation of the plan's effect upon the efficiency of our service.

The evaluation consisted of a study of only those hours which were directly affected by the change. There were no changes in manpower during the day shift and little change during the early portion of Watch II (swing shift). Therefore, we have only concerned ourselves with that time period between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. during which the major shift in manpower occurred.

RESPONSE TIME

In reviewing the effect of the Ten Plan on the patrol units' response time, we considered the period between 9 p.m. and 2 a.m., when Shift II and Shift III overlap, and the time between 2 a.m. and 7 a.m., when we reduce the number of personnel assigned to duty.

As could be expected, the response time

between 9 p.m. and 2 a.m. was significantly reduced. Our study reflected a 32 percent reduction in response time on Code 3 (proceed to location with red light and siren) runs and a 38 percent reduction on routine calls.

The result we did not anticipate was the reduction of response time during the period of 2 a.m. to 7 a.m. The Ten Plan called for a 30 percent reduction in manpower during this time period. In spite of this substantial reduction in manpower, there was a 46 percent reduction in the response time on Code 3 runs and a 7.7 percent reduction on routine calls.

In attempting to determine what factors caused this increased efficiency, we found that prior to the application of the Ten Plan, Watch III (graveyard) was receiving a majority of its calls for service prior to 2 a.m. Because officers assigned to that shift were unable to file their reports until later in the shift, many times after 2 a.m., there was a substantial reduction of units available on the street between the hours of 2 a.m. and 7 a.m. The efficiency of the shift was further reduced by officers processing arrestees who would be taken into custody during the shift's peak period of 11 p.m. to 2 a.m. With the introduction of the Ten Plan and the resulting increase of personnel on duty between the hours of 11 p.m. and 2 a.m., many of the calls received during this period are now serviced or handled by Watch II (swing shift). As a result, more Watch III cars are available for service during the period of 2 a.m. to 7 a.m.

OFFICERS' FIELD ACTIVITY

We conducted a study of the patrol division's total field activity under the Ten Plan and found that between the hours of 9 p.m. and 2 a.m., felony arrests have increased 16.6 percent, misdemeanor arrests increased 55.28 percent, and observations increased 31.5 percent. Traffic citations have decreased 2.9 percent, but we could identify no outside cause for this reduction.

During the time period of 2 a.m. to 7 a.m., when the number of patrol units is reduced, we noted an 87.5 percent increase in felony arrests and no change in misdemeanor arrests.

COMMERCIAL BURGLARIES

One of our primary concerns about reducing the number of officers on duty between 2 a.m. and 7 a.m. was that we would experience an increase in commercial burglaries. Contrary to our beliefs, we found that prior to the implementation of the Ten Plan, we were experiencing 1.63 commercial burglaries each day. After instituting the 10-hour shift, we found the rate dropped to 1.3 commercial burglaries a day, a 20.2 percent reduction in that crime.

OVERTIME

In comparison the overtime expenditures under the Ten Plan to those under the normal 8-hour shift, we found that the overtime required for completing reports under the new plan is 47.8 percent less than previously expended.

The members of the investigative staff of the Huntington Beach Police Department, while not themselves scheduled on a 10-hour day, have encouraged the continuation of the plan. They have noted that, since the institution of the plan, the reports written and the investigations conducted by the patrolmen are far superior to those submitted prior to the test period. This improvement is attributed to the availability of time to file comprehensive reports—a direct result of the Ten Plan.

After reviewing our test of the effectiveness of the Ten Plan, we concluded that this method of scheduling not only increases the efficiency of our department, but also has a positive effect upon the morale of the officers. This higher morale, while not directly measured by our test, is reflected in the quality

of work being produced. We have adopted the 10-hour shift for patrol forces on a year-round basis.

A DIFFERENT APPROACH TO THE CAUSE OF WATER POLLUTION

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure is true of all my colleagues in the House, I share the public's great concern for the protection of all aspects of our environment. However, if this concern is to be effective in achieving the environmental goal we seek, it requires also a recognition of the complexity of many of the ecological problems we confront and the need for thorough research in understanding the nature of these problems before committing our resources of proposed solutions.

For example, I have in mind the alleged role of detergent phosphates in causing eutrophication. Some have advanced a very simplistic solution—remove all phosphates from detergents and thereby curtail the eutrophication of our lakes. More thoughtful experts, however, are challenging the validity of this approach, including a team of chemists and biologists at the Southeast Water Laboratory at Athens, Ga. An article on their work appeared recently in the Atlanta Constitution which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

I am not a water quality scientist. I do not know the extent that phosphates cause water pollution. However, when the experts disagree, the public is entitled to see and hear from both sides. I include the article in the Record which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution earlier this year:

PHOSPHATES NOT TRUE CAUSE OF POLLUTION, ATHENS FIRMS
(By Jeff Nesmith)

In the midst of a national push to ban phosphate compounds from detergents because they are thought to cause a serious pollution problem, scientists at Athens have found evidence that the phosphates are not the culprits after all.

The pollution problem for which phosphates are being blamed is called "eutrophication." It is the process by which a lake dies. Overwhelmed by a sudden growth of small plants, mostly algae, the lake loses dissolved oxygen, when the algae dies and begins to decay. Without dissolved oxygen, fish and other aquatic creatures cannot live.

For several years scientists have been aware of a correlation between the presence of phosphate compounds and the unnatural growth, or "bloom" or algae that leads to eutrophication.

And detergents are a major source of phosphate pollution because phosphorous compounds are added when the cleansers are manufactured. As detergents replaced soap, the volume of phosphorous pollution of lakes and rivers in this country tripled.

Therefore, the association between phosphorous and the increasingly common algae "blooms" has led to a movement to force detergent manufacturers to stop adding phosphate compounds to their products.

It was believed that phosphorous was directly responsible for the sudden algae growth and that the answer to this problem was simple: remove the phosphate compounds and the eutrophication will stop.

However, a team of chemists and biologists at the Federal Water Pollution Administration's Southeast Water Laboratory at Athens have made a painstaking analysis of algae blooms and decided that phosphorous is not the true culprit.

Phosphorous is but one of the elements necessary to living things. Others are carbon, nitrogen, oxygen and other materials that are available in an unnatural abundance in any polluted stream or lake.

However, when such elements as carbon, oxygen and nitrogen are put into the water in the form of organic compounds they generally are not available to the algae. They must first be broken down into simpler chemicals that the algae can utilize.

The Southeast Water Lab scientists have described a complex cycle in which water bacteria and protozoa consume organic pollution (such as sewage) and reduce it to compounds—mostly carbon dioxide—which the algae can use. In exchange, the algae release oxygen that the bacteria and protozoa must have.

The capacity of a lake or stream to accommodate this type of exchange can be tremendous and as more and more pollution is added, the algae, as well as the protozoa and bacteria, increase to tremendous quantities.

However, a cool day or a cloudy day can cause all the algae to die. The lake becomes an extremely odorous cess pool; and as the other organisms begin to consume the decaying algae, water oxygen is reduced to zero. The lake dies.

Phosphorous plays a key role in the description developed at the Athens lab, both in the tremendous growth of algae and the corresponding growth of bacteria and other organisms.

The difference is that phosphorous is not the prime culprit.

Remove any of them, including phosphorous, and eutrophication stops.

"But what do we want?" asks Miss Pat Kerr, a member of the Athens research team and co-author of a recent article on eutrophication. "What is increased water quality? Is it the absence of phosphorous or is it a balanced water environment?"

The answer, of course, is obvious.

To simply prevent one of the more obnoxious aspects of pollution from occurring is not adequate. A lake can be utterly polluted without the offensive odor associated with eutrophication.

The solution rather than banning one element of pollution, is to cure the entire problem.

THE SOVIET THREAT

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to identify myself wholeheartedly with the remarkable statement made on the floor of the House today by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Having visited the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean earlier this month and having seen firsthand the full impact of the Soviet naval buildup, I urge every American to heed the warning sounded in the well of the House this afternoon. The remarks of the chairman deserve the sober attention of all

of us. Too long have we taken for granted our naval superiority. Our missile advantage exists no more. Unless we determine at once to respond to the growing strength of our adversary within this decade, we will find ourselves faced with the kind of military blackmail that heretofore has been wreaked only upon the weak nations of the world.

I commend the chairman for his timely speech. It remains to be seen whether it will serve as a turning point in our resolve or another lost voice in a sea of complacency.

DRUG TRAFFIC IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently the New Leader published an article by a veteran British correspondent, Ray Alan, titled "Drug Traffic in the Middle East."

Since the article corroborates the feeling of a growing number of people that I have talked to in the United States who feel that the key to reversing the upward spiral of drug addiction is to dry up the supply, I think my colleagues will be interested in what a Middle Eastern specialist has to say about drug running in the Near East.

DRUG TRAFFIC IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Ray Alan)

MADRID.—Another group of young Americans had just been arrested for peddling narcotics here, and we were discussing the incident. "Dope addicts are like syphilitics," a Spanish doctor commented. "They feel impelled to pass on their disease. It's their way of getting even with society for playing such a dirty trick on them." A newspaperman added: "And America, a diseased society, feels impelled to infect other societies."

An Englishwoman then told this story: "Last summer on the Costa Brava, an American family had the next apartment to ours. Our two balconies adjoined. They were always trying to be friendly and encouraging the children to get together. We snubbed them time after time; they must have thought we were savages. They seemed educated and looked nice—the man was a minister of one of the more respectable American churches—but I had such a fear of their kids taking ours into some quiet corner and persuading them to take dope."

A few days later, I was looking through my collection of old maps with an American friend who had asked me for "something exotic" to make a lampshade. We came to one marked "Secret, Near East. Opium, morphine and hashish." It was an old French Army map on which hashish-producing regions had been shaded in green, opium poppy areas in red, and morphine laboratories in blue; green, red and blue dotted lines traced the drug-runners' known routes. I had added a few details myself, but most were already there when the document was given to me many years ago.

"Hell's bells!" my friend exclaimed. "I'll land in jail if I take that home."

"You wanted something exotic," I said. "In the States right now," he replied sadly, "drugs are about as exotic as a drunken Irishman on Saint Patrick's Day. They're becoming an epidemic." He tapped the map.

"You've seen the Middle East drug traffic. You ought to publish something about it in America. What's the cause of the drug mania? What's the answer to it? How have countries like Egypt dealt with it? Maybe we can learn something from them. You've no idea how badly we need help."

So here I am, looking at that out-of-date map, trying to remember something significant, and wondering how it is that the colored lines now mainly point westward. Most of the Near East's opium poppy crop is grown in Turkey, Persia and occasionally Egypt. Morphine, extracted from the poppy itself, is produced in Turkey—legally for medicinal purposes, illegally for conversion (chiefly in France and Italy) into the more potent, and profitable, heroin. *Camabis sativa*, grown in Lebanon, Syria and Turkey, is familiar in many parts of southern Asia, North Africa and America as Indian hemp, bhang, ganja, grifa, and marijuana, and is the primary ingredient in such preparations as hashish, kif and charras.

The man who gave me the map had another like it, and lived in Egypt. While a British officer at the end of World War II, I devoted some time getting to know the Syrian-Turkish frontier area; later, southern Syria and Lebanon. I made an effort now and then to check some of the dotted lines and add a new one, keeping my Egyptian contact informed. But drugs were not our business—it was just that we thought it might prove useful one day to know something about smuggling routes and the men who used them—and I had orders not to take any initiative. Indeed, I had been told by an influential British official that "antidrug fanatics like Russell Pasha" had done Britain more harm than good.

Sir Thomas "Pasha" Russell, a dedicated British police officer who retired in 1946, spent the 1930s and early '40s fighting the hashish and heroin traffic then ravaging Egypt. In 1930, nearly 10 per cent of male Egyptians were taking dope, and 5-6 per cent were already addicts.

It has been said that but for Russell and his colleagues, Egypt would soon have ceased to count as a nation—reason enough for some British Mideast specialists to criticize him. By 1940 he had broken the back of the problem, and wartime controls strengthened his hand: The British Army moved into Lebanon and Syria the following year, and at Russell's request occupied a big part of the island during the next four summers burning hemp crops and chasing smugglers. That earned Britain the enmity of some of the Levant states' most influential families.

By the time I arrived in the Near East, the hashish trade was reviving. In the summer, on Lebanese mountain tracks, one might come across many donkey-loads of the hemp plant being brought in from the fields. After being dried and flaked, the crop was steamed and compressed into khaki-green kilo bricks, which camels and trucks took down to the plain for shipment from Lebanon and Syrian ports, or via Acaba in Jordan. In the trade never recovered its prewar importance, in part because the reemergence of Israel cut the overland smuggling route to Egypt.

The growers and first-stage smugglers I met were on the whole conventional God-fearing men—the growers mainly Christians or Syrian Alawites, the smugglers Moslems of a variety of sects. All seemed to enjoy the face-saving game of hide-and-seek they played with the local gendarmes and customs men. It was only a face-saving game because graft was a way of life in Lebanon and Syria. The key producers had bribed key officials, even small growers had a political string to pull, and the first-stage smugglers had taken care, in their jargon, to "buy themselves a route."

What happened to the stuff once they were paid for it did not interest them in the least.

I asked some growers and smugglers if they ever smoked hashish. The reply was al-

ways an indignant "No!" Proud though they might be of the quality of their crop, they would nevertheless assure me that hashish was for the subnormal and wretched—"Egyptians, underdogs; not real men." Their contempt for their ultimate clients was unbounded. In the magical mountain scenery of Lebanon, western Syria and southern Turkey, it was all too easy to forget those distant customers in the slums of Egypt and consider hemp just another crop—even something of a joke, as it was to most Lebanese.

I was a rather earnest youth, however, and I took the dope traffic seriously, having read a file of Russell's reports and seen a few addicts in Egypt. Still, my immediate reaction was to smile when I realized one day in Cyprus that the little hedges surrounding an open-air restaurant and separating its tables were Indian hemp plants. Cyproites, I discovered, were uninterested in narcotics; I preferred bread. At the restaurant I told me the only person to do a little harvesting when the hedges flowered was the Moslem sheikh who read the Koran every morning over *Sharq el-Adna*, the British Foreign Office's Communist-infiltrated Arabic radio station.

In due course, I went on to other work and lost sight of the dope trade. Then a Turkish official told me of a new development. It seemed that American and Western European youngsters, mainly middle-class students, had suddenly taken to visiting India and Nepal. Some of them were bringing back drugs and selling them in Turkey in order to help finance their travels.

As morphine producers, the Turks did not want a drug problem in their own back yard, so they were passing stiff sentences on these foreign delinquents. Protests were flowing in from fond parents, while Western newspapers and politicians expressed anger that "decent" white Christian kids should be locked up in harsh Oriental prisons. But, asked the official, why hadn't the parents kept their dismal offspring out of trouble in the first place? What sympathy would be shown a Turk who was found to be pushing dope in the West? Back in Western Europe, I was surprised to hear talk of hashish one day in an English university town. A pusher had appeared in a student's residence, and while some of the young men kept him talking, an executive of the student union called the police and had the outsider arrested. It appeared in subsequent discussion that the majority of students in the residence approved of the action.

The incident took place about a year and a half ago, at a university the gutter press had pilloried for alleged moral laxity. A few months later in France, I read the results of an opinion poll in which 84 per cent of the youths questioned declared themselves firmly "against drugs." Clearly, neither England nor France seemed in any great danger from narcotics.

But today in England, France and Spain drugs are a problem, though as yet a minor one by American standards. France has about 6,000 addicts, Britain 4,000, and Spain, the most exposed of the three, has fewer than 3,000. Great quantities of hashish pass through Spain on their way northward from Morocco, and heroin is coming in from France. But with more than 20 million tourists visiting Spain annually, the authorities can only skim the surface of the dope traffic.

The situation was complicated last year by an international hippie migration to the Spanish Mediterranean islands of Ibiza and Formentera—for a few weeks there actually were more hippies than Spaniards on Formentera. Now the government is tightening its drug and vagrancy laws, and the police are giving hippies compulsory baths and haircuts, in the hope of discouraging another invasion.

Police and educational authorities in France and Spain blame U.S. youths for the spread of the dope craze. In Britain, where

Americans are not so conspicuous, the allegation is less assertive but still made, since most teen-age fads there—whether motorcyclist exhibitionism or campus Maoism—are imitation American. It is perhaps significant that the jargon of British hoppers comes exclusively, and pathetically, from across the Atlantic: fix, trip, turn on, pot, reefer, horse . . . even marijuana (though most of the hashish smuggled into Britain comes from North Africa and the Near East, not Mexico). A dope slogan or catch phrase coined in New York will be parroted in London within a week or so.

The speed with which the jargon circulates, and the fact that lobbies in distant cities and countries call for the legalization of "soft" drugs in more or less identical terms, have made many Europeans suspect that someone is masterminding the narcotics explosion. But who? The Mafia? Mao's China?

Some European Left-wingers (the genuine ones, not the teenyboppers of the New Left or the Maoist *Tontons Macoutes*) blame "big business." "Capitalism must have a docile labor force," they argue. "Persuading young workers and students to dope themselves is the easiest way of getting it." In their view, the narcotics traffickers are tied up with such industries as pop music and mod fashion, and the mythic "drug culture" that has bedazzled thousands of American adolescents is more than merely clever PR work. "It's brainwashing," a militant international anarchist told me one day. "The regimentation of the young and gullible by the barons of the consumer society. Note the complacent, discreetly approving, attitude of leading big-business organs."

To be sure, the original "Assassins" (*hashishin*), a Shiite Moslem sect, were superstitious with hashish by their Grand Master so that he might exploit their credulity. And in our own century, cases have been reported in Egypt and the Far East of employers giving their workers a ration of hashish, opium or heroin. But I doubt if one need blame anything more occult than the profit motive for the present narcotics explosion.

If before the War fortunes could be made by supplying drugs to Egyptian slum-dwellers, the profits that are being squeezed out of the affluent U.S. market must be superpsychic. The price of heroin is said to appreciate 500 per cent between Marseille and New York, and 6,000 per cent between the New York "importer" and consumer. It is not surprising, then, that the field attracts many eager businessmen—slick young graduates as well as old-fashioned *Mafoes*. (I have heard, too, that some cigarette manufacturers and pharmaceutical firms are even experimenting with hashish-tobacco blends and "safe" synthetic mind-shrinkers, in readiness for the day when "soft" drugs are legalized. Are any of them also investing promotional funds in an effort to hasten the day?)

Americans seem to like the theory that drug-taking is a reaction against the increasing material and moral complexity of modern life. But the middle-class and *petit-bourgeois* youngsters who are now the pushers' best prospects have far less to worry about materially, and live in a far simpler moral universe, than their equivalents 30-40 years ago. By Western standards, too, the Egyptian society that produced so many hashish and heroin users was not in the least complex.

Excluding from the discussion the poet or painter who may experiment with drugs in the hope of enriching his art, the Near Eastern experience suggests several major factors for narcotics abuse. They include a relatively servile status; a monotonous, wearying and/or debasing mode of life; a sense of personal inadequacy and purposelessness; boredom; group ethics tolerant of "extreme" forms of escapism (these might embrace religion and alcohol as well as narcotics); and above all,

an efficient supply network employing shrewd distributors and active pushers.

In Egypt, Sir Russell's strategy was to cut supply routes. Employing polyglot police officers and captured smugglers, he built up a crack anti-narcotics intelligence service, and concentrated repressive action against suppliers and distributors. Drug-users were not usually imprisoned unless they were also pushers—or had asked to be jailed, as many did in the hope of finding release from their habit. Imprisonment in order to effect a cure can be a nightmarish experience for addict and jailers alike, but it was the only treatment available in Egypt and in some cases it worked.

In one Egyptian town, a heroin addict found that his craving for the drug had left him after he had been bitten by a mad dog and undergone the usual course of anti-rabies injections. As the news spread, other addicts flocked for the treatment. When doctors refused to cooperate, a local barber rigged up a dog's skull that gave a realistic spring-operated bite for a few plasters.

Of all drug-users, the heroin addict is the most desperate for a cure and the hardest to help. Some authorities even argue that it is cruel to try to help him, and kindest to let addiction run its course. The hashish smoker, on the other hand, is much less likely to become hooked if he is in good physical and mental health. For example, I have known well-fed, well-balanced Europeans to smoke, as an experiment, a quantity of hashish that would probably send an Egyptian peasant over the roof; but because they found it so boring, they discontinued and went back to whiskey.

The trouble, of course, is that the people most likely to use hashish are not in the best of mental health. All too often they are immature and insecure, and some are incipient neurotics or psychotics. (It is admittedly arguable that without hashish they would become dependent on something anyway, be it alcohol, amphetamines, astrology, quack psychiatry, religious or political fanaticism.)

In the Near East, the usual effects of hashish I observed with the inducement of apathy, passivity, indifference to social evils, neglect of physical well-being, and erosion of the moral block that prevents normal adults from fooling with harder drugs like heroin. Once a man took to hashish, he found it difficult to let go, so long as it was available; a disruption of supplies would usually release him. Roughly 20-25 per cent of the hashish users developed a desire for stronger action, and most of these went on to heroin if it was available.

Obviously, supplies are the key to the problem. If narcotics are easily obtainable and efficiently pushed, the social workers and educators worrying about drugs might just as well take up golf, for all the good they can do. But cuts of supplies and jail distributors, and the situation becomes manageable. Thus Iran has been able to reduce addiction merely by executing a dozen or so smugglers. Britain supplies more or less hopeless cases with a heroin ration under the National Health Service so as to keep them out of crime, but stern police measures have been found necessary to combat the pushers who attempt to propagate addiction.

It can be argued that narcotics of some kind should be made available on humanitarian grounds to people who work at hard-drug jobs, have no creative or sporting talent, live in squalid cities, and are unable to get away on weekends to coast or countryside. Inexpensive drugs might also help eradicate much mindless juvenile delinquency, itself a form of escapism. This is a moral problem, however, and should be discussed as such by responsible public opinion. Certainly it should neither be resolved by the lobbying of commercial interests, nor neglected until society is faced with a *fait accompli*.