WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, October 14, 1970:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

William J. Curtin, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service for a term of 1 year, which was sent to the Senate on September 28, 1970.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 774, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, November 16, 1970.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 774, the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 16, 1970, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 14, 1970:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Elmer T. Klassen, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service for a term of 1 year; new position.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. William Henry Moncrief, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. William Hyde Meroney III, xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-... Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Robert Morris Hardaway III; xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Henry Vogel, Jr., xxx-... xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Moncrief, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Spurgeon Hart Neel, Jr., xxx-xx-x... xxx-x... Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 14, 1970:

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Jonathan Owen Seaman xxx-xx-x... xxx-x... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, xxx-xx-xx... xxx-xx... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-... Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. Jackson D. Arnold, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning George B. Aaron, to be major, and ending Phillip A. Johnson, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on Sept. 24, 1970.

UNESCO CONFERENCE REPRESENTATIVES

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

John Richardson, Jr., of Virginia.
Louise Gore, of Maryland.
Pierre R. Graham, of Illinois.
Harold Taft King, of Colorado.
Kimon T. Karabatsos, of Virginia.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Edward T. Brennan, of Massachusetts.
Edward O. Sullivan, Jr., of New York.
R. Miller Upton, of Wisconsin.
Tom R. Van Sickle, of Kansas.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH TO THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, "clearcutting" is a type of logging practice which is used by our public land management agencies, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. It refers to the total removal of all timber and other vegetation from a plot of land, usually followed by burning and reforestation. It is a practice which is coming under increasing opposition from concerned groups all over the country.

The word "clearcutting" is very descriptive in terms of what the countryside looks like after being subjected to this practice. The scene is one of total devastation, more like the site of a military Armageddon than that of a placid national forest. Literally nothing remains but rows of gouging "terraces" in the hillside. Anyone who knows the beauty of a forest cannot avoid a feeling of dismay when viewing the aftermath of a clearcutting operation.

Why then allow clearcutting at all? Many conservationists, outdoorsmen, residents of affected communities, and foresters themselves are beginning to ask this question with increasing insistency. The answers which are forthcoming are not wholly satisfying, although they reveal the issue to be a complex one. The subject remains an issue of hot debate among foresters and among the public at large.

In response to the widespread public concern with this practice, many responsible public officials have asked the Federal agencies involved for a reexamination of clearcutting. The senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) has been a leader in bringing this issue to the attention of responsible agencies.

Senator RANDOLPH has recently made a definitive statement on the subject in an address to the 95th annual conference of the American Forestry Association in Atlanta, Ga. He describes the experience of his own State of West Virginia with clearcutting, and the response of Forest Service to his request for a review. And he calls for further review by the Council on Environmental Quality for the creation of a National Forest Management Commission to oversee the total management and protection of our forests.

This problem is, of course, not limited to our eastern forests. It is a national issue and is of particular concern to the people of the Western States, where fragile mountain soils make up the foundation for the evergreen forests of the Rocky Mountains. Here the same practice is applied to different conditions. And the results in many cases have been equally unpleasant.

For the past several years clearcutting has been carried out on a large scale in the Bitterroot Valley of Montana to the extent that public indignation rose. Senator MANSFIELD, Representative OLSEN, and I requested that the Forest Service review the clearcutting policies in the area. The Forest Service appointed a task force and gave it the broad assignment of examining the entire spectrum of forest management in the Bitterroot Valley. In the resulting study, which was released in May of this year, the task force criticized clearcutting and overcutting as it had been practiced in several parts of the area under study. It cited four goals to be pursued in future forest management plans:

First. Any lingering thought that production goals hold priority over quality of environment be erased.

Second. Multiple use planning must be developed into a definitive, specific, and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

current decisionmaking process that it is not today.

Third. Quality control must be emphasized and reemphasized until it becomes the byword of management.

Fourth. The public must be involved more deeply than ever before in developing goals and criteria for management.

The enunciation of these goals is a positive step in the direction of critically planned forest management. But neither these nor the assurances given Senator RANDOLPH can rest as the final word on the subject of clearcutting. It needs even more thorough analysis and constant evaluation.

The most disturbing element in this controversy is the attempt to see forest management in terms of short-term economic goals. We are told that there is or will be a timber shortage. We are told that housing construction costs are up. And we are told that a "more rapid turnover" can be had by "intensifying forest management" through clearcutting. But these arguments fail to recognize that long-term economic and environmental goals may be adversely affected by clearcutting. We do not yet know fully the way in which erosion caused by clearcutting and its associated terracing may affect the landscape. We may not realize its full impact on wildlife and on the recreational values for man.

We do know that the greatest water pollutant of all is siltation from erosion and that clearcutting in some cases increases water runoff. And we know that methods which have been devised before to meet short-term economic shortages have created monumental environmental damage. Commonsense would lead us to proceed with extreme caution in this or any other large-scale exploitation of a natural resource.

Charges and countercharges are exchanged in the dispute over the merits of clearcutting. An eminent forester claims clearcutting is an age-old practice in European countries. A Swedish forester counters that this practice has long been abandoned in his country as being hopelessly outdated and destructive. Some professionals maintain that better regrowth can be obtained through clearcutting and that the soil is not injured. Others counter that equally good timber is raised through other methods and that the soil is damaged through clearcutting.

Throughout all of this professional controversy the public becomes bewildered, sometimes unnecessarily. There is a disturbing tendency by some officials to employ as technical language as possible which contains often nothing more than euphemisms. Senator RANDOLPH makes note of the systematic replacement of the term "clearcutting" with a better-sounding phrase "even-aged management." And a whole list of other examples come to mind: "Modern silvicultural practice"—for clearcutting, "timber harvesting"—for logging, "intensive management"—for increased logging, "dominant use"—for single use, and "accelerated forestry management"—for increased logging. Particularly disturbing is the attempt to diminish the difference between a beautiful and an ugly landscape to a question of ethereal-sounding "aesthetics." By the same token we might label the difference between living in a slum and in a well-to-do suburb as "esthetic.'

Despite the jargon, the public has maintained an active interest in the controversy. It is commendable that groups all over the country are insisting on the right to have an active part in the formation of policy on the use of public lands. I applaud Senator RANDOLPH for his leadership in bringing this issue into the open, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREST SERVICE PRACTICES NEED REVISION TO STRENGTHEN MULTIPLE USE FOR PUBLIC GOOD

"I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life, and see if I could not learn what it had to teach, and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived."

These words of Henry David Thoreau eloquently describe the spiritual and moral substance to be gained from sojourns to our woods and forests. Those of us who cherish our great forests and wooded lands receive a real meaning in these words—a meaning also expressed by Robert Frost, who wrote: "The woods are lovely, dark and deep. But I have promises to keep, and miles to go before I sleep."

It is unfortunate that the pace of our society, the demands of daily living—Frost's "promise to keep, and miles to go"—preclude many of us from going to the woods as Thoreau suggests "to live deliberately, to front only the essential facts of life" and to learn "what it had to teach." But this does not lessen our desire and our commitment to preserve the beauty and tranquility of our forest lands for citizens today and for future generations. We recognize the urgent need as our country becomes increasingly urbanized to have areas to which people can escape where relaxation and unhurried contemplation is still possible. *Our forests must and will serve this purpose—if they serve no other purpose. But they also serve many, many vital purposes.*

Our Nation has demonstrated an unparalleled capacity to build and develop economic resources and to continue to increase our standard of living. Yet this capacity has been accompanied, it seems—albeit unintentionally—by the tendency to destroy our natural resources and our environment. This course has resulted in the crisis of the quality of life confronting us today. It is the basic issue of the forest management controversy.

I assure you that a controversy over timber management practices—particularly over a system of silviculture known as even-aged management or, more commonly, clearcutting does exist. Contrary to the views which have been expressed by some foresters and representatives of the lumber industry, serious public concern over clearcutting is increasing and spreading. It is not an isolated problem.

My initial involvement in this issue was based on the timber cutting policies in the Monongahela National Forest. But I soon realized the national implications of this controversy despite the reassuring pronouncements by the Forest Service and by many foresters that clearcutting was being accepted without argument in most areas, and being criticized or challenged in only a few instances. The "few instances" involved extensive controversies in Montana, Wyoming, Oregon, Colorado, Alabama, Alaska, Virginia, and West Virginia, to name some of the States. Many citizens and organizations from other areas who come to our forests for their recreation and scenic values were becoming increasingly critical of this forest management practice.

My entry into the clearcutting issue was with some degree of trepidation. This is a highly complex and technical subject on which many professionals are in disagreement. Most discussion on timber management generally has been conducted by the professionals. It has been the private preserve of the experts who are trained and experienced in the field. Increasingly, a public official is confronted with a myriad of issues and topics in which he may invest his time and energy, and he, therefore, must attempt to be selective. And there are too many subjects for a public official to become involved in each one. Very few are as complex as clearcutting.

In this context I undertook my own investigation of even-aged management, resulting in a communication to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin requesting a moratorium on clearcutting in West Virginia. This action was followed by numerous conferences, letters, visits with Forest Service officials, and a trip into the Monongahela National Forest. These activities, in part, have been reported in the *American Forests Magazine* and other publications.

I visited the Monongahela National Forest, accompanied by representatives of the Forest Service, industry, and conservation organizations. That survey—what I learned and witnessed—dispelled any question in my mind as to the advisability of becoming actively involved in the even-aged management controversy and pressing for many of the modifications of the clearcutting program recommended by citizens of West Virginia.

We viewed at one location an area of 160 acres which had been clearcut. This turned out to be two clearcut areas so close together that the Forest Service had to explain that it was two cuts. These cuts had been made despite repeated reassurances that clearcut areas would be widely spaced.

We viewed a hillside on which there had been a clearcutting operation which—I am positive—will cause significant erosion problems. This cut had been made despite statements that steep slopes are not compatible with clearcutting.

The entire area was covered with usable pulpwood, slash, and dying timber.

It will suffice to note my comment after this part of my trip. I used the word "shocking." My feelings have not changed. In fairness, however, I add that Forest Service officials when confronted with this devastating display admitted that such cuts should not have been made and would not be made in the future. But the point is that this clearcut area was tangible evidence that our concern, reservations—even fears—with regard to the present clearcutting program were well founded.

Although residents of my State had previously expressed these basic concerns to the Forest Service, early this year I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin. I quote from that letter: "I convey to you my genuine anxiety and great concern over the substantive aspects of this type of timber management. My comments do not reflect an unalterable position, but they are composite of my current feelings. . . . Far too much controversy exists on the question of advantages and scope of clearcutting to provide the necessary assurance that this procedure will not lead to the destruction of the Gauley Ranger District and larger areas of the entire Monongahela National Forest. It is questionable whether this type of management—as presently being proposed—gives equal consideration to other forest values, such as wildlife, recreation, land preservation and stabilization, and water conservation. Knowledgeable persons, including foresters and

private lumbermen, have expressed the fear that the Monongahela National Forest and, specifically the Gauley Ranger District, will become a demonstration program for intensive clearcutting to satisfy only the demand for commercial timber and to accommodate new wood utilization methods and harvesting techniques. This fear—which I share—is compounded by the awareness that resulting damage cannot be corrected. Questions with regard to the impact of clearcutting on watersheds located in areas of critical flooding have been raised. Despite the assurances by Forest Service officials that flood hazards will not result, information on this problem appears insufficient to support this conclusion."

The basic thrust I attempted to impress on Secretary Hardin and the Forest Service—and I am continuing in this effort—is that judgments should not be made too quickly on a question that involves the life span or rotation age of a forest stand.

Yet, at the time of my letter to the Secretary, there was every indication that final judgments had been made without full exploration of the merits and demerits of even-aged management and without sufficient recognition of the many concerns of interested persons and organizations—public and private.

I recognize certain elements regarding the application of even-aged management. That this method of timber management may be a valuable management tool is understood. And I realize that it may be used in selected areas to clear diseased stands, to promote certain intolerant species, and to facilitate regeneration by seeding. It is equally recognized that even-aged management is the most economical method of timber harvesting and will produce the largest timber yield for a given investment, an important element when considered in light of the increasing demands for timber.

I certainly agree that the method of timber management most desirable for a given situation depends on the purposes of management and the characteristics of the tree species in the forest. This means that any application of even-aged management must be a studied discriminatory process, painstakingly researched before implementation. You do not institute a clearcutting program for the Douglas Fir in the Northwest in the same manner that you would for the mixed hardwoods of the Appalachian Region. It also dictates that you do not initiate a deliberate program to alter the balance of the mixed hardwood regions to obtain a monoculture or an artificial forest.

Within this framework, even-aged management should be a tool of management, and *not* the primary method of timber harvesting in a forest area. I hope that you can understand my concern when—after extensive questioning—the Forest Service tells us that over a span of a hundred years or so every acre of the general forest zone, which comprises 75 percent of the Monongahela National Forest, will be clearcut. This concern is heightened when the Forest Service under questioning reveals plans for 17 contracts in a 4½ month period consisting of 5,281 acres of regeneration cutting and only 2,608 acres of selective cutting. These sales were to yield nearly 50 million board feet of lumber—roughly equivalent to an entire year's cutting in the past. More revealing than the actual statistics is that this information was offered only after intense questioning at a Congressional hearing. Is it any wonder that we question the contention of the practitioners and the theoreticians that even-aged management is a "tool" of management?

A most intriguing element in our continuing discussions of clearcutting has been the references to "most desirable species" by the Forest Service and other proponents of the practice. While presenting this as an advantage of clearcutting, the proponents have been hard-pressed to provide a satisfactory definition of "most desirable species"—or at least it has not been defined in response to my questions or to the questions of others when I have been present.

What is the "most desirable species"? Who will make that determination? At what point in time will it be made? Who is to say that what is desirable under current conditions will be desirable 15 or 20 or 30 or 80 years from now? Finally, for what or whom will the species be most desirable? I do not know the answers to the former questions, but I have a rather good idea of the answer to the latter. The species will not be "most desirable" for wildlife, recreation, or aesthetics. It will be "most desirable" for commercial timbering. Although firm answers to these questions have been lacking, every avenue of questioning has led to the marketability of a particular species and the steps needed to promote that species.

You may think that much of what I have said bears on the application of clearcutting as opposed to the advantages and disadvantages of the practice. This is true, but you cannot divorce application or implementation from a discussion of this issue. It is well for the professional to present testimony or written documents which suggest that clearcutting is an extensively researched, tested and proven tool of timber management. But the real test of the practice involves application on the forest and not in the research or experimental operations which are developed under optimum conditions. The well-conceived and thought-out government programs and projects which have gone astray in the application or implementation phase are numerous. They can be counted in every government agency and organization—the Forest Service and clearcutting are no different in this respect. In many instances, a perfectly sound program does not survive the controversy associated with its application. Success or failure, then, depends on the judgments of the persons charged with the responsibility of implementation.

The in-house Forest Service study of the Monongahela National Forest initiated in March because of the clearcutting dispute in West Virginia admits as much.

While the report stoutly defends even-age management, or clearcutting, as a forest management system, it is highly critical of the way in which it has been administered in the Monongahela National Forest. The study notes that in several instances the Forest Service committee visited clearcut areas that admittedly were poorly located or too large or both. The common explanation was that under recently prepared multiple use plans the objectionable features would no longer be in evidence.

Very important findings of the Committee were that inventories of forest resources are not adequate to ensure that management of all resources will receive proper multiple-use planning; that good resource inventories are necessary to time, size and space clearcutting; and that there is a definite feeling that the forest's relatively small acreage of mature timber (31,000 acres) is in danger of being cut first without reference to long-range resource planning.

With inadequate inventories . . . planning cannot proceed to the point of orderly management . . . There can be, for example, no long-range planning as to where timber will be harvested and how much in any one location.

Yet, under those circumstances, plans for increased clearcutting on the Monongahela National Forest were moving forward.

Although the study contains some harsh criticism of the Forest Service practices, it wholly misses the public temper with regard to clearcutting. The very crucial point of the extent of the controversy and concern is described in these words: "A careful review of testimony and correspondence dealing with the three legislative reviews and a reading of press clippings strongly indicate that this controversy is centered in the Richwood area in the Gauley Ranger District. This is the District where the greatest amount of clearcutting has been done. Review and reading also suggest that vocal opponents to even-age management are few, perhaps not more than a half-dozen individuals. They have however, through newspapers, conservation groups, and the State Legislature, been able to influence a larger number of people who, out of their concern, have written their Congressional representatives. Interviews given in the Appendix, with opponents, middle-roaders, and proponents indicate the wide variety of beliefs and something of their intensities."

This appears to be the same lack of awareness or effort to minimize public concern which the Forest Service has demonstrated on a nationwide basis. Such thinking is not conducive to effective public participation in the development of national forest programs. I know from my personal involvement that the West Virginians who have assumed active leadership roles number substantially more than a "few, perhaps not more than a half dozen individuals." And these persons certainly are not mere publicity seekers. Rather, they have undertaken in-depth study and evaluation of the issues before speaking out. My staff and I have worked with knowledgeable individuals whose number is over three times that mentioned in the Forest Service report and by no means have we been in personal contact with all the individuals in this issue.

The Forest Service report did recognize the need to promote public participation in the development of forest plans, programs, and projects in a timely manner. I stress the importance of timely involvement, because the timing was one of the critical issues in the Monongahela National Forest controversy. It is not sufficient to invite involvement by the people after the final decisions have been made. A further cautionary note—and this relates to the Forest Service recommendations—is that distribution of pamphlets, brochures, and press releases and one-way briefing conferences do not constitute genuine public participation. There must be continuing exchange of views and discussions.

In this regard, the recommendations in the recently released report of the Public Land Law Review Commission are of particular significance. The Commission recommends that: "Provision should be made for public participation in land use planning, including public hearings on proposed Federal land use plans, as an initial step in a regional coordination process." There is also a recommendation that: "Public hearings with respect to environmental considerations should be mandatory on proposed public land projects or decisions when requested by the state or by the Council on Environmental Quality."

Such public participation initiatives at the earliest possible stages might not have altered the opposition to the Forest Service program of clearcutting in the Monongahela. It could, however, have brought into clearer perspective the issues in even-aged management and prevented much of the emotional atmosphere which has existed.

While focusing on problems in the application of even-aged management and multiple use, the in-house Forest Service Review Committee did not come to grips with some of the basic issues. I am gratified that a State commission of West Virginia did perform such a task.

During the controversy over even-aged management, the West Virginia Legislature became increasingly aware of the magnitude of the problem. The Members of the Legislature voted unanimously to establish the West Virginia Forest Management Practices Commission whose responsibility it was to determine whether the use of the clearcutting system throughout the Monongahela

and other forest lands in West Virginia was compatible with the multiple use, sustained yield established by the United States Congress. It was not, however, to be a study of uneven-aged versus even-aged management or selection versus clearcutting.

Clearly this was a significant development and it evidenced the intensity and scope of the interest and concern for the management of our forest lands.

An in-depth study was begun by the Commission which included members of the Legislature, professional foresters and interested citizens. The Commission's report, released August 1, represents a comprehensive detailed study and review of the problem areas surrounding the management of national forest lands in West Virginia. It makes very valid recommendations. I generally support the programs advocated in the report and I strongly suggest that the Forest Service, foresters, and private commercial interests give them careful attention.

The members of the West Virginia Forest Management Practices Commission have performed a public service for the people of not only our State but also other parts of the Nation. Future generations who will enjoy our forest lands will have benefited through the dedicated and diligent work of this Commission. As a member of the United States Senate, as a citizen, as one individual intensely interested in the utilization of our forests, I express appreciation and commendation to the membership of the commission.

I stress some of the highlights of the Commission's report since it represents the objectives toward which we are working.

The report stresses that in 1964 the U.S. Forest Service switched from a policy of uneven-aged management to one of even-aged management as the policy for the general forest zone. However, the general public was not made aware of this fact for several years. The Forest Service had contended that clear-cutting was being practiced on an experimental basis, carefully supervised and in small plots, widely separated.

In a letter to me on March 9, 1969, Supervisor Frederick A. Dorrell of the Monogahela National Forest—and I want to emphasize that Supervisor Dorrell had recently assumed his new position—stated: "Research and experience have clearly demonstrated that the even-aged management system, which includes clearcutting, is the best way to manage our forest's timber stands. We, therefore, do not intend to depart from even-aged management as the *basic timber management system on the Monogahela National Forest.*" He was outlining policy developed several years before. Therein lies the center of the problem. Is clearcutting a timber management tool or is it the primary harvesting method?

Perhaps the most important of Commission recommendations was that a sixth value, aesthetics, should be recognized officially as a co-equal partner with the other multiple uses of outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed and wildlife and fish purposes. It defined aesthetics as "the value of the forest and of the trees, water-courses, views and all else contained therein that are intrinsically beautiful and especially appealing as distinguished from the merely pleasing." Aesthetics as a multiple use will militate against extensive clearcutting.

Significantly, Supervisor Dorrell, an energetic and able public servant, acknowledged before the Commission on June 1, 1970, that in the past the U.S. Forest Service has been "more timber oriented than anything else." I submit that timber is only *one* of the multiple uses and deserves no higher standing or commands no higher pedestal than any of the other uses.

The Commission recommended that on all national forests within West Virginia specifically, and on all national forests generally, the forest management policy be multiple use, sustained yield. The report stated, however, that "full multiple use and sustained yield of all resources cannot be accomplished if even-aged management is used as the basic timber management system through the national forest."

The validity and necessity of even-aged forest management as a method that may be used by the forester to manager the timber resource and the use of the clearcutting system as one regeneration silvicultural technique within even-aged management was recognized by the Commission.

The report was critical of clearcutting in that the blocks were too large in area; too near to each other in terms of both space and time; too concentrated in certain areas; and oftentimes improperly located considering slope, soil, site and stand conditions. It recommended that individual clearcuts should normally be 25 acres or less in area and that in any one year the total area clearcut should not exceed one half of one percent of that area of the forest in which clearcutting is justified and authorized. Further, the Commission specified that in any one year the total area clearcut within any one ranger district in the forest should not exceed three-fourths of one percent.

As I noted earlier, my tour of the Monongahela National Forest uncovered cords of pulpwood lying on the ground, left to decay in areas where clear-cutting had been practiced. The Commission members believed this to be important as they urged the Forest Service to give immediate consideration to timber marketing with special research on developing ways to utilize small products. There has been a failure to promote adequate markets for the harvest and utilization of small timber products such as pulpwood and mine props. New uses should be found for timber below saw long size and cull trees.

Increased attention to the location, construction and maintenance of roads in the national forests was stressed for the prevention of erosion, particularly into small streams.

On June 9 of this year, I introduced legislation to designate the Cranberry Backcountry, Otter Breek and Dolly Sods areas as parts of the Wilderness System. The Commission recommended that no part of the Cranberry Backcountry or Otter Creek, in addition to other small acreages, be clear cut or disturbed in any manner.

The Commission felt little attention has been given to the relationship of even-aged management and wildlife. Many wildlife specialists have indicated that clearcutting, if practiced at all, must be kept small in size, widely distributed and narrow in shape. Wildlife technicians in general agreed that even-aged management and clearcutting, if excessively used, could significantly harm wildlife. Most of these technicians felt that in many cases small clearcut areas could be beneficial to deer, birds and in some cases to turkey and bear.

Some of the concerns involving even-aged management centered around concentration of clearcuts within prime recreation areas favored by hikers, hunters, fishermen and campers; their location proximate to highways, scenic vistas, waterways and in areas where they are readily visible by the users of the forest. This, in my belief, is a clear violation of established land management procedures.

I shall give serious consideration to the recommendation in the report suggesting that a National Forest Management Commission be established. It is my intention to attempt to formulate legislation to create such a Commission, *in accordance with the multiple use, sustained yield concept.*

Prior to the reports of the Forest Service and the West Virginia Forest Management Practices Commission. I wrote to Russell Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, to urge that the Council conduct a comprehensive investigation of the practice of clearcutting on our National Forest lands.

Chairman Train has solicited views on this subject from foresters, interested organizations, and knowledgeable citizens and is in the process of reviewing their responses.

In closing, I recognize that perhaps I have been overly critical. It is my earnest desire to be fair and to present objectively the circumstances and problems which have confronted us in West Virginia. Those persons in our State who have been involved in forest management issues share this desire.

We are intensely aware of the outstanding accomplishments of the Forest Service and our foresters in the development of a multiple use program. Without them, the people of West Virginia and the Nation would not have had the unique opportunities to enjoy the varied benefits of our forests. The Forest Service has been required to carry on its important activities in too many instances without adequate funding and personnel. This has been a continuing problem which can be met only by decisions and commitments of the Administration and the Congress.

The level of funding and personnel will be even more critical if the Forest Service is to meet the public needs for the challenging environmental 1970s, as recently outlined by Chief Edward Cliff in a message to Forest Service personnel.

I commend Chief Cliff for his realistic appraisal of Forest Service direction and plans in the future. He said in part: "Our programs are out of balance to meet public needs for the environmental 1970's and we are receiving mounting criticism from all sides. Our direction must be and is being changed. We recently issued our broad overall objectives in 'Framework for the Future.' In addition, we have developed a preliminary program for the 1970s which starts to put our program back in balance and more adequately recognizes environmental needs. I have every intention of carrying this position through to fulfillment and every hope that we can achieve it. The American public is demanding top quality in management of natural resources and attention to the way things look. If the Forest Service receives no increases in funding for F.Y. 1972, reprogramming will be necessary, meaning a reduction in our timber sale activities, in order to have better balance in our programs. We will undertake a major reprogramming of dollars, putting priority on maintaining quality for the commodity work we do. I have recently told my Forest Officers that the public will not tolerate poor quality work. We will go as far as we can in meeting quantity goals, but what we do must be on a quality basis. The Forest Service wants to be fully responsive to these various demands. But we can no longer afford to emphasize programs that produce revenues at the expense of others. If we do, we will not be providing the proper service to the public and will be faced with many more court cases. In my opinion, the best path is one that will provide a balanced high-quality program."

I am confident that Chief Cliff and the Forest Service will fulfill this commitment to a better balanced program and to top quality management of our forests and our natural resources.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, I shall insert extensive statements in the RECORD in regard to the appropriation bills and in regard to spending

measures otherwise. Today, I wish to present a brief summary as to the appropriation bills, including the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD appropriation bill. On yesterday I made a similar statement but in somewhat less detail, at page 36158.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971 IN THE HOUSE

The House has now passed all the regular annual bills. In House actions we have made net reductions—and I am including the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill—of $2.5 billion below the budget requests. If the vetoed bill is not considered, then we are about $2.7 billion below the budget requests.

I am speaking of new budget authority, or appropriation requests for fiscal 1971, not budget estimates of expenditures which in addition to expenditures from new appropriations, also involves expenditures from carryover balances of prior year appropriations.

Including the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill, the House totals for 1971 in the 14 bills are:

[Amount in billions]

Budget requests considered	$137.1
Approved by House	134.6
Net reduction (14 bills)	−2.5

Eleven of the 14 bills were below the budget requests; three were above.

Excluding the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill, which must be replaced by a new bill to be reported after the recess, the House totals for 1971 on the other 13 bills are:

[Amount in billions]

Budget requests considered	$119.9
Approved by House	117.2
Net reduction (13 bills)	−2.7

The vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill as it passed the House was $173 million above the budget. Of course, Members will recall that as vetoed—after it had been through the Senate and through conference—it was $541 million above the budget.

IN THE SENATE

In the Senate, nine of the regular appropriation bills, including the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill, have been approved. The 10th bill, for military construction, has been reported and may pass today. In these 10 bills, including the reported version of the military construction bill, the Senate has made a net increase of $2.5 billion above the President's budget requests. If the vetoed bill is excluded, the increase above the budget would be about $1.3 billion on the other nine bills.

Excluding the Independent Offices-HUD bill but including the military construction bill as reported, the totals for 1971 on which the Senate has acted are as follows:

[Amount in billions]

Budget requests considered	$27.8
Approved by Senate	29.1
Net increase (9 bills)	+1.3

CLEARED CONGRESS—ENACTED

Mr. Speaker, eight of the fiscal year 1971 appropriation bills have been sent to the President. He returned two by way of veto, Education, overridden by the House, and Independent Offices-HUD, sustained by the House.

As sent to the President, the eight bills involved with respect to fiscal 1971:

[Amount in billions]

Budget requests considered	$35.3
Enacted	36.1
Net increase (8 bills)	+0.8

But excluding the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill which involved about $18 billion—$541 million above the budget—the totals with respect to fiscal 1971 for the 7 bills enacted are as follows:

[Amount in billions]

Budget requests considered	$17.9
Enacted	18.1
Net increase (7 bills)	+0.2

Mr. Speaker, the exact net increase on the seven bills is $230,286,921.

Six of the seven bills were below the budget requests; the Education bill was $453 million above the budget.

ESTIMATED REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION BUDGET REQUESTS

Mr. Speaker, although the Senate still has pending before it major appropriation bills dealing with Defense, Labor-HEW, Foreign Assistance, and Transportation, and a new Independent Offices-HUD, Foreign Assistance, and Transportation, and a new Independent Offices-HUD bill will be acted upon, I think it can safely be said that Congress, at this session in the appropriation bills, will in the aggregate be under the fiscal 1971 Presidential budget requests in the general area of about $1 billion, give or take a couple of hundred million or so.

In other words, Members can say that there is every indication that when this Congress adjourns following the post-election session, Congress, in its actions on the fiscal 1971 appropriation bills, will be below the President's budget requests for 1971 considered in those bills.

THE APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971—AT A GLANCE

Mr. Speaker, following is a capsule summary of the amounts of new budget obligational authority for fiscal 1971 currently involved in the 14 bills. The figures for the Senate include the Military Construction bill as reported from committee:

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971 AT A GLANCE

[New budget obligational authority. Fiscal 1971 amounts only]

	Budget requests considered	Approved	Change, (+) or (−)
1. In the House:			
a. Subtotal, 14 bills	$137,138,661,822	$134,627,396,817	−$2,511,265,005
b. Deduct: Independent Offices-HUD bill, veto sustained	−17,216,823,500	−17,390,212,300	+173,388,800
Net total, 13 House bills	119,921,838,322	117,237,184,517	−2,684,653,805
2. In the Senate:			
a. Subtotal, 10 bills	45,250,005,499	47,728,716,253	+2,478,710,754
b. Deduct: Independent Offices-HUD bill, veto sustained in House	−17,468,223,500	−18,655,019,500	+1,186,796,000
Net total, Senate bills (9 bills)	27,781,781,999	29,073,696,753	+1,291,914,754
3. Enacted:			
a. Subtotal, 8 bills cleared Congress	35,366,850,999	36,138,439,720	+771,588,721
b. Deduct: Independent Offices-HUD bill, veto sustained	−17,468,223,500	−18,009,525,300	+541,301,800
Net total, 7 bills enacted	17,898,627,499	18,128,914,420	+230,286,921

Note.—Item 2 includes military construction bill as reported from committee.

CAPT. FRED SWEGO, INDIANAPOLIS POLICE FORCE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the duty day on November 2, 1970, Capt. Fred Swego, of the Indianapolis Police Department, will end over 40 years' service.

Born in Indianapolis in 1907, he was appointed to the Department on March 12, 1929, and has served in all ranks up to his present rank of captain. He has received four commendations from the department for outstanding police work.

Active in Indianapolis Lodge 86, Fraternal Order of Police, he is a charter member, having served as an officer in the lodge when it was formed in August 1938. He was financial secretary for the Indianapolis Lodge from 1942–63; was treasurer of the National Fraternal Order of Police from 1963–69; served on the State legislative committee of the Fraternal Order of Police for 28 years, up until 1969, and served several terms as president of the Indianapolis Police Department's credit union.

In addition, he has also served as a pension consultant for law enforcement agencies throughout Indiana and the United States.

His many friends and associates, on the police force and off, join in a hearty "well done," and I am happy to add my voice to their praise.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, all Americans throughout the country today pay honor to Christopher Columbus for his heroic efforts almost 500 years ago when he set out from the European continent to seek a new route to the Orient.

Unlike today's modern explorers, he made the voyage without the assistance of radio communications, advanced navigational aids, or updated equipment. His particular courage in laying out his task and seeing it through to the end is a characteristic that has marked the people of this continent from that time forward.

For myself and other Italo-Americans his daring feat of accomplishment represents the first of many contributions those of Italian ancestry have made to this Nation.

Columbus faced unknown perils when he ventured out past 15th-century man's known sphere of influence. The threat of death by starvation, the elements or unknown causes were daily with him and his crew members. Yet, he persevered and conquered the many adversities that so often nearly ended his voyage.

Similarly Italo-Americans today face many perils because of their ancestry. Many known and unknown threats seek to destroy the tremendous heritage and record of contribution these Americans have made to our pluralistic society. But like Columbus, they persevere and in the end success will prevail over those who would destroy their voyage.

Although today is a day of national rejoicing for all Americans, I know I speak for my 22 million fellow citizens of Italian ancestry who take particular pride and gain special strength from the most admirable feat of Columbus—this Nation's first and foremost Italo-American and discoverer of the New World.

OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, while there has been a great deal of controversy over the recently published report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, it has served to spotlight the increasing concern throughout the Nation that we provide some protection through reasonable legislation. As far back as May 1969 President Nixon transmitted a message to Congress asking for legislation in the following areas: First. Prohibition of sending offensive sex materials to minors; second, prohibition of sending sexually oriented advertising through the mails; and, third, protection of the privacy of the home from all smut peddling which is unsolicited. These suggestions were based upon a Supreme Court decision indicating the areas of obscenity and privacy in which Congress could constitutionally legislate.

In an effort to meet the needs of concerned citizens, while staying within the constitutional guidelines given by the Court, the House overwhelmingly passed two bills along these lines. The President's first and third proposals were passed in April in the form of H.R. 15693 and his second proposal was passed in August in H.R. 11032. We can be extremely pleased that titles II and III of H.R. 15693, calling for increased protection of the individual's privacy against unsolicited sexual materials were included in the 1970 Postal Reorganization Act and are now law. I am hopeful that in the light of increased public attention to this problem, it will not be long before action will be completed on the rest of the administration's requests.

While the Federal Government cannot and should not set itself up as a censor for the American people, the actions taken by the House are, in my opinion, reasonable legislation, and I feel that Americans need and want this type of legislative help. There is no reason why we cannot protect our homes and children against pornography without infringing upon the rights of those who wish to receive sexually provocative literature.

FARMINGTON, MO., CHAPTER OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMENS CLUBS HONORS OPAL WRIGHT

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, local chapters of the Business and Professional Womens Clubs have been asked to honor an outstanding member during Business Women's Week, October 19 through 25. The Farmington, Mo., Business and Professional Womens Clubs have chosen Mrs. Opal Wright as the woman who should receive the honor this year. She is director of elementary education in the Farmington R–VII School District. She is an outstanding educator who has filled a position usually given only to men. Mrs. Wright has held many offices in State and local organizations. Among these has been president of department of elementary school principals, southeast Missouri district; president, Delta Kappa Gamma, mineral area; Mineral Area Elementary Principals Association. She was a member of the executive committee of southeast District Teachers Association from 1966 to 1969; bulletin editor of Missouri Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development. She is at present State chairman of committee on professional affairs of Delta Kappa Gamma. Her service to education is extensive. She served for 5 years on a committee for the State Department of Education to write a social studies guide for grades one through nine. She served as an educational advisor for two publishing companies. She served as one of the workshop leaders for New Madrid County Educational Association in 1960. She was a discussion leader for the National DESP meeting in St. Louis, 1960. Mrs. Wright served on curriculum materials committee for the national meeting ASCD, 1964. She has been a program participant several times at departmental meetings at Southeast Missouri Teachers Association. She was a consultant on supervision at State DESP meeting in 1964. Mrs. Wright has taught extension courses for the Flat River Junior College, was a teacher at Southeast Missouri State College during the summer of 1957, and taught a seminar in 1960. She was appointed a teacher of extension courses for the University of Missouri in 1964 and taught for the university during the summer of 1967.

Opal Wright is frequently asked to be a program participant. These include various county teachers associations, district and State meetings of DESP and ASDC; district PTA organizations, State Reading Conference, and other conferences. She has at least three commitments during October—two for State meetings. One of her most outstanding accomplishments has been helping to initiate a new concept in teaching—a building designed to facilitate team teaching with the child's needs being constantly evaluated. Visitors have come from all over Missouri and from at least four other States to observe this unusual idea.

Farmington R–VII has been fortunate to retain Mrs. Wright. She has had offers from large city schools, at least three colleges, and the State Department of Education. So far she has resisted the temptation of larger salaries and greater honor to remain with the children she wishes to help.

KNOXVILLE SOLDIER KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, since the fall of 1965 there have been 85 young men from Knox County, Tenn., killed in the Vietnam war.

Number 85 was a career soldier who had dedicated his life to the defense of this country. With deep regret we have learned of the death of Sp. 4 Frederick P. Broyles, 25, of Knoxville.

Specialist Broyles was the son of Mrs. Maud Cherry and also left behind two sisters and a brother.

In tribute to this young man I place in the RECORD the following news article:

KNOXVILLE SOLDIER KILLED IN VIETNAM

Today's report of the death of a Knoxville serviceman brings to 85 the number of Knox Countians killed in the Indo-China War since Nov. 17, 1965.

A Knoxville career soldier, Sp. 4 Frederick P. Broyles, 25, was killed in action near Long Bien, South Vietnam, Sept. 26, his mother, Mrs. Maud Cherry, 746 College St., has been notified.

He was the first Knox Countian killed in the war since June 11.

According to word received by the family, the Knoxville soldier came under enemy attack when a civilian building in a small village near Long Bien was attacked. He died in the fighting that followed.

He was in a transportation unit.

Besides his mother, he leaves two sisters, Queen Elizabeth Broyles, Knoxville, and Gladys Virginia Broyles, California, and a brother, Samuel Broyles, Knoxville. His father, Irvin Broyles, is dead.

He was a graduate of Vine Junior High School, and he attended Austin High before he entered the Army in 1964. He had been in Vietnam since February.

Clark Mortuary is in charge of arrangements.

SIXTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in every year since I have been a Member of Congress, I have polled my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Iowa in order to obtain their views on the major issues before the Nation and the Congress.

The results of these annual questionnaires have played an important part in my consideration of legislation before the House of Representatives in addition to my daily mail, my visits with constituents in Washington, in my district office and in communities throughout the district, and my own judgment on the issues.

Although each Member of Congress must form an independent judgment as to what action is in the best interest of his district, his State, and the Nation as a whole, it is essential that this judgment includes the best possible understanding of the views of his constituents.

The issues before the Congress and the Nation are some of the most critical in recent times. The urgent need for involving our people in this legislative decisionmaking process is both greater and more obvious than ever before.

I have been extremely pleased by the size of the response to my questionnaires. This year, the initial response indicates an even higher participation than last year. And I have been particularly grateful to the many who have found the time to add extensive comments in addition.

Because my district represents such a broad cross-section of interests and opinions, I think that the results of this latest questionnaire will be of interest to every Member of this body. I, therefore, under unanimous consent include them at this point in the RECORD:

[In percent]

National priorities: Present inflationary pressures require both restraint and priority allocation in federal spending. Please indicate those areas of the federal budget which you feel should be decreased, increased, or held at present spending levels. (Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of 1970 budget allocated to each function):

Defense (40.1%):	
Decreased	59.8
Increased	5.8
Held at present levels	30.5
International Affairs, including economic assistance, Peace Corps, Food for Freedom, USIA (2.1%):	
Decreased	36.8
Increased	17.5
Held at present levels	40.1
Space (2.0%):	
Decreased	44.1
Increased	12.4
Held at present levels	38.5
Agriculture (3.2%):	
Decreased	20.4
Increased	25.4
Held at present levels	48.2
Natural Resources, including pollution, recreation, flood control, control, conservation (1.3%):	
Decreased	7.5
Increased	65.0
Held at present levels	21.9
Commerce and Transportation, including highways, airports, postal services, business assistance (4.8%):	
Decreased	17.5
Increased	26.3
Held at present level	50.3
Community Development and Housing (1.5%):	
Decreased	20.6
Increased	35.4
Held at present levels	38.7
Education and Manpower (3.8%):	
Decreased	14.6
Increased	36.0
Held at present levels	43.4
Social Security (22.2%):	
Decreased	13.0
Increased	30.5
Held at present levels	49.5
Health and Welfare, including medicare, health research and manpower, food stamps, child nutrition, vocational rehabilitation (6.7%):	
Decreased	20.1
Increased	32.7
Held at present levels	39.8
Veterans Benefits (4.4%):	
Decreased	11.5
Increased	24.4
Held at present levels	56.3
General Government, including law enforcement, crime reduction civil rights, Congress, and the courts (1.8%):	
Decreased	11.8
Increased	41.0
Held at present levels	37.6

Vietnam: Which of the following do you consider to be the most preferable course in Vietnam at the present time?

Increased pace of withdrawal of American combat forces and U.S. expenditures solely for withdrawal of U.S. forces and assistance and asylum to endangered Vietnamese after December of 1971	22.5
Continued phased withdrawal of American combat forces as South Vietnamese Army assumes more responsibility for conducting the war	40.7
Complete immediate removal of any American presence in Vietnam	21.1
Resumption of full scale attacks on the North with any necessary increase in American men and material	6.2
Undecided	2.4

The draft: Which of the following alternatives do you prefer?

(a) Continuation of the present draft lottery system	27.3
(b) A professional Army	19.4
(c) A National Service System which would allow a young man to choose among:	
Volunteering for military service	
Volunteering for civilian service (working in hospitals, with VISTA, teaching school, etc.) taking his chances in the draft lottery	40.9
Undecided	4.9

Crime and violence: In meeting the problems of mounting crime and violence in our nation and in our neighborhoods, do you support—

Greater federal assistance for the improvement and support of local police, correctional and rehabilitation agencies:	
Yes	68.0
No	14.8
Undecided	9.1
More effective public and private programs in the areas of jobs, housing, and education to improve conditions in the cities:	
Yes	67.8
No	13.0
Undecided	9.9
Stricter regulations covering the sale of explosives:	
Yes	72.9
No	13.0
Undecided	5.3
Stricter regulation of the content of TV programs:	
Yes	49.7
No	32.0
Undecided	9.1

Consumer: Do you favor legislation which would enable consumers to take collective legal action against deceptive bargaining practices?

Yes	70.0
No	10.6
Undecided	10.1

Agriculture: Do you favor Congressional action to establish a strategic grain reserve to provide a guaranteed source of supply in times of natural disaster or emergency?

Yes	57.9
No	17.2
Undecided	14.7

Social Security: Do you favor legislation which makes increases in social security benefits automatically tied to the increase in the cost of living?

Yes	63.1
No	17.0
Undecided	7.4

Political campaign expenditures: Do you favor legislation which would limit the amount of money which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representatives, Governor and Lieutenant could spend on political broadcasting?

Yes	67.1
No	7.1
Undecided	5.1

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. VINCENT COLLEGE

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present for the RECORD a short history of St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa., on the occasion of its 125th anniversary.

The community of Latrobe is very proud of St. Vincent and the great work it has accomplished. It is just as proud, as all of us are, of the total work of the Benedictine Fathers with 36 parishes in our 5-State area as well as a secondary school in Savannah, Ga.

I am sure that the House joins me and the citizens of our community in wishing for St. Vincent and the Benedictine Order a long and continuing service in their chosen field.

I assure you we are very proud of their good works.

The history follows:

HISTORY OF ST. VINCENT COLLEGE, LATROBE, PA.

On October 26, 1970, the Benedictine Order will begin the one hundred twenty-fifth year of its presence in the United States. On that day in 1846 a small band of religious, led by the Bavarian monk Reverend Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B., settled in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, and laid the ground-work for what would become Saint Vincent Archabbey and College. From this spot, situated near

present-day Latrobe and colonial Forbes Road, the monks spread out across the United States and Canada, establishing parishes, abbeys and schools of higher learning in Minnesota, Kansas, New Jersey, North Carolina, Alabama, New Hampshire, Illinois, Colorado, Florida, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Saskatchewan.

The Benedictine heritage of fourteen centuries continues to act as a religious, cultural, and humanistic leaven in contemporary society; and the presence of innumerable Benedictine schools in the United States gives witness to the vision and perseverance of the founders of Saint Vincent. Like all immigrants to America, they dared to abandon the familiar but tired soil of their homeland in order to confront the uncertainties and challenges of the New World. They found here fertile ground for their ancient heritage of service to God and man.

Today the community of Saint Vincent continues to engage in parochial, educational, and missionary work. The monks staff thirty-six parishes in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Maryland, and Virginia. They operate a liberal arts college, a seminary, and a preparatory school near Latrobe, as well as a secondary school in Savannah, Georgia. In the spirit of Wimmer and the early founders they also do missionary work and have established monasteries in Brazil and Taiwan.

THE NEED FOR EXCHANGE OF VIEWS BETWEEN ADULTS AND YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Telling the Truth to Young People" was published in the Anderson (S.C.), Free Press of October 1, 1970.

The editorial presents a forthright challenge both to youth and adults to bridge the generation gap with more communication. Such an effort by all of us would certainly reap benefits for ourselves and our Nation.

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

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

TELLING THE TRUTH TO YOUNG PEOPLE

One of the most important tasks for any society is to transfer from generation to generation the inherited wisdom basic to that society. No generation has an answer to all the questions of life. Each generation learns something new. In all true civilizations, however, there is a continuity of life and understanding which bridges the so-called generation gap.

This observation should have special meaning in our own time when radicalized young people condemn their elders.

Youthful rebels are a minority. But because of the publicity they seek and receive, their attitudes cannot be ignored. They have to be dealt with directly so that their confusion won't spread to the majority of young Americans.

Sympathy for the young always is in order, up to a point. Youth is a good time of life. Older citizens should not scorn youthful enthusiasm. It is a happy part of life. Nevertheless, it is a mistake to refrain from candor in talking to or about young people. Most certainly it is foolish, even dangerous, to make a cult of youth.

Youth should be made to understand that it hasn't any monopoly on dedication, understanding or moral conviction. Some of the greatest leaders in history have been old men at their time of greatness—Winston Churchill, for example. The old can be just as courageous as the young, just as willing to sacrifice.

Nowadays it is important to speak out this way to young people. One reason for this is that there is a barrier of experience between young and old. Many young people have been sheltered by America's affluence.

Americans attending college in previous generations knew that they were privileged. Around them was a world of hard work and of hard times. They could not have afforded to spend their time on demonstrations.

Today, many young people don't fully appreciate that a college education is a privilege. Many youngsters have grown up in an environment of affluence and forgotten about money problems. They imagine that Daddy always will be on hand to buy new clothes and make payments on a sports car.

No adult wants to shout angry words at young people. One simply wants to make them see things as they are, to place their own actions in perspective. It is necessary therefore, to remind young people of the extent to which their activities are subsidized. They need to be told that behind their pleasure is the hard work of adults.

Some young people say: "You adults haven't left us a very good world." To that remark, an adult should say: "No one left us a very good world. We had to make our way and handle our problems without cry baby reactions." The youngster who opposes military service in the 1970's should be reminded that his father fought the Germans and Japanese in World War II.

A strong, healthy society believes in links between those who have gone before, those who live today and those who live in the future. It is imperative, therefore, to stress the degree to which the living are dependent on the devotion and sacrifice of those in the past. The generations are bound together. The young are not an isolated segment of life that is automatically entitled to a brave new world nicely wrapped up and delivered without cost.

A serious generation gap won't exist if adults talk as frankly as they listen sympathetically. If adults "lay it on the line" about their own work and sacrifice, if they explain that no generation can expect to have a free ride through life. To work and defend one's country is an obligation that rests on every generation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 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?

POSTMASTER WITH A MESSAGE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, Postmaster General Winton M. Blount reaffirmed that the Nixon administration was doing all possible under current law to curb the flow of pornographic material through the mail. The Postmaster General stated:

If the people decide against pornography, we can do away with it, if we endorse stringent laws, if we elect and appoint discerning judges, and if, above all, we refuse to patronize the pornographer, then we can put him out of business.

In "Postmaster With a Message" the Nashville Banner editorializes on General Blount's speech and also his meeting with political science students at Vanderbilt University. I include the editorial in the RECORD:

POSTMASTER WITH A MESSAGE

The Postmaster General of the United States Winton M. Blount, spoke candidly and to the point Monday when he told members of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce that there is no room in America for those who use its freedoms to destroy the very mind and spirit that give meaning to those freedoms.

He took the occasion of a dinner in his honor to remind the assembled guests—and people throughout the country—that the administration is doing all that is in its power to curb the flow of pornographic materials through the mail. Nothing conclusive can be accomplished, however, until the American people demand laws tough enough to be effective against the poison which threatens the very social fabric of the nation. The Postmaster General said: "If the people decide against pornography, we can do away with it, if we endorse stringent laws, if we elect and appoint discerning judges, and if, above all, we refuse to patronize the pornographer, then we can put him out of business."

Postmaster General Blount obviously was taking strong issue with the purported findings of the presidential commission dealing with the effects of obscenity and pornography on society. That panel, set up by former President Lyndon Johnson, is running into severe criticism for its recommendation that the United States dismiss all laws prohibiting the distribution of salacious material except where it concerns children. In short, the Danish approach. There is talk in some quarters that the Nixon administration would be wise to either reject or disavow the controversial findings of the obscenity commission. Postmaster General Blount leaves no misunderstanding here in Nashville on where he stands regarding pornography.

Earlier, Gen. Blount met with a group of political science students at Vanderbilt University and reassured them that in times of great national stress the overwhelming majority swings hard to starboard in their political views. "History shows very clearly," he told the gathering "that when the middle class people feel themselves threatened, they don't go to the left, they go to the right. And today we have a fantastically large middle class."

The implications again are crystal clear. The uncivilized and often insane activities of political extremists in the country today are driving the people farther and farther to the right. America always has been more susceptible to right wing authoritarianism than to

the totalitarianism of the left, and the Postmaster General, in alluding to this fact, emphasized that the radical left is accomplisning the precise opposite of what it wants.

Tall, articulate, and refreshingly well informed, Postmaster General Blount is one man who knows his politics, recognizes the aspirations of the American people, and wants to do something to ensure that those aspirations come to fruition not just for the present generation, but for the children of our children.

THE FREE RAIL CONCEPT

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, the summer of 1969 edition of the Virginia Engineer contains an intriguing article on the concept of free rail, written by Prof. Robert L. Whitelaw, of Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

The basic idea of free rail travel is an automatic track for moving private vehicles in both inner and outer city travel. I believe it is an idea which merits serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Whitelaw's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREE RAIL: THE NEXT STEP IN TRANSPORTATION

(By Robert L. Whitelaw)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author is a member of the engineering faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The Virginia Engineer gratefully acknowledges his courtesy in preparing this article about a subject upon which he is a recognized authority.)

If Rip Van Winkle had fallen asleep in 1900 and awakened sixty years later, the changes in the Victorian world of his memory would overwhelm him. Electricity and the telephone he might barely recognize; television, air conditioning, a host of little things—and the length of ladies' skirts—he would find incomprehensible but none the less delightful. But when he sought out the one thing above all which had so radically changed both city and countryside, changed where people live and work and shop and rest and travel, the answer would be inescapable. This thing called the automobile—this contraption vaguely remembered as the noisy toy of the eccentric rich, gawked at by the farmer come to market, and scorned above all by the great railroad barons. In the span of one man's lifetime this little vehicle had snuffed out the golden age of rail travel, had taken over 90 percent of all passenger-miles, and brought to pass a million miles of pavement to every corner of the land, and had multiplied to a fleet of 70,000,000 toting up a trillion miles a year.

It is necessary thus to dramatize what may well be the greatest technological revolution in history in order to drive home some lessons that are in danger of being forgotten today.

HISTORY'S THREE LESSONS

Lesson one: the coming of the automobile, and the sweeping changes it brought in its train, were almost totally unforeseen by the experts and planners of sixty years ago.

Lesson two: it represents a trend, a progression in human travel, from foot to public vehicle to private vehicle which will not be denied or reversed except where the saving in time or money is very great. Whereas public transportation in the form of the railroad, interurban and streetcar once enjoyed almost 100 percent of the business, it now gets only 5 percent of city travel and only 10 percent of intercity, even with all the fanfare and subsidy enjoyed by the airlines. Even for journeys over 1,000 miles, where the airplane is thought to be unchallenged, the auto still carries 65 percent of all passengers, so great is the appeal of private vehicle over the public.

Which leads to lesson three: the automobile succeeded like nothing else in history because it satisfied some of the deepest yearnings of the individual. All in one package it gave its owner travel *plus* privacy, comfort, speed, economy, dependability, independence, door-to-door service, readiness on demand, single-vehicle travel, relief from baggage problems, exhilaration, prestige, status! In short, what was once reserved for the aristocracy, Detroit now put within the reach of all. In the automobile every family found a slave more powerful and obedient than the Caesars ever dreamed of, and behind its wheel every man became a lord and every woman a lady.

The next step then in human transportation should be a logical application of these lessons and extension of these trends clearly observable as we look back over the first great century of transportation, 1860–1960.

First we see that, given the *means* to travel farther and faster, people somehow find the urge, and the need, and the money to do so. Second, with increased range and speed people find themselves with access to jobs and markets hitherto unthought of, and jobs and markets likewise find new customers. Third, with faster means of daily travel, people moved away from the shadow of the factory and office, and suburban living began to grow along the lines of public transportation. Fourth, with the coming of a personal, door-to-door vehicle (the auto) there was a dramatic shift from public to private vehicles, even at greater money cost to the user. Fifth, with a private vehicle and diminishing working hours, the homesite can be still farther from work and any direction, no longer dependent upon "commuter lines"; thus grew "exurbia" as we see it today. Sixth, as the private vehicle impelled the homesites and the taxpayers to the suburbs, the tax burden upon inner-city business increased, and increased again with the need to provide employee parking space. Thus the pressure grew for industry and business itself to move to the suburbs, a migration everywhere evident. Seventh, with business, industry and homes migrating to the suburbs all because of the private vehicle, the retail stores begin to follow, congregating in wide areas (shopping centers) near the principal arteries (freeways) being built to serve this same vehicle. Eighth, as all intercity travel bypasses the innercities, and most local travel finds little occasion to go "downtown," the central business district (CBD) grows less important. Ninth, with the coming of an ultra-fast means of long-distance travel, i.e. airlines, subsidized to compete with the private vehicle and the railroad, its terminals soon become the principal transportation investment and point of travel interchange in any city, yet far removed from the CBD. Finally, as is inevitable, all travel accommodations (hotels, restaurants, etc.) become located and designed to serve the private vehicle and the air traveler, with less-and-less regard where "downtown" is.

A SUBURBAN NATION

The picture today is of a nation living mostly in suburbs, towns and open land nearby, with better than one automobile per family; an excellent network of highways on which the traveler can average 50 mph door-to-door; an excellent airline network by which door-to-door travel can average 100 mph in the east, up to 400 mph in trans-continental travel; and with the automobile providing 95 percent of all local travel, and even 65 percent of all travel over 1,000 miles, despite the fact that it must be humanly guided every second, in all weather, in all conditions of repair.

Upon such a picture let us superimpose, as by a magic wand, a *completely automatic* third system: a network of electric-powered guideways linking every significant city, traversed by private vehicles available at any time, like the auto, and traveling at 200 mph to match airline service, and superior to both in that every vehicle is guided automatically from origin to chosen destination by the shortest route. And let us suppose at every terminal there was available for every traveler a rental "utility" auto, electric or hybrid-electric, capable of serving his local needs between home and the nearest terminal, or between terminal and final destination; or suppose even that on reaching the exit terminal the traveler merely disengaged his vehicle body from an overhead high-speed electric-powered "carriage," and with the same lever reattached his vehicle to a conventional auto undercarriage for the remainder of the journey by road. And finally, let us suppose that such a system could be constructed and operated for considerably less per passenger-mile than any system today. What would be the effect upon living, working and travel patterns in our society?

First of all, people would soon come to look upon every village, woodland dell, mountainside or ocean shore within 200 miles of the workplace as a potential homesite not more than an hour or so from office or shop. Not more than 40,000 miles of national network of this new kind of high speed guideway would put 90 percent of the nation within an hour of some metropolis. The whole land would become a residential "suburb," and dense-packed ticky-tacky housing would no longer make sense. Second, the hour or so spent going to work, or school, or whatever, would be *productive* time for reading or resting, being freed from the steering wheel, so that daily journeys even greater than 200 miles would become acceptable both for pleasure and business. Third, the system would not only serve but also be served by the growing trend to a society of random working hours, a society of automation in production, distribution and even retailing, with human talents spent in design, service, consulting and education, besides leisure and recreation, so that journeys of all kinds, at all hours and in all directions will gradually replace the senseless rush-hours of today. Finally, the City Center revitalized by becoming itself a terminal on a high-speed national network would emerge as a true community cultural center instead of just a place where bankers, lawyers and conventioneers gather.

THE "FREE-RAIL" CONCEPT

The concept that can bring to pass such change is called the Free-Rail System, and the heart of the concept is the guideway; a double "trackway" consisting of a hollow tube about 2 ft. by 3 ft. slotted at the bottom and suspended 40 ft. above the countryside by light catenary cables between clean simple towers about 600 ft. apart. Such a guideway would be inconspicuous, esthetic, free from problems of land obstructions, grades and curves, paid as economic to build as a modern transmission line. *Inside each trackway* run the wheels and motors of each vehicle, their sound being muffled, and their power source a weather-protected electric cable. Suspended from its "overcarriage" inside the trackway by streamlined struts passing through the bottom slot, the Free-Rail vehicle would be an ultralight perfectly

streamlined shape accommodating passengers with the comforts of the airliner, the privacy of the automobile, and with scenery and door-to-door speed surpassing both.

THREE SYSTEMS FORESEEN

Three kinds of Free-Rail vehicle are foreseen. The "Aerocabin" accommodating six or eight adults with baggage, vacation gear, etc., for long distance travel, such as an 8-hr vacation or convention trip from Richmond to Denver, or the 4½ hr. trip to Miami. Such a vehicle would be large enough for inside movement and might include airline-type food storage and toilet facilities, even though stops enroute would be quite feasible. The "Aerocar" would be a compact four- or six-passenger vehicle primarily for daily commuting or the short business trip. The "Amphicar" might be of either type, but designed for simple transfer from highway undercarriage to Free-Rail overcarriage as mentioned above.

In every case, the essence of Free-Rail travel would be constant speed following an almost bee-line across hill and vale, river and forest, and automatically guided from origin to chosen destination, the vehicle control system making the correct choice at every switch and junction, and always maintaining a safe headway behind the car ahead.

For local travel in large metropolitan areas, a similar system would serve but with a much lighter guideway, a network following the principal arteries to connect all centers or large employment and public gathering, schools, shopping centers, etc., and with two- or four-passenger plastic vehicles available for each traveler or group at any time round-the-clock. As before, all guidance would be fully automatic, in all weather comfort, high above the traffic, but at a more moderate speed of say 60 mph. Such a metropolitan travel system could be erected at such moderate cost, and operated with so little manpower to serve so many, that it might well come to be considered in the same light as sidewalks, street lights, escalators and elevators,—that is, provided free of charge as part of an up-to-date city's standard services.

THE NEXT LOGICAL STEP

Both Free-Rail systems, the larger one for intercity automatic travel at 200 mph, and the smaller one for metropolitan automatic travel at 60 mph, represent the next logical step in the 100-year trend toward private, all-weather, round-the-clock, door-to-door travel epitomized by the dramatic rise of the automobile. The family car will stay; the airlines will continue to be best for long-distance nonstop travel where timesaving is important; and the railroad might even continue for high-density local travel between cities. But the Free-Rail system will be exclusive in offering fully automatic travel, and will exceed all others in economy and door-to-door speed under 1,000 miles. It should easily recapture a significant portion of the city and intercity travel in which the auto now has over 90 percent, and in doing so it should relieve our crowded streets and highways, help to clear our smog-laden air, and open up the entire countryside, 200 miles out from every city, as a potential place to root a home and raise a family.

Lake George would now be a suburb of New York; Vermont and Maine within daily reach of Boston; Roanoke and the Blue Ridge and the Eastern Shore just an hour or so from Washington and Richmond. And every minute of such travel, whether daily or weekly, would be delightful, anxiety-free and *useful*. And the cost would still be within the budget of the average American by virtue of a guideway that consumes no land, vehicles that need no driver, and quiet electric power. Truly, there is no better way to conserve the nation's resources of people, land and fuel.

CAST AND FILM INDUSTRIES

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, every Member in this body would be justifiably angered if television, radio, and motion pictures always depicted all Congressmen as overweight, cigarsmoking, aloof, underhanded, backroom politicians. Fortunately, the motion picture and media industries realize that if such a stereotype consistently appeared in their productions there would be serious repercussions.

However, similar kinds of slurring and discriminatory portrayals occur daily on the movie and television screens and radio airwaves of our country. There has been very little concern over this kind of activity by legislators until now, because it always involves the so-called minority groups of America who, until recently, were believed not to have the ability to organize and wield enough group power to influence our country's politics.

While I hesitate to classify as a minority group any body of people that has in its 22 million citizens, I do include in this categorization the Italo-Americans, along with the Jews, the Blacks, the Irish-Americans, the Polish-Americans, the Greco-Americans, the Puerto Ricans and the many other nationalities that have contributed so much to the mixed culture of our Nation.

Several resolutions, one of which I have sponsored, are aimed at correcting this serious problem. They will not do the complete job, I am sure, but they will help shape the final form of a House concurrent resolution which I hope will accomplish several things.

First, it would put this body on record as being strongly against the further practice of demeaning, degrading, and destructive ethnic slurring in the broadcast and film industries.

It would encourage responsible motion picture and broadcast industry executives to establish and enforce their own standards to prevent this harmful practice.

And, it would also put the industries on notice that if adequate self-regulating procedures and policies are not established and followed. Congress will quickly respond by enacting appropriate controls of its own.

Mr. Speaker, I do not advocate Government controls whenever and wherever problems exist. I am confident the film and broadcast media will live up to our expectations.

However, if such Government action should become necessary because of a lack of response on the part of the industries, I will not hesitate to rise in the House Chamber to propose such controls.

INFLUENCE ON DAILY LIVING

To me, and I am sure the same applies to my colleagues, this measure is of tremendous importance. It is important because most Americans are unaware of the extent such harmful, direct and insidious stereotyping and defamation are practiced in our country. Most people are also unaware of the influence this sort of activity has on the daily lives of those ethnic groups that are victimized by the practice.

I personally have been concerned with this problem for many years. My concern and my efforts to eliminate it certainly go back long before I came to Congress.

I can recall several specific incidents in which my intervention, as head of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations, a group of over 80,000 civil servants in New York, resulted in changes in broadcasting format and policy.

One such incident involved an internationally famous television show which was popular many years ago, called "The Untouchables." I am sure you recall the show and remember how for weeks and weeks on end, its characterizations of criminals was such that it became hard to believe that crime—all crime—both past and present—was not the sole province of Americans of Italian extraction.

In effect, the show's message was not that some Italian-Americans were and are in criminal activity, but rather that all criminal activity was and is Italian American.

My personal discussions with various media people, and then with Desi Arnaz, the producer of the show—who is an ethnically identifiable show business personality himself—resulted in a modification of the scripts and the casting of characters to more realistically present the picture of crime and criminals in America.

This, of course, was only one show. It did not stop all defamatory broadcasting. I am unhappy to say that it continues today and, if we do not take a stand somewhere, it will go on and on and on.

FALSE AND DEMEANING CHARACTERS

There is no doubt that, at times, an actual ethnic characterization becomes necessary to make a point in a plot, a story, or a news report. Yet, even here, much good judgment must prevail. You can imagine, therefore, how deplorable—how immoral—how despicable—it is when a characterization is absolutely false and demeaning. Yet, it is done and done often, and we must ask why.

One of the reasons may be because there exists certain individual broadcasters who, either through habit or personal immorality, see fit to swing a vicious ethnic verbal sword. And they do not hesitate to use it to satisfy personal grudges, psychopathic urges, or just to create gross sensationalism. Moreover, they play the ethnic line because they know all too well that a good part of their audience has been conditioned. over the years, to accept ethnic innuendoes, false associations. and outright lies.

The Federal Communications Commission has stepped up its policing of the broadcast industry. Several stations have been subjected to intensive scrutiny before broadcast licenses were renewed. Some are now undergoing hearings. Perhaps in a few cases the review has been too harsh, and has been complicated by

factors other than the question of service in the public interest.

While I am convinced that our broadcast industry is as much interested as we are in establishing and maintaining high practices may be necessary nonetheless.

The majority of the broadcasters will be responsive, I am sure. However, there will always be a few station managers or individual newscasters whose motives and morals must be kept in question. Whether they interpret the right to exercise freedom of speech and freedom of the press as a right to lie, to distort, and to attack ethnic groups or their representatives, is a serious question that needs an early and forthright answer.

As I have said, I believe the industries as a whole can face this issue. However, each member of each industry must face the issue. If not, Congress will take measures to guarantee that he does.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one additional point. This House recently passed legislation that, if enacted, would allow television broadcasting of certain legislative activity—specifically legislative committee hearings. I hope we are not setting one-sided standards when we call on the broadcast industry and the movie industry to upgrade their treatment of ethnic groups.

CONGRESS COULD BE AN OFFENDER

It is entirely possible that we in Congress may engage in the very same practices we are trying to put a stop to by our resolution. I think this could easily happen in the future because it has happened in the past.

I am sure you will agree that the TV spectacular put on several years ago,, which, despite its broader scope came to be known as "The Valachi Hearings," was not Congress' finest hour in the eyes of the millions of decent and law-abiding Italo-Americans of our Nation.

This was a highly dramatic show. The effect it had on its nationwide audience was horrendous. To say that it came close to hypnotizing the vast majority of Americans into believing that crime was Italian is not an understatement.

For days, one witness—tailormade for the show—spewed forth one Italian name after another, encouraged to go on and on and mesmerize the Nation into believing that crime in America was, indeed, Italian and nothing else. Because of that show, too many people of our country, most of whom were introduced to television, to crime, and to Italians for the first time by the imponderable Mr. Joseph Valachi, the underworld of crime became a world made up exclusively of Italo-Americans.

The sad part of this tale is that Congress was a direct party to the act. One wonders if closed hearings, with a judicious examination and evaluation of all the evidence given, and then a public statement by responsible legislators would not have better served the cause of law enforcement as well as the interests of 22 million decent Italo-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, along with the managers and producers of movies, radio and television shows, we in Congress must be equally vigilant within our own halls, against the promotion of hate, defamation, and ridicule of whole groups of people.

The standards we set for the industries, we must apply to ourselves. And, the treatment we expect for the ethnic groups we personally identify with, we must all expect for our neighbors and for all our fellow men.

RESOLUTION IS FIRST STEP

Finally, let me say this. I am not so naive as to believe that the resolution this committee reports out will immediately wipe out ethnic stereotyping and ethnic discrimination forever. However, I do believe that if the motion picture and the broadcasting industries, along with all sponsors of such programs, take steps toward the elimination of demeaning portrayals of good, honest peoples of our country, we can at least stop the spread of this practice—which is the first step toward the eventual elimination of it altogether.

During the 1960's, Congress passed numerous pieces of legislation. Legislation for civil rights, aimed principally at raising the dignity of the beleaguered blacks of America. These measures were commendable and must be reinforced and expanded.

Only recently we sought to eliminate discrimination based on sex. I commend this House for that. I think now we can do no less for those millions of other Americans who are victims of ethnic biases and prejudices.

Although my statement may seem primarily to deal with the problems affecting Italo-Americans, I am equally concerned with every other ethnic group and have combated with the same vigor any instance—any occasion—where such groups were portrayed in a poor or demeaning fashion.

The issue we are concerned with today is important to all Americans. Our basic sense of fairplay cries out for the enactment of a strongly worded resolution that will lead the way to the eventual eradication of the practice everywhere in our Nation.

FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON EDUCATION OF THE DEAF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, over 1,300 educators of deaf children and others interested and knowledgeable in education of the deaf from 70 countries met in Stockholm, Sweden, on August 17–21, 1970, for the Fifth International Congress on Education of the Deaf. The delegates, including more than 100 from the United States, and among them Jack Forsyth and Roy H. Millenson from the majority and minority staff, respectively, of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, exchanged ideas and discussed techniques in order to better serve the needs of the deaf.

Dr. Edwin W. Martin, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Education, for the Handicapped, of the U.S. Office of Education—and ranking member of the American delegation—pointed out to the international assemblage the new programs which have been authorized by the Congress of the United States and which are being undertaken in the States and in the communities. Dr. Martin indicated that until recently many of the deaf young people were unable to attend postsecondary schools since no appropriate educational placement was possible. Today about four times as many deaf young people in the postsecondary age group continue their education as was the case 10 years ago. Emerging vocational training programs in community colleges and the National Institute for the Deaf in Rochester, N.Y., for example, are opening new horizons for such young people.

Others from the Departmnt of Health, Education, and Welfare who led discussions and presented papers at the Congress included Malcolm Norwood, Assistant Chief, Media Services and Captioned Films Branch; Mrs. Patria Forsythe, Secretary of the Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf; Dr. Phillip Schmitt, Coordinator of Teacher Training Programs, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped; Dr. Gilbert Delgado, Chief, Media Services and Captioned Films Branch of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped; and Dr. Frank B. Withdrow, Director, Division of Educational Services of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

The Swedish Government, as the host nation, made available to the delegates valuable information with respect to procedures and techniques employed in that nation for education of the deaf, contributing much to making the International Congress a constructive meeting of the world community concerned with educating the deaf for fruitful lives. It was a productive conclave.

GUN CONTROL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gun lobby never rests in its fight against reasonable regulation of firearms. Unfortunately, the great majority of the people who favor such laws, and who were moved to press Congress for action after the assassination of Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy, have now once again fallen silent.

Yet the need remains, as stark as ever.

The following item from today's Washington Daily News serves as an eloquent reminder of the failure of the Congress to act responsibly in this important field:

SLAIN NEWSBOY PUSHED GUN CONTROL

William Psimas, 18, of Springfield is in Fairfax County jail today on a homicide charge in connection with the death of a 14-year-old newsboy, Todd McKinney, who was shot-gunned while delivering the morning paper.

Mr. Psimas, of 5000 Kingston-st, is being held on $25,000 bond, and a preliminary hearing is scheduled for No. 2.

Fairfax police gave this account of the incident:

Mr. Psimas said he was awakened by noises shortly before dawn. He looked out his second floor bedroom window, and thought he saw someone tampering with his car.

He loaded his 16-gauge shotgun, unlatched the window screen, and fired one blast. The youth then woke up his stepfather and told him that he had shot at a prowler. His stepfather then called police.

When police arrived, they searched the area and found the body of Todd McKinney in a driveway in the next block, with gunshot wounds in his head and back. Police said his bicycle was parked 30 feet away from where the body was found.

Todd lived at 4708 Dobson Drive, in the same Springfield subdivision where he had delivered newspapers for three years. He was chief of the editorial staff of the Poe Intermediate school paper, was captain of the intramural football team, student body president when he was in sixth grade and had won a number of basketball trophies.

"Just a few days ago," said Raymond D. McKinney, the boy's father, "he said he wanted to contribute last month's money to Joe Tyding's campaign, because 'Joe Tydings was doing his best for gun control.'"

"He was very interested in life and contributed to the church we belong to . . . he always contributed money to many human causes," including the Salvation Army and an Annandale community-church group working with day care centers.

AN OVERLOOKED POLLUTION LAW

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, since the "rediscovery" of the 1899 Refuse Act by Congressman HENRY REUSS, this long-neglected legislation has been performing a valuable service by focusing attention on the vital fight against pollution.

The Green Bay, Wis., Press-Gazette recently took note of the 1899 law in an editorial I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

AN OVERLOOKED POLLUTION LAW

A conservation and natural resources subcommittee in the House of Representatives, headed by Milwaukee Rep. Henry Reuss, has discovered an 1899 federal statute that is now being used in the fight against pollution.

The act prohibits the discharge of any refuse except liquid sewage into navigable waters without a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. Since 1899, only 415 permits have been issued. It appears that only 266 remain in effect—but it is obvious that the dumping has been going on quite illegally ever since.

All that law and order promoted by the Justice Department somehow hasn't become involved with upholding the Refuse Act of 1899. In fact, an assistant attorney general said "it would not be in the general interest of the government" to prosecute polluters who are making genuine efforts to stop the polluting, which may be practical. But where has the department been all these years? It has finally sought court injunctions against ten "consistent" mercury polluters but only after the considerable publicity, the fears of eating contaminated fish and the damage done to the tourist industry in Wisconsin as well as other states.

A major reason why the act has been resurrected is that it stipulates that anyone who reports a violation to the federal government can collect one-half of any fines that are levied. This lure has brought charges in Alabama by the Bass Anglers Sportsman Society against 214 corporations and municipalities. In Massachusetts, 151 polluters have been charged by Rep. Michael Harrington. Reuss has named 270 alleged polluters in Wisconsin and sued four firms. Both Reuss and Rep. Edward Koch of New York have offered mail order kits to citizens who want to know what to do.

As we have pointed out before, halting pollution is not an instant matter and the problems of industry must be weighed against the dangers to society. But the government foot dragging over the years since the 1899 act was passed is one reason we are in such dire straits today.

THE SCHOOL RULING IN DETROIT

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an interesting and informative editorial on the question of school desegregation nationwide was published in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., on October 3, 1970.

The writer takes note of a Federal hearing examiner's ruling regarding an all-black school in Detroit, Mich. The failure of the hearing examiner to meet the issue fully is noted by the writer.

Once again we have witnessed, as in this ruling, the promotion of the idea that the "making of new law" is in the hands of the courts. The courts have repeatedly flaunted the clearly expressed will of Congress, particularly in school cases, and issued decisions which call for racial balancing by busing in clear violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. President, the educational system of the South is being destroyed by court decisions which bus children around as if they were so many checkers on a checkerboard. If such were being done nationwide, this country would come apart at the seams. The civil rights of children in the South, black and white, are being trampled. Pupils and parents are distraught over this pellmell patchwork of busing which has been forced on Southern schools alone.

The challenge of providing a good education has given way to the challenge of maintaining order. The most precious possession of black and white parents in the South, their children, are being shifted about to satisfy the schemes of social scientists in Washington, who in many cases have their own children attend neighborhood schools.

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

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

NORTHERN SCHOOL RULING STILL EVADES THE ISSUE

A Federal hearing examiner in Washington this week ruled that an all-black school in the Detroit suburb of Ferndale had engaged in illegal racial segregation.

This was the first such ruling outside the South, which says something about the government's professed desire to root out segregation wherever it exists. It had existed in Ferndale since 1926, the year Grant School was built.

Aside from this case and another challenge in Wichita, Kansas, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has been content to let sleeping dogs lie so long as they lie somewhere outside the old Confederacy. The engines of public outrage—the television networks, the "news" magazines, the powerful dailies of the Eastern establishment—have been equally tolerant.

Thus it has been possible always to muster a majority in behalf of the most stringent "civil rights" laws. Thus also have the courts felt free to stretch those laws so as to require busing, racial balance, and other extra-legal gimmicks. And lest non-Southern schools be affected adversely, the courts roped off the South from the rest of the country by means of dishonest *de jure-de-facto* distinctions that exist chiefly in the fertile minds of lawyers and judges.

The Ferndale ruling might have demolished that legal mumbo-jumbo by declaring Grant School ineligible for federal funds regardless of whether segregation resulted as a matter of law or from the physical setting. The hearing officer side-stepped the opportunity, however, saying that the school had been built for the intended purpose of segregating black pupils and had been continued for that purpose.

As for the link between segregated housing and segregated schools, he said, he would "leave the problem of the making of new law" to the courts.

That, of course, is precisely where the most glaring inequities arose in the first place. It is the federal judiciary that has permitted non-Southern school districts to use the *de facto* dodge, while requiring Southern schools to bus children for the purpose of achieving racial balance. Congress, in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, explicitly prohibited this requirement.

"Nothing herein," says that act, "shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

After the fashion of medieval monks, federal judges have debated endlessly the number of black and white angels that can stand on the head of a pin. They have concluded that racial balance is required, though percentages may vary arbitrarily, and that busing is a legitimate means to this end. In short, they have done deliberately what Congress said they might not do.

There is no little irony in the hearing officer's willingness to leave to the courts "the making of new law." This practice, more than anything else, is responsible for the system of patchwork justice that increasingly has disrupted the progress of education in the South. Nor is it much comfort to know that the Supreme Court has promised to solve the *de jure-de facto* riddle when it takes up the gavel again. One knows from experience that the court will simply make a new law, rather than leaving that job to Congress as is required by the supreme law of the land.

The best to be hoped for is that the Supreme Court will fashion a new law that applies equally to all parts of the nation. If that happens, areas outside the South will begin to feel the heat. And when the nation comes to a boil, who knows? Constitutional government may even be restored.

SCHOOLS SHOULD TEACH ETHICS AND MORALITY COURSES

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, over the last several Congresses I have introduced legislation to provide for Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles.

My bill, H.R. 12339, to carry out this program is pending in the House Education and Labor Committee. It has some 35 cosponsors, and I am hopeful it can be enacted into law in the near future. A pilot program in this area was enacted in 1964 as a section of the Juvenile Delinquency Act, and it has resulted in sound accomplishments to stop the rising crime and juvenile delinquency rate.

There is a great need in America today for broad instruction in the development of man's moral and ethical values. Such a program, the content and nature of instruction prescribed by State school agencies, can be stimulated through Federal grants. The teaching of morals and ethics is a proper function of schools, just as it is in the home and church.

The latest Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reports stated that 32 percent of all offenses solved involved persons under 18 years of age, while the age group from 10 to 17 years of age is only 16 percent of the total population in the United States. It is obvious we must do something to raise the moral and ethical standards in America, especially among young people.

A recent letter from John E. Ingersoll, Director, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, to me makes this very clear. Director Ingersoll wrote:

> It has been our experience, and indeed this experience has been corroborated by research, that in families and communities where strong moral and spiritual values exist, little abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs is to be found.

Mr. Speaker, also in support of my legislation to teach ethics and morals. I include in these remarks the following resolution approved by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, calling for the teaching of religion in public schools.

RESOLUTION V: TEACHING ABOUT RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(As approved by convention delegates, June 3, 1970)

Whereas, The National Congress of Parents and Teachers states in its principles "We believe religion is fundamental in our American tradition as a basic factor in personal and social behavior and that every child is entitled to the opportunity to develop a religious faith", and

Whereas, Thousands of homes provide neither religious experiences for the young for whom they are responsible nor opportunity for religious experience in church, and

Whereas, The public schools share with the home the responsibility to provide each child the opportunity to achieve the finest possible preparation for living, and

Whereas, The Supreme Court decision regarding the reading of the Bible and the use of prayer in the public schools prohibits only religious practice in the schools, but permits the study of the Bible and religion when presented objectively and comparatively as part of a secular program of education, and,

Whereas, Misinterpretation of the Supreme Court decision has caused confusion and even rebellion in many communities and schools, and

Whereas, Many educators have felt it advisable to minimize or omit religious content in the school curriculum because of general misunderstanding of the purpose of such study; therefore be it

Resolved, That the National PTA, its state branches and local units develop educational programs designed to promote understanding of the U.S. Supreme Court decision regarding the reading of the Bible and the use of prayer in the public schools; and

Resolved, That the National PTA help its state branches and local units to implement such a program by supplying them information about investigated educational materials and legal programs on teaching *ABOUT* religion being used presently in many school systems; and be it further

Resolved, That the National PTA, its state branches and local units initiate conference and cooperation between religious and secular groups to produce intelligent action in order that every child may experience the highest advantages in character and spiritual education.

"WE'LL HELP YOU MAKE IT"

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of southern California's major food processors, Hunt-Wesson Foods, Inc., is embarking upon a new promotional program which can do much to help the average family combat the rising cost of living.

The program, entitled "We'll Help You Make It," offers the public individual, computerized monthly menus suggesting ways a family can provide for nutritional and appetizing meals at the lowest possible cost.

Under this program, a family will fill in a coupon—obtained from newspaper and magazine ads or from the local supermarket—specifying the size of the family and the amount of money available for food purchases.

By sending this coupon to Hunt-Wesson's Computerized Meal Center in Dayton, Ohio, the family will receive in return, at no cost, a personalized full month's menu based on current prices, with buying tips and recipes.

Hunt-Wesson will be spending more than $2,500,000 in this program, in addition to the sums it is already spending on its low-cost cookery program it initiated last year to help educate consumers to the advantages of more modestly priced and nutritional foods.

Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, no substitute for a more determined effort by the administration to bring down the spiraling cost of living.

But in the absence of such action by the administration, the Hunt-Wesson people are to be commended for their own programs to help the American people make ends meet.

ON LOOKING AT SMALL BUSINESS IN THE 1970'S

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of the distinguished Senator, the senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) on "Small Business Looks at the 1970's." The speech was delivered at the first national convention for the 550 field directors of General Business Services, Inc., of Washington, D.C., one of the Nation's foremost small business counselors. The convention was held at the Marriott Twin Bridges Motel from June 29 to July 1, and the Senator addressed the group on June 29.

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

(Address of Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman, U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business, before First Annual Convention of General Business Services, Inc., Washington, D.C., June 29, 1970)

SMALL BUSINESS LOOKS AT THE 1970's

Mr. Chairman, small businessmen and businesswomen and friends and guests of your convention, it is a distinct pleasure for me to accept the invitation of President Browning today to address a gathering of small entrepreneurs who daily help other small entrepreneurs across this Nation. This first national convention of General Business Services Corporation is a graphic demonstration of how new industries can grow up within the free enterprise economy of this country. More particularly, it reflects just how the franchise field mirrors the real potential of our economic system—imagination and innovation.

Some months ago your convention officials asked me what my topic would be so they could use it in advance announcements of your convention. I bravely said the general title would be "Small Business Looks at the 1970's". . . . Whether I would be brave enough again today, in all honesty to pick that topic in view of our economic jitters these days, I would seriously doubt. Be that as it may, I believe you will agree with me that any look at our business future through today's economic-clouded glasses takes a daring crystal-gazer no matter whether it is a financial expert or novice doing the predicting.

Today we have prices and wages moving upwards feeding the inflation spiral. At the same time unemployment is increasing and the rate of business failures is on the upswing, highlighted this past week by the nation's largest railway system going into bankruptcy, adding more confusion to a jumping-jack stock market.

Over the past year, we have noted with mounting concern the triple squeeze on our small businessmen from credit policies restricting money in the private sector, tax changes adverse to small firms and a cutback of nearly 60 percent in the last-resort lending programs of the Small Business Administration.

Three months ago, the First National City Bank of New York forecast a severe economic downturn, the first in a decade, "as a result of the tight money policies pursued throughout 1969." Wall Street commentators in April and May were saying: "All indicators point to severe . . . pressures on profits during the first half of the year . . . perhaps more than 20 percent on a before-tax basis. . . ."

Net corporate working capital, from December 1968 to April 1970, rose only $2 billion (or less than 1%). The bulk of this increase was in inventories (at the highest ratio to sales in 9 years) and accounts receivable; while cash and government securities both declined more than 10 percent. As a result, we are seeing liquidity difficulties, particularly for communications, finance, and railroad companies, with Penn Central being the most notable victim.

Across the spectrum of commerce, the number of business failures increased 20.5 percent in the past year with the annual failure rate in a comparable rise from 36.4 firms per 10,000 to 43.7 percent.

Unemployment, according to Governor Brimmer of the Federal Reserve System, may average 5.5 percent for the next six months.

Prices in the past 12 months rose at their steepest rate in 20 years.

Since December of 1968 the Dow-Jones Industrial Average has declined roughly 300 points, or about 30 percent of its value.

Requests to the President to supplement the Administration's financial policies, which have been described under a heading of "gradualism," have come from among others, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, and distinguished Members of Congress from both parties.

Already serious doubts have been expressed that merely making a monthly identification of inflationary wage and price increases will not do the job that is needed to reverse these trends.

In continuing the process of gathering information, correctly interpreting it, and making proper decisions on the action to be taken about our economy, we need to bring to bear all the wisdom and experience this Nation possesses.

And what does all of this mean? I assure you I am not here to paint a drab economic picture of the future because the country's top economic prognosticators differ widely and deeply in their predictions. As a legislator and someone who listens to what the various economists, bankers and business leaders predict, just as you do, I see no valid reason for a crying-towel or a doom-and-gloom recitation at this time. And as for you directly, one big reason is that as franchisees, you are participants in one of the most dynamic features of our economy today. What about franchising?

According to estimates of Senator Harrison Williams' Subcommittee of my Small Business Committee, which held 6 days of franchise hearings earlier this year, the number of franchise holders is now over one-half million. The Small Business Administration projects an increase of 650,000 units by 1976. Our Subcommittee estimates that the franchising industry now generates about $90 billion in sales annually, almost one-third of the country's retail total, and nearly one-tenth of our entire gross national product.

And why is franchising such a dynamic force today. It offers a prospective businessman with limited capital and experience the opportunity to own and operate a business which has been settled into a relatively established format. However, a major ingredient is the franchisee himself and the drive, discipline and willingness to work long hard hours which he brings to his endeavor. I therefore congratulate you for your part in a classic American success story.

There is an almost natural law that big businesses tend to deal or do business with other big businesses. Likewise, small businesses tend to trade with other small businesses. It doesn't have to be that way, but that is what the facts seem to prove out. You franchisees who serve small business are witness to the operation of this law, for you are small businesses dealing with small businesses. You are performing a creditable and necessary function, because you work every business day to strengthen the vitality of our Nation's small businesses.

Many students of business size have a tendency to emphasize the advantages of big business over small business, but that is a mistake. Those who are close to the small businesses of America know very well that they are truly the foundation of the American economy . . . its true well spring, if you please.

There, flexibility, quick adaptation, native unincorporated intelligence, personalized relations with employees, other businesses and the general public, and above all the vital element of high personal risk-taking, have an opportunity to dominate and flourish.

There is the tough frontier for new risk-taking entrepreneurs to enter, the new land of opportunity which hundreds of thousands choose to enter each year. There is the opportunity for responsibility and decision-making and the challenge of risk-taking, which are the seedbed for our best managers in both large and small American businesses. And there is the retreat, the self-renewal for which thousands of managers, scientists, and engineers abandon big business each year to refind themselves in the small business crucible of renewed enthusiasm, challenge and new horizons.

The tremendous service which you are performing for these small businesses in your every work day to bring them some of the advantages of large-scale business through your specialized services. You relieve them of tedious routine or the burden of operations which can better and more cheaply be performed by specialists like yourselves. Thereby, you leave them free to concentrate on their unique capability . . . their thing . . . which is their business acumen.

The American people have wisely been aware of the vitality with which its small businesses strengthen our economic life, and have wisely embodied their appreciation in the great organic legislation, the Small Business Act of 1953. On the legislative side, the Congress has seen fit to create two special Select Committees on Small Business to help monitor the well being of small business. In the executive branch of the Government, the Small Business Act is translated into reality by the Small Business Administration in its relationship with other branches of government and the general public as well.

Now, I should like to tie together for you the points I have sought to make thus far today by means of a simple comparison . . . I have rarely seen it expressed this way but I believe it sets forth the absolute wisdom of the American people in their belief in small business.

At the very heart of economic strength must be found a vigorous decision-making process and a stringent over-riding risk-taking. That is the nucleus of the free enterprise system. The decision-making is indispensable because of the lightning-fast changes which characterize our age of innovation. On the other hand, personal risk-taking is the whiplash which keeps businessmen honing the competitive razor in the marketplace.

Now, in these terms let us concern our economic system here in the United States with that in Russia. Yes, when the chips are down, and when the problems get heavy, the Russians always have one economic decision-maker, *the Kremlin*, and *no* personal businessmen risk-takers.

But what about the United States? We have over 11 million risk-takers, businessmen and women, that is. And 99 percent of our businesses are small businesses. They provide a deep, vibrant, challenging, freedom-of-choice, self-motivated challenge to do better and reap the personal rewards of their personal endeavors through personal profit. Our Soviet neighbors across the seas have no comparable challenge.

That is the essence of the differences between the Russian economy and ours. That explains why Russia has over 15 percent greater population than the United States yet 50 percent less Gross National Product. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recently celebrated its 50th anniversary. Fifty years have been more than enough to achieve a much closer gap with the productive capability of the United States. Certainly, the Japanese and the Germans have done better in 25 years subsequent to their World War II defeats.

I believe you will find the reasons for our greater economic gains lie in the number of independent, self-governing businesses. We have no Gosplan; we have no Central Party Committee to dictate to each business enterprise. We have over 11 million individual, independent businesses. That is the American strength.

And what about these 11.4 million businesses, just who and what are they? About 80 percent are sole proprietorships, another 12 percent are corporations and the remaining 8 percent are partnerships.

Farms numbered about 3.4 million, or 30 percent of the total. Retail, services, and finance, insurance and real estate groups number about 5.8 million, or 50 percent. Manufacturing had 410,000 businesses for 4 percent and contract construction had 880,000 for 8 percent. The balance of 8 percent were in mining, wholesale trade and various utilities.

By size, almost all farms are small business although big corporate farming is on the rise. Of the 8 million non-farm businesses, 85 percent had annual business receipts under 100,000, and another 13 percent were bigger but under $1 million. Thus, 98 percent of the non-farm businesses were small by the definition of the receipts under $1 million, and over 99 percent if farms are included.

Thus, I repeat, that is the American strength.

And what is another challenge as small business looks at the 1970's? May I read to you from a letter I received several months ago from a business management executive. He said:

"During the 1960's, growth was the prime objective of business effort. The 1970's may have brought us to a plateau. Managements tend to concentrate today on efficiency although growth, of course, is still desired. But greater efficiency may be the key to survival."

And, of course, that message is particularly significant for all of you as you think about yourself and the 1970's. You have businesses which provide a medium for upgrading efficiency of other business firms throughout the small business segment of our economy.

That is not only your personal challenge but the challenge to all small businesses as you seek to enrich and strengthen the American economy.

In closing, may I wish you well as small businesses in your own right, and as allies of other small businesses you serve across this land. Those of us in the legislative halls of the Congress with special responsibilities to assist small business will continue to work hand-in-hand with you as the 1970's present their challenges, their burdens and their benefits.

IN SUPPORT OF THE MANPOWER BILL

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in behalf of

the manpower bill, and in particular I would like to single out for special praise the effort to expand the public service employment in the State of North Dakota. We have had a special mainstream program in Minot, N. Dak., where Green Thumb workers came in to clean up after the flood in the parks, helping distressed families and working with the public agencies. This project has gained a great deal of public response and support and showed the potentials for this kind of program throughout the State.

Communities throughout the State, including Fargo, have inquired how they could get a similar program in their area, both to assist in doing necessary public work and also to do a job showing the potentials and carrying out the training with older workers. We have also heard about the excellent programs over in Minnesota and the manpower bill provides a good chance for this kind of public service employment and training of older workers who have had to leave agriculture and move into our towns.

For this reason I strongly support the manpower bill and thank the administration and the members of the committee for developing this much needed legislation.

FUEL CRISIS IN NEW ENGLAND

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, members of the New England House Delegation, Democrats and Republicans, requested a White House meeting with the President to discuss the prospect of his ending present import quotas on badly needed heating oil. A similar prospect was suggested earlier by the President's Task Force on Oil Import Quotas, but, ostensibly, rejected.

As yet, there has been no reply as to whether our meeting request will be granted. Understandably, Mr. Nixon's response has been delayed by his European trip and his preparation of the recent televised speech on Vietnam. But now those commitments are past and I would expect to receive word on the proposed meeting soon.

There is no question but that the Nation, and especially the New England area, is threatened by a very serious heating crisis this winter. Nor, as is evidenced by the articles which appear below, is there any question but that the best remedy to such a crisis is available in fast and firm executive action. The people of New England are relying on the President for this response. I therefore hope that the President will consent to meet with the New England Delegation so that New Englanders can at least be sure he is aware of the true scope of the problem and considering remedial action, hopefully, of equal scope.

At this point, I ask that the following New York Times articles be included in the RECORD. The first, entitled "Man-Made Fuel Crisis," is a Times editorial that appeared October 2; the second, "Why There May Be a Shortage of Heating Fuel," was written by William Smith and appeared October 4. The items follow:

MAN-MADE FUEL CRISIS

It comes as a stunning surprise to most Americans to realize that a temporary shortage of coal, oil and natural gas may produce power blackouts and brownouts this winter. That surprise is heightened by the state's notice to New Yorkers that fuel rationing might be necessary here for the first time since World War II. The ordinary citizen's astonishment is justified. If ever there was a man-made crisis, this is it.

There is no shortage of coal, oil and gas as such. The nation's reserves of all three are still enormous. Foreign sources are also available. But several special circumstances have developed at the same time to cause disruptions in the normal marketing of these fossil fuels.

The United States is a coal-exporting country, and coal exports have risen this year. Heavy exports have tied up railroad coal cars at seaports where they wait for days to be unloaded. The new Federal Coal Mine Safety Act—long overdue and still slackly enforced—has pinched production because companies are closing small mines rather than making the capital investment necessary to bring them up to the new Federal safety standards. But, basically, the shortage is not of coal but of railroad cars.

The international oil market has been upset because Libya is restricting production in an apparent effort to get a higher royalty for its oil. Syria, bringing pressure for higher transit fees, has refused since May to repair a break in a major pipeline. But the United States could easily overcome these adverse factors if domestic oil production were not rigged low to keep the price stable and imports from Venezuela not rigidly restricted.

Natural gas has moved temporarily into short supply, partly because gas producers and distributors did not forsee the extent to which the public outcry for clean air would send the demand for their product skyrocketing. Unfortunately, however, another part of the explanation is that the major oil companies, which own the lion's share of gas leases, are not averse to an artificially induced gas shortage which would heighten the pressure for a hefty increase in gas prices.

The Council of Economic Advisers' first "inflation alert" noted that fuel prices have been advancing with "exceptional rapidity" this year. The cost of bituminous coal climbed at a 34.4 per cent rate in the first quarter, then shot up at an 81 percent rate in the second quarter. Residual fuel prices went up at a 36 per cent pace in the first quarter and 60 per cent in the second.

The Administration's instinctive response to this many-sided problem was to let it drift. Dr. Paul W. McCracken, the President's chief economic adviser, said several weeks ago: "I think the most helpful solution from what very little I have been able to see of this problem at the moment would be to pray for a benign weatherman this winter."

With the seriousness of the problem becoming more apparent every day, however, the White House has now announced some small measures. They seem more designed to take the political heat off the Administration than to provide real heat to anyone else.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has doubled the charge for railroad cars standing idle in loading zones. The impact quota of 40,000 barrels a day on fuel oil used for home heating on the East Coast is to be doubled in the first quarter of 1971, but with a compensating reduction in the last nine months of next year to maintain the over-all average. Other import restrictions are eased in minor ways. "In view of numerous uncertainties, no one can now be sure that these steps will be adequate," the Administration spokesmen observed.

The Administration has spent a year and a half marching up the hill and then down the hill on oil import quotas. It is time to march back up the hill and stay there. Oil import quotas make no sense at any time, as the President's own task force has made plain. In a time of fuel shortage, they constitute nothing less than an attack by the Federal Government on the welfare of milions of its own citizens to safeguard oil industry profits. The Eastern Seaboard should routinely meet much of its energy needs by imports of oil from Venezuela. The quota changes announced this week amount to mere trifling with the issue.

The regulatory commissions in the oil-producing states could be prodded to increase the number of days on which oil is pumped from existing wells. The doubling of charges on idle railroad cars is a step in the right direction, but the Department of Transportation could work with the coal-carrying railroads to devise new procedures and, if necessary, new incentives and stiffer penalties to get them to cut their "turnaround time" on unloading coal cars.

If fuel rationing is necessary this winter, homes and stores will have to take precedence over heavy industry. But this is a choice which should not have to be made. Aggressive Government leadership can still make it unnecessary.

WHY THERE MAY BE A SHORTAGE OF HEATING FUEL

(By William Smith)

The Administration began taking concrete steps last week to avert the possibility of the country's first peacetime fuel shortage.

The moves appeared to satisfy no one, and the specter of unheated homes, idle factories and power shortages continues to hover over the Northeast and mid-continent sections of the country.

The Administration's actions ranged from a modest relaxation of the import restrictions on No. 2, or home heating, oil to steps effecting an increase of some 36,000 barrels a day in the amount of crude oil Canada is allowed to ship into the United States.

The program was announced Tuesday by Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and a member of the President's Oil Policy Committee, and George A. Lincoln, director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness and chairman of the Oil Policy Committee. They urged the consuming public to "conserve the use of energy."

Mr. McCracken gave assurances that no homes would be without fuel. He suggested, however, that industrial users might have to cut their fuel consumption during periods of extreme cold.

New England members of Congress from both sides of the aisle were quick to criticize the Administration moves as far too limited. Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, characterized the program as "callous disregard of the needs of New England consumers."

The oil industry, on the other hand, believed that the steps taken by the Administration had very little to do with the chief problem, the shortage of No. 4, 5, and 6 residual fuel oils. These are used to heat apartments, hospitals and factories and run utility generators.

The common denominator between the Administration and its critics, both consumer and industry-oriented, was an obvious sense of uncertainty.

Why not?

SHOCK FOR AMERICA

To a country accustomed to always getting light when it turns the switch and receiving warmth when it moves the thermostat, even the hint of a shortage comes as quite a shock—a shock that may not be fully comprehended until this winter.

The energy shortage, if it occurs, is the result of many complicated forces—some old, some new, some political, some logistical—coming together at a point in time when the country was vulnerable. Oil, gas, coal and nuclear power all have played a role in creating the present situation.

The problem first came to the surface in May, when a tractor in Syria "accidentally" poked a hole in the Trans-Arabian Pipeline. The Syrians, for political reasons, have refused to repair the line, cutting off 500,000 barrels a day of crude oil from Mediterranean ports.

In June, the Libyan Revolutionary Government began price negotiations with the oil companies operating there by ordering cutbacks in production, reducing by another 700,000 barrels daily the amount of crude available at the Mediterranean ports for easy shipment to Europe.

To replace more than a million barrels a day, cut off by Syria and Libya, means that oil must be carried from the Persian Gulf around the tip of Africa to Europe. Five times the amount of tanker tonnage is needed to carry the comparable amount of oil because of the much greater distance. An already tight tanker situation was made far worse, forcing spot tanker rates to a record high.

Back in the United States, longer-range forces were coming into play. Electric power demand in the last three years of the 1960's grew at a rate considerably faster than predicted.

At the same time, the promise of nuclear energy failed to become a reality. Thus by early 1969, only 2,840 megawatts of nuclear capacity were operative, in contrast to the 4,200 megawatts forecast by 1968 by the Federal Power Commission.

In anticipation of shifts by the electric power industry to nuclear fuel and pressures from the Government to cut down on air pollution, coal companies did not expand production and transportation facilities. Instead, they exported coal profitably under long-term contract to Europe and Japan.

Utilities on the other hand, because of anti-pollution regulations, began switching in large numbers to natural gas and residual oil as fuel sources.

The steps taken by the administration appear to be of limited importance. Some observers believe that President Nixon is relying on jawboning to get the domestic refiners to raise their yield of residual oil.

A bigger help would be a mild winter.

THE CRITICAL BOTTLENECK

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the critical bottleneck of law enforcement in the affairs of large corporations is the failure of Government to collect and disclose information upon which it and its citizens can act. Corporations emphasize their attributes through extensive advertising and promotion programs. They are reluctant, however, to disclose data which detracts from their public image.

Information about corporate activity which the public needs to know, but cannot obtain, must be obtained by Government. Industry seeks to discourage disclosure through a variety of methods. One of the most important—and assuredly the least publicized—methods is through advisory commissions, of which there are hundreds at the federal level.

Last week Senator MUSKIE's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations held 4 days of hearings on Federal advisory commissions. The hearing focused on the Budget Bureau advisory committees. They have no statutory basis. They are composed exclusively of industry representatives. They have operated since 1943. I daresay that until last year not one person in 10,000 in this knowledgeable city was aware of their existence, not to mention their influence.

Ralph Nader testified Thursday. Substantial excerpts from his extemporaneous testimony deserve to be printed in the RECORD, for three reasons:

First, they will be instructive to the many young men and women who are training themselves in effective methods of restructuring and improving our society.

Second, they will be helpful to those newsmen who desire a fuller understanding of the public's right to know.

Third, Mr. Nader's testimony will, I hope, engender more interest within the Congress in the importance of corporate disclosure, and Government insistence upon it, to law enforcement.

Special urgency attaches to one of the examples cited by Mr. Nader, the inventory of industrial water waste.

As some of you are aware, this inventory was proposed 7 years ago. It was designed to determine the facts about water pollution—who is polluting what, where and how much. This information is obviously needed in order to develop standards, prosecute violators, and stop pollution.

This inventory has not been made, despite efforts by congressional committees and pollution abatement officials, because the Office of Management and Budget does not approve of it. OMB has the power to approve agency requests for collection of information from 10 or more firms or individuals. OMB listens to its industry advisory committee, which does not want to disclose their contributions to pollution, rather than to Congress and pollution abatement officials.

OMB is the Government information threshold—the Khyber Pass, to use Mr. Nader's phrase—and this powerful agency has kept from the Congress, from regulatory agencies, and the public, information which we very much need.

Mr. President, I have just learned that the administration plans to initiate this coming weekend a remarkable pollution inventory, which is in reality a gruesome hoax. The inventory will be sent to only a small percentage of the companies which are likely polluters. It will be a trial inventory. And it will be voluntary.

A voluntary inventory, as Mr. Nader pointed out:

> Is going to put a premium on industrial dishonesty because the companies that are polluting and are willing to be honestly reported are going to be subjected to greater interests by the regulatory agencies.

I have asked the President to reverse OMB promptly. I have asked him to direct that a comprehensive, mandatory inventory of industrial water waste be undertaken at once, in the interest of environmental protection and law enforcement.

I have also suggested that the President's National Industrial Pollution Control Council—which is scheduled to meet in closed session at the Commerce Department tomorrow—be broadened to include ecologists, youth, women, and other nonindustry interests. This 63-man council is now composed exclusively of board chairmen and presidents of major polluting companies and their trade associations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Nader's testimony, that of his associate Petter Petkas, colloquy with Subcommittee Counsel E. Winslow Turner, and background articles on the inventory of industrial water waste which were published in Science, the New York Times, and the Missoulian.

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

THE CRITICAL BOTTLENECK

Mr. NADER. The critical importance of information obtained by government agencies in fulfilling their statutory and regulatory mandates needs little elaboration. But I think it is important to focus on at least three points here so that we can frame the background of our discussion with some greater concreteness.

First, the implementation of congressional policies such as in the area of anti-trust, pollution, safety, rate-making, or approving, the allowance of subsidies, the giving of licenses and certificates for routes, and many other activities require detailed information from these regulated industries that come under the statute if the agency is going to develop sound policy, equitable policy, and develop some sort of criteria to insure compliance with its regulations.

The second function of information is to permit more rational decision-making that individual citizens or public bodies can evaluate. It is not sufficient for an agency simply to produce what it thinks is a good decision without elaborating the details and the facts behind that decision. The greater the amount of information obtained the more likely that the agency will be more detailed, meticulous, accurate, and more careful in the kind of decisions that it makes and, incidentally, quite as important, in the kinds of decisions that it refuses to make. The more information that is obtainable and is actually obtained by these agencies, the less likely are we going to get a perpetuation of this endemic disease that we know as bureaucratic delay, bureaucratic inaction, oftentimes perpetuated by the excuse of inadequate information or the difficulty of obtaining information.

And thirdly, information obtained by government agencies permits citizens access to this information in order not only to evaluate government action, but to inform themselves so they can pursue their own citizenship activities, their own pursuit of rights whether before legislatures, courts or whether in the form of public opinion. The blockage unnecessarily of any form of information that government needs from business for its regulatory duties also limits the usefulness of the Freedom of Information Act. What good is the Freedom of Information Act if the rights accorded under that Act can't cling to any information of any significance because the information was never collected by the regulatory agencies because the Bureau of the Budget or the Office of Management and Budget has impeded that collection?

It is a remarkable tribute to the ability of business and government to engender a process of secrecy since 1942 when the Federal Reports Act was passed that was so

impressive that it even escaped the attention of some long-time employees in the Bureau of the Budget.

I recall over a year ago I asked the Chief Recruiter of Personnel for the Bureau of the Budget about the birdwatchers list and about these activities under the Federal Reports Act, and the individual had never heard of them. And the individual happened to have been a Bureau of the Budget employee for many years.

The secrecy began to break down with probes such as the one undertaken by you, Mr. Chairman, and by the Consumer Federation of America and other groups about two years ago. But it is quite clear that the Bureau of the Budget, or the Office of Management and Budget as it is now called, has control over the "Khyber Pass" of information procurement in the Federal Government. And it makes very little difference what the situation is in one agency or the other or what the clarion calls are from Congress as long as that critical "Khyber Pass" is controlled by a handful of anonymous Bureau of the Budget personnel with their industrial conferees.

The history of the Federal Reports Act is significant here. First of all, it was born out of wartime emergency and crisis. With the establishment of the Office of Price Administration a large number of forms had to be sent not only to large businesses but to small businesses and to many citizens to deal with such things as price controls, rationing and the like. This, of course, caused an uproar among citizens who had to wait in line at the post office to make sure that these forms were filled out properly during the rationing process. It created the kind of uproar that congressional representatives are very responsive to, of course, the bill was introduced and it was pushed through with incredible haste.

I regret to say that even Congressman Patman, who usually watches out for these things, was so pressured by his constituents that he was willing to push this through with great haste. I give this example to illustrate that it was a panic situation in Congress at that time, so great was the uproar from individual citizens who had to fill out these forms.

There is also another Act and amendment that is relevant to the OMB's authority here—that is the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

Now, I would like to illustrate how inept that Federal Reports Act is to present day necessities and how misconstrued have been its original purposes and spirit by quoting from a number of addresses by regulatory commissioners, very briefly. These are rare comments, critical to say the least, on the OMB's power here.

This excerpt comes from a speech entitled "Regulatory Independence, Factual of Fanciful," by Commissioner Everette MacIntyre of the Federal Trade Commission delivered at the Federal Bar Association on January 16, 1969.

He states, "The power of review within the Bureau of the Budget extends so far as to permit forbidding collection of all or a part of the information sought. In the case of the traditionally used questionnaire, for example, the Bureau of the Budget may withhold clearance for its issuance altogether or it may strike certain questions—a matter entirely within its discretion.

"Congress in its haste to pass this bill, however, did not heed the warning of those questioning its extent, although this point was the subject of considerable debate. Specifically, some members of Congress felt that while the bill was ostensibly aimed at the elimination of unnecessary and presumably duplicate reports the way it was phrased gave the Director of the Budget a good deal more control over the collection of information than was necessary under the circumstances and perhaps even intended by Congress had it considered all the ramifications of the bill. As it turned out, the Act permits the Bureau of the Budget to exercise a good deal of control over the investigative functions of the independent agencies. With respect to the Federal Trade Commission this represents a drastic departure from the theory of its creation. One of the Commission's most important functions arises out of the mandate to investigate and publicize business conditions harmful to the continued good health of the economy and to do so independently and outside of the control of the Executive. Any control over its ability to investigate or a substantive review of the information it seeks will naturally adversely affect the independence of the Commission.

"There is no doubt that the purpose for which the Act was conceived, to cut costs to the government and to avoid unnecessary harassment of citizens and business, has considerable merit. If, however, it becomes an instrument of control over some types of investigations, specifically those in independent regulatory agencies, and if this in fact has occurred, it would appear that the authority of the Act vested in the Bureau of the Budget needs to be reexamined."

Not long thereafter, Chairman Paul Rand Dixon—

Senator METCALF. Mr. Nader. May I interrupt. Mr. MacIntyre, of course, used to have an office just across from mine when I was a member of the House of Representatives, and he is an outstanding expert. But he was talking only about the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. NADER. Yes.

Senator METCALF. But this reaches over to the independence of all of the regulatory agencies.

Mr. NADER. Of course. I wanted to take what few documentations I have been able to obtain where regulatory commissioners have had the courage to stand up in public and criticize the Federal Reports Act administration by the Bureau of the Budget, and I will extend my comments on that in a moment.

Senator METCALF. Surely.

Mr. NADER. A few days later on January 30, 1969, Chairman Paul Rand Dixon, before the Anti-Trust Law Section of the New York State Bar Association made the following remarks: "I fear, however, that the statute could operate considerably beyond its goal if used to interfere with the gathering of information for law enforcement purposes. Any decision by the Commission to utilize any of its compulsory processes takes into account the policy of the Act of avoiding unnecessary harassment of citizens. The Federal Reports Act, however, was never intended to foreclose the use, for example, of extensive and detailed surveys which may be the only feasible and certainly is the most efficient way to conduct important investigations for broad-scale law enforcement purposes."

I might note here that while the greatest merger movement is US history was underway in the last six to seven years, the Federal Trade Commission was impeded repeatedly from putting out the kind of detailed questionnaire to hundreds of corporations that would have permitted it to anticipate and plan for this merger trend rather than to be caught short with essential data that it should have had years ago.

In this connection, there is need for some reference to a very little read statute, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. This was the basic Act which began the process of control over federal agencies' budgets by the Bureau of the Budget. In Mr. MacIntyre's speech, he referred to this Act and he also stated that it was his judgment that the Act has been interpreted and elaborated in practice far beyond its original purpose and spirit, which was a concern over economy in government. And I would submit his entire speech as well as Mr. Dixon's speech in the record for perusal here.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Reports Act can be fully understood without going back to other generic acts affecting the authority of the now named Office of Management and Budget.

Senator METCALF. Those matters will be incorporated in the record at the conclusion of your remarks, Mr. Nader.

Mr. NADER. Thank you, sir.

At this point to indicate how broad the powers are as conceived by OMB in administering the Federal Reports Act, I should like to quote from one of the more complete statements by the Office of Statistical Standards which administered the Act under the old U.S. Bureau of the Budget. This was an article which appeared in the Statistical Reporter, July 1968. And I would like to quote their concept of their authority: "It is sometimes assumed (or hoped) that the review procedure does not apply to the basic need for the data, but only to problems of duplication or technical problems of form design; that it applies only to statistical reports, not those needed to administer a program; that it applies only to reports which the respondent must file as a requirement of law, not those which are voluntary; that it does not apply to reporting programs pursuant to a legislative authority given the agency; or that it applies to data collected in certain ways but not in others.

"No such limitations are written into the Act. It has over the years been interpreted to give the Director a broad authority over all types of data collection by all agencies in the Executive Branch with very few exceptions. The exceptions included the reports of the Internal Revenue Service and several other Treasury bureaus, and forms arising from bank supervision. Also, the Act does not apply to data collection sponsored by the legislative and judicial branches"—for which we may be thankful, incidentally.

I would like to say that while there may be interpretations of this Act more restrictive than that offered by the Office of Management and Budget, that it is truly a very broadly-written Act and that Section 3(d) of the Act has the following statement: "To the extent, if any, that the Director determines"—that it is, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—"the collection of such information by such agency is unnecessary either because it is not needed for the proper performance of the functions of such agency or because it can be obtained from another federal agency, or for any other reason, such agency shall not thereafter engage in the collection of such information."

Who are the principal beneficiaries of the Act? It is quite clear that even though only the surface of the iceberg has emerged visibly in the administration of this Act, that big business is the principal beneficiary. These are the representatives that dominate the various subcommittees under the Advisory Council on Federal Reports. These are the gentlemen who represent the large trade associations, the large oil companies, the large electric utilities, the large automobile companies. They are omnipresent.

In other words, it is quite clear that what was the basic concern of the Act, namely undue harassment by questionnaires emitting from Washington of individual citizens and of small businesses, has not been the concern of the Office of Management and Budget, that the overriding major question that it has been concerned with has been the impact of occasional surveys desperately needed by federal regulatory agencies, from the Federal Power Commission to the Federal Trade Commission to the Food and Drug Administration to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to the Department of Transportation

regarding big business operation and the large oligopolistic industries.

In 1942, the then Director of the Budget asked for business advice to be processed through formal advisory committees. The Advisory Council on the Federal Reports, originally known as the Advisory Committee on Questionnaires, was established, and shortly thereafter a long series of subcommittees dealing with various industry groups and regulatory areas were also developed.

Now, it seems to me that the type of operation that is going on over there behind closed doors is ideally suited for abuses and ideally suited to perpetuate unbridled secrecy.

In the first place, let us list the reasons why the present situation over at OMB is almost a textbook cases of unjust, secret administrative behavior.

First of all, there is unbridled discretion in the decisions to overrule portions or entire segments of questionnaires or to reject a questionnaire altogether. There is unbridled discretion in delaying the approval of these questionnaires.

I might say that the section in the Federal Reports Act dealing with unlawful disclosure of information and other prerequisites to the collection of information only feeds that unbridled discretion. In his recent book, Dicretionary Justice, Professor Kenneth Culp Davis, bridles against the uncontrollable discretion in federal regulatory agencies. One might say that the unbridled control of discretion in these agencies is a picnic by comparison with what goes on in the Office of Management and Budget.

The second deficiency in the administration of the Act is the secrecy, secret meetings, no complete transcripts, inadequate minutes, a closed fraternity, which has slightly had a window opened upon it in the last two years by the permission extended by OMB to have public representatives or consumer lawyers attend some of the meetings. This has not been very effective in developing consumer or public scrutiny partly because the closed fraternity has developed a process of intimate caucusing where the deals are worked out.

The kind of fraternization and ex parte contacts that go on are notorious. Mr. Harry Sheftel, for example, an old hand in dealing with these advisory committees, is an illustration of business in government, is an illustration of how a civil servant paid for by tax funds can in effect perform business duties in his governmental role. He has been singularly uncooperative and singularly secretive toward any people who have been trying to get the facts about this operation in the Office of Statistical Standards, now the office of Statistical Policy.

Fourthly, there has been an incredible delegation of the authority of OMB and its predecessor the Bureau of the Budget to these advisory panels. This is a delegation which in effect goes way beyond an arbitration role between these industrial spokesmen and the federal regulatory representatives seeking the questionnaire, because in case after case, the regulatory agency has been overruled, has been deterred, has been delayed and in fact the hurdle that one has to overcome against this combined bastion of industry representatives and amalgam of Bureau of the Budget officials is such that many agencies don't even make a try anymore, that many needed questions and many needed questionnaires are not even offered to the Office of Management and Budget.

Indeed in the statement that I referred to in the Statistical Reporter on January 1963, the anonymous author, which is another indication of the secrecy here, the anonymous author stated the following: "One object of review"—that is the Bureau of the Budget's review—and I am quoting—"one object of review is, of course, to kill unnecessary reports, but the number of proposals formerly disapproved is small. This is inherent in the nature of the operation and the relationships which the professional staff deliberately cultivate with their opposite numbers in the agencies. The hurdle of Budget Bureau clearance discourages proposals of marginal merit."

The fifth deficiency involves the personal attitudes of the Office of Management and Budget. For example, in interviewing personnel in the Office of Statistical Policy, the most incredible analogies were made. One individual of considerable acumen, for example, put forth the analogy in terms of rights of privacy; the right of women to be protected in their rights of privacy on questionnaires dealing with cervical cancer was anologized to the rights of privacy which they wish to similiarly accord to giant industrial enterprises affecting pollution, affecting utilities rates, affecting safety standards. In other words he was putting the corporation in the same status of protecting rights of privacy as he would individuals filling out personal health questionnaires.

There is also a sixth problem which has received very little attention, and that is the total lack of skilled staff competent in the Bureau of the Budget to really analyze these questionnaires. Since there is no skill here, since there are only a handful of officials involved, that is what encourages the total delegation of the substantive analysis to these industry advisory committees. I will illustrate that in a short time. The natural adversary role between the Office of Management and Budget and the regulatory agencies further encourages the Bureau of the Budget to go to industry personnel for this kind of policy-making assistance.

Of course there may well be other deficiencies involved. Who knows what is going on and what has been going on in the Office of Statistical Standards. Who knows to what degree there has been fraternization and perhaps other less than savory relationships.

The fact is that as long as it is in a secret cocoon nobody is going to find out. When people began studying the Interstate Commerce Commission last year it, too, was very secret, and as it was opened up we now read about the kinds of neglect, the kinds of waste and now the kinds of criminal violations by personnel in the rate-approving bureaus, in the Tariff Bureaus that the ICC has forwarded to the Justice Department for possible action. Whenever there is no public spotlight on a critical function of government, the seeds for abuses are sown.

The other interesting question which few people have attempted to even consider is what does the Department of Defense do here? Obviously, it needs various answers from industry and yet there is almost no record of questionnaires going through the Bureau of the Budget here. Is this the same situation as was admitted over a year ago by the White House and the Bureau of the Budget that the Bureau of the Budget hardly reviewed the Defense budget? It basically perfunctorily passed on and in effect permitted a unilateral determination by that Department. I think that and perhaps other departs that don't routinely go through the Bureau of the Budget process may throw greater light on the true parochial function of this Khyber Pass of information.

The complaint process by the agencies is something which deserves your investigation. It is quite clear that most commissioners of regulatory agencies are not about to stand up in public to the Bureau of the Budget or OMB. They have to pass their communications to Congress through OMB. And they are not about to criticize the administration of the Federal Reports Act in public or in more formal ways.

I think this is very unfortunate. I think this is an excessively stifling, if not totalitarian submergence, of free speech on the part of government regulatory commissioners in this area, and I would urge the subcommittee to encourage, if not demand, the emergence of detailed commentary and case study about this problem by federal regulatory commissioners, past, present, and those in the submanagerial levels in these agencies who deal on a day-to-day basis with OMB.

I would like to next turn to a number of case studies of abuses so as to perhaps make this consideration or treatment a bit more concrete.

First, there is, of course, the notorious delay involving the national industrial waste inventory survey. This survey—this inventory was designed by the Water Pollution agencies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and then transferred to the Department of Interior to find out how much water pollution there is, what kind of pollutants are being dumped, when, where, by what companies all around the country. How in the world can there be standards developed, how can there be sanctions imposed if it is not possible for the regulatory agency to have information about what contaminants are poisoning our waterways?

The process began in 1963 with the recommendation by a congressional subcommittee that such an inventory be prepared, and after a process of normal bureaucratic delay the inventory form was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. It was sent back on a number of occasions and then reissued, and only under sharp House congressional probing and pressure led by Congressman Henry Reuss a few weeks ago, did the OMB finally say it was going to approve this form but it was going to preserve the confidentiality of the data.

Now, listen to the enormity, the outrage that is involved in that posture. Here are companies unleashing poisons, chemicals, effluent matter in the public's waterways, the most precious natural resource we have, and the Bureau of Management and Budget approves the industrial claim that corporations have a trade secret and a property right in the poisons that they unleash on the unsuspecting public.

Now, since when even in the earliest days of wild-eyed capitalism can we permit corporations to preserve the secrecy via a property right in the poisonous chemicals and other contaminants that they put in other people's water? That is an illustration of the depravity that is endemic over at OMB. Also I might add this form is voluntary. In short, a pollution information form that is not required to be filled out under compulsory processes of law is one that is going to put a premium on industrial dishonesty because the companies that are polluting and are willing to honestly report are going to be subjected to greater interests by the regulatory agencies than those companies that are dishonest and refuse to report the full range of their deadly violent emissions into the waterways.

The second case which I would like to illustrate does not involve quite the seven-year delays of this national industrial waste inventory survey. This deals with the natural gas pipeline safety survey. The Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act which was passed about three years ago has been in the doldrums. The Congress passed it almost unanimously after a number of serious pipeline explosions and after recognizing that some 500,000 miles of underground natural gas pipelines without any safety standards at all were a threat to the public safety.

On the other hand, what Congress gives with one hand Congress takes with the other. The appropriations committees proceeded to starve the Office of Pipeline Safety. I believe last year's budget was about $200–$250,000, totally inadequate to deal with the necessary expertise and competence and inspection that is required under that Act. A

detailed questionnaire was proposed by the Office of Pipeline Safety in the Department of Transportation to find out about such things as how much pipe there is in the ground, the depth of the pipe, the age of the pipe, and other factors dealing with its safety.

Immediately the industry-dominated technical advisory committee to the Office of Pipeline Safety objected. There was a process of negotiation, and there was also a rulemaking proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act. One would think that this would be enough, but, no, the industrial representatives of the pipeline industry wanted a second attempt to erode further the questionnaire. And so when the questionnaire was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget, the industrial advisory committees appurtenant to that office went into action.

They objected, for example, specifically about being required to report the location and age of their pipeline systems. They claimed that they don't know the full age of their pipeline systems.

Well, of course, that is exactly what the Act was designed to remedy, to require these companies to find out whether these underground pipeline systems were 70–80–100 years old, whether they were made of cast iron or in some cases actual wood, hollowed out wood.

Now, this is an example where in a two-step procedure, not being satisfied with the formal rule-making at the administrative agency level, the industry uses the bottleneck of information in the Office of Management and Budget to further delay and further erode the entire process.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Nader, if you will pardon an interruption, I think it would be appropriate to put in the record at this point the names and the connection, the affiliations of the members of the Subcommittee on Natural Gas Pipelines; and it is so ordered.

Panhandle Eastern Pipeline, Eastern Pipeline Company, Columbia Gas Systems, Texas Eastern Transmission Company, Florida Gas Transmission Company, United Gasline Company, Consolidated Gas Supply Corporation, Northern Natural Gas Company, Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Gulf Oil, and El Paso Natural Gas.

The names and affiliations will appear so that you can see it was an understatement when you said domination. It is complete.

Mr. NADER. That is right.

Senator METCALF. There is just absolute control.

Mr. NADER. In fact, on the Technical Advisory Committee to the Office of Pipeline Safety there are supposed to be six public members. One of them is the head of a supplier to the gas pipeline industry. And others are in some way connected with the industry with the exception of Fred Lang. Fred Lang and one other member are the only two real public members on that committee.

The third case study of course is one which you are most familiar with. This deals with the Federal Power Commission's attempt for the past three years to clear a form through OMB requiring the utility companies to report their consultative fees, outside consultative fees, such as accounting, legal, public relations and others. This, of course, should have been done years ago. These fees are used to influence policy, to influence Federal and State legislative branches, and they are part of the calculations for the rate structure.

It was watered down so that now the Federal Power Commission requires reporting of outside payments above $10,000 for Class A companies (those grossing over $2.5 million), above $5,000 for Class B companies (those grossing over $1 million), or above $600 for payments to an individual, group or partnership. As testimony before the Kefauver committee bears out, these are relatively high minimums for utility influence-peddling, especially if the funds are channeled through an incorporated intermediary.

Another example which I would like to bring to your attention comes from the National Highway Safety Bureau. This dealt with a reporting form called the Garage Repair Reporting Form. This was an attempt by the National Highway Safety Bureau to get information from various garages and individual motorists as to the maintenance and repair problems and frequency rates of critical categories dealing with motor vehicle safety. It was sent over of course to the Bureau of the Budget, and automatically the Bureau of the Budget took entire responsibility for reviewing that and threw it in the hands of the automobile industry. And so every question was picked apart in a detailed commentary by the auto industry representatives which I will submit later on for the record just as soon as I can copy it. But it gives you an illustration of how the Bureau of the Budget is totally unequipped to make these critical reviews. What it does is take wholesale the industries' commentaries and throw it back at the National Highway Safety Bureau.

Senator METCALF. If you want to submit that at the present time, it will be returned to you before you leave and copies will be made.

Mr. NADER. Yes, Senator, but I have to more clearly identify the source—

Senator METCALF. Surely. Go ahead.

Mr. NADER. —which is not identified in the materials that I have for purposes of the record.

In other words, the delaying process is not one that is due to a critical scrutiny that is developed from OMB or the Bureau of the Budget but one that rests on the leisurely pace of the surrogate here, namely, the industry representatives—that is, because they are given such a powerful advisory role they can just take their time—weeks, months—to delay responding in order to put off the time when the questionnaire is submitted, if they don't delay permanently the questionnaire.

A word about the finances of the advisory committees. These are the only advisory committees to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, that are privately funded by industry with an office here in Washington and a propaganda communications system to industry throughout the country to support its effects.

All the advisory committees which operate properly in this government operate according to a strict interpretation of the Executive Order 11007. While it is clear that this Executive Order, which was issued in 1962, is full of loopholes and can be read to be meaningless by a non-well-intentioned bureaucrat, there are enough guidelines if the spirit of it is read correctly to provide for certain orderly procedures in the establishment of these advisory committees.

Who appoints these advisory committees to the Advisory Council on the Federal Reports? They are basically appointed by industry. But members of the National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Committee are appointed by the Department of Transportation, the Secretary of Transportation. All other advisory committees are either appointed by agency heads or by the White House. But this is a self-appointed advisory committee, a series of advisory committees which perpetuate themselves in order to insure even that minority business opinion doesn't get a chance to have its voice heard.

Look at the uniform monolith type of posture by these advisory committees. One can envision in an allegedly competitive industry diverse views, and yet these committees are so structured and perpetuated by the clique dominating the industry that any potential, any opportunity for diverse views by smaller companies in the industry are snuffed out at the inception—another example of the totalitarian pattern here.

There are, of course, further and different kinds of abuses, and I would like to ask Mr. Petkas to summarize for you the recent situation affecting the Federal Communications Commission, both the so-called Minshall decision, and the pending conglomerate questionnaire.

Mr. METCALF. Go ahead Mr. Petkas.

Mr. PETKAS. Thank you, sir. First, as to the Minshall Broadcasting Company case, FCC 2d 796 (1968), this illustrates the point that the OMB advisory committee set-up provides a very subtle input of industry attitudes into the administrative process. And I am going to recount a startling episode for you, in itself perhaps minor, but indicative of potential for abuse in the OMB advisory committee mechanism.

In this case FCC policy as declared in *Minshall* appears to have been altered in a footnote of a subsequent decision as a direct result of the so-called advice of an OMB advisory committee. In *Minshall*, the Commission clarified the answers it expected in Part I, Subsections 4(a) and 4(b) of the Radio and Television application forms. This part of the form is designed to determine the extent to which an applicant had been diligent in ascertaining community needs. Among the data required is the applicant's evaluation of suggestions received from the community.

The commission then determined that a fuller explanation of each of the four requirements would be helpful especially in light of the need for comparable information from each of the respondents. The request for approval of the further explanation, which was to be printed on the forms, was sent to the BOB. The uninitiated might ask why would an elucidation of FCC case law itself arrived at after a full-blown hearing before the commission be submitted to the Budget Bureau for approval?

It is part of a murky story of these committees, that interagency politics plays a large part in what goes on.

Mr. TURNER. Just a minute, Mr. Petkas. We had testimony from the Bureau of the Budget today and it was discussed directly with the assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget that under no circumstances did the Bureau get involved in any informational request here an adjudicatory proceeding is pending or where a hearing is taking place or a hearing examiner is involved. The Bureau stated that the only time it reviews a request for information such relate to preliminary investigatory reports surveys and requests. I asked several times that question and in doing so indicated that to do otherwise might be an interference by the Executive branch in the judicial process.

Now, is this the implication here that the Bureau of the Budget may well have been looking at some informational requests subsequent to a hearing, or during a hearing by a quasi-judicial agency?

Mr. PETKAS. It is a technical question. In this case the question before the Bureau of the Budget was whether explanatory notes to the routine application form for radio and television stations should be amended as per the decision in the Minshall case which set out the policy of the Commission.

Mr. TURNER. But it was a part of the proceeding.

Mr. PETKAS. It was a part of the proceeding.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you.

Mr. PETKAS. Not being a devotee of FCC practice, I would rather refer that to someone else. At any rate, this is somewhat understandable: interagency politics play a large part in what goes on, especially since, as a practical matter the Bureau of the Budget has enormous influence over the budgets of the various agencies, and, under the Federal Reports Act the Bureau of the Budget has a very large amout of discretion, uninhibited discretion perhaps.

A meeting of the communications industry advisory committee was called after the industry had made the appropriate overtures to the Bureau of the Budget.

I might add that the general procedure here as far as I can determine is that once a form is noted on the so-called birdwatcher sheet or yellow sheet, the industry people contact the Bureau of the Budget if they feel that a meeting would be in order.

Commissioner Bartley of the FCC was on hand at this meeting. During the course of the meeting as the sketchy minutes indicates, Bartley agreed to minor changes in wording for each of the four explanatory paragraphs. The following language was mysteriously, in my view, appended to the Bureau of the Budget minutes of this meeting in a footnote to the minutes: "Note. Subsequent to the meeting additional discussion indicated a need for clarification of the intent of the Paragraph, *'Applicant's Evaluation.'*: What is expected of the applicant is that he will evaluate the relative importance of those suggestions and consider them in formulating the stations overall program service."

In other words, a reporting requirement was completely deleted. Rather than reporting his evaluation, the applicant is merely asked to evaluate. A reporting requirement contained in the Minshall decision was thus destroyed. There is no indication where, how, or when, or by whom the decision was made. Suffice it to say that the common practice, especially now that outsiders occasionally attend these meetings, is for the agency and the industry people to retire to an intimate caucus, as one member of the communications industry advisory committee referred to it, to negotiate their differences. All that remained was to rewrite the Minshall decision to conform to the agreement, and this was accomplished in a footnote in the Sioux Empire Broadcasting Company case, 16 FCC 2d 989. In that footnote the exact language of the footnote to the minutes of the Bureau of the Budget advisory committee meeting was adopted by the FCC.

I might add that inquiries at the Commission indicate that a number of the commissioners were not at all clear on how the footnote got into the *Sioux Broadcasting* decision.

Another experience with the communications industry advisory committee, one in which I was involved, may be of interest. This was a meeting to determine whether or not and to what extent a task force of the FCC should be allowed to collect information on conglomerates in the broadcasting industry.

Before attending this meeting I had difficulty understanding why verbatim transcripts of these meetings are not kept. After attending the meeting with Mr. Al Kramer of the Citizens' Communications Center it is quite clear why minutes are not kept: issues are discussed, questions are raised and commitments are made which are not within the scope of the Federal Reports Act.

If the Chairman is willing, I will be glad to submit to you my personal transcript, in which Mr. Kramer concurs, to give you a flavor of what went on. It may be of interest to compare our version with the minutes of the meeting from the Bureau of the Budget. These minutes have not as yet been issued.

I might add that common practice is to submit the minutes of these meetings to all industry participants to have their corrections, additions, and deletions made, and that both Mr. Kramer and I were refused the opportunity to review the minutes before they were put into final form.

But just to give you my impression as to what went on, the meeting lasted for eight hours. They considered a 17-question form.

Mr. TURNER. May I have an identification of the committee meeting which you attended?

Mr. PETKAS. Yes. That is the Communications Industry Advisory Committee meeting, September 18, 1970.

Mr. TURNER. And that is the same committee of which Mr. Frank U. Fletcher is chairman.

Mr. PETKAS. That is correct.

Mr. TURNER. Did Mr. Fletcher take over the charge of the committee after Mr. Harry Sheftel opened it?

Mr. PETKAS. Yes, he did. Now, I hasten to add, however, that throughout the course of the meeting there was to my mind a concerted attempt to impress the public interest observers who were present that the meeting was not totally in Mr. Fletcher's control—that is to say, Mr. Sheftel interjected his view on the conduct of the meeting at points, but Mr. Fletcher was clearly the chair.

Well, as I was saying—

Senator METCALF. Was there any question about your participation?

Mr. PETKAS. I would say the opposite was true, that there was a very concerted effort to make it clear that we were welcome, at least on the part of Mr. Sheftel.

Senator METCALF. Well, what about the industry men?

Mr. PETKAS. The industry people seemed rather concerned that we were present and were very annoyed at times, especially when Mr. Kramer asked what I thought were very pointed questions about the issues that had been raised during the course of the discussion.

But I feel that in general a concerted effort was made at least for the record for it to appear that we were welcome. I did not, nor did Mr. Kramer, feel welcome.

The meeting lasted eight hours. By the end of the eight-hour period it was clear that Mr. Louis Stevens of the FCC had been put in what I considered a very difficult position.

Senator METCALF. How many questions were there?

Mr. PETKAS. Seventeen.

Senator METCALF. Seventeen.

Mr. PETKAS. Mr. Stevens had been put in what I considered a very difficult position.

These men were clearly old hands at this business. All had apparently attended similar meetings before. Most were corporate counsel who had devoted a considerable amount of time preparing for this particular meeting.

Mr. Stevens, a conscientious civil servant and a veteran of federal service, was not prepared for such a frontal assault. He indicated to Mr. Kramer and me later that he had only been vaguely aware of the advisory committee's procedure.

Mr. Stevens was quite literally put through the wringer. For the first few hours he held his ground, with support from Mr. Kramer which he gratefully acknowledged later. As time wore on he was more willing to accept industry criticism and to offer to make changes accordingly.

As an example of the wearing down process, we spent approximately an hour and a half discussing the extent to which a company official should be required to put his name on the bottom of the conglomerate questionnaire and the extent to which it was necessary to have the survey notarized.

On the other hand, the discussion frequently centered upon questions that the OMB claims are not considered by the committees: agency policy, the depth of support among the Commissioners for carrying out the survey, and the names of Commissioners who were responsible for instigating it.

And most disturbing of all from my point of view was the fact that incredible assertions of fact were made about the costs of gathering this information, about the burden of the information on the industry respondents, about the extent to which they would be subject to litigation in the future because of their divulgences, the extent to which they would be embarrassed because of their divulgences. No effort apparently had been made to apprise the FCC in advance of the kinds of things that the committee would consider. So that—and this is especially disconcerting in light of the fact that the budget bureau reviewing officer in these meetings—and I think you will find this to be the case even in the minutes that are available—sees himself as a mediator or a judge. And to a great extent his attitude is colored by the unsubstantiated assertions that are made. There are no affidavits on the costs, no independent surveys or independent reports on the real burden. We spent what seemed three hours on the mechanics of searching the files at the National Broadcasting Company—a tale of woe which, for all we knew, could have been a fairy tale.

I hope this has given you at least an impressionistic view of what happens at these meetings. At the end of the meeting—we had only gone through the first five of the seventeen questions and this was at the end of eight hours with a break for lunch—it was suggested by one of the committeemen that the issues that remained between the Bureau of the Budget and the FCC could be very easily resolved in private sessions. I think the word intimate caucus was used by Mr. Fletcher. At that point Mr. Kramer and I suggested that perhaps our presence would be necessary in order for the discussions to be balanced. And, of course, we were assured by Mr. Sheftel that this was no business of the Office of Management and Budget and that in any case no OMB representative would be present. We were assured by Mr. Fletcher that we were not invited. And, of course, there will be another meeting on this form. That is to say, we were able to convince them that they could not make the final determination without a further open meeting.

Mr. TURNER. May I ask one question here. Were the members of the industry group prepared with their own copies of the proposed questionnaires and with backup information when they came into the room?

Mr. PETKAS. Yes. I had attempted to get a copy of the questionnaire from the Office of Management and Budget but was told that there were not sufficient copies available. So I walked down to the FCC and they provided me a copy of the questionnaire. That was the day before the meeting.

Senator METCALF. The Bureau of the Budget did not provide you with—

Mr. PETKAS. That is right. We are on the mailing list and we get notices.

Senator METCALF. You do not get the essential questionnaires and so forth?

Mr. PETKAS. No, not unless we make a special effort to go directly to the agency.

Senator METCALF. You are on the mailing list but when you get the notice you don't get the questionnaires or forms that are going to be subject matter of the meetings?

Mr. PETKAS. No, sir. At that particular meeting in front of the industry chairman was a stack of manilla folders approximately this high (indicating), each folder containing the notes of prior intimate caucuses on each of the questions which were contained on the questionnaire. So not only were the public interest observers completely unprepared for the kind of frontal attack that was inflicted on the form but so were the FCC representatives unprepared.

Mr. NADER. I might add here, Senator, that two years ago, a young attorney, John Esposito, phoned the Office of Management and Budget and asked to be put on the mailing list for the birdwatchers' list, and he had to go through extraordinary exertions and repeated requests and explanations simply to be accepted on the mailing list.

Senator METCALF. Would you make a special effort, Mr. Turner, to see that Mr. Nader has a copy of the testimony that was given by the Bureau of the Budget this morning.

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

Senator METCALF. They have assured us that anybody who wants to be will be put on the mailing list, that forms and questionnaires will be provided, and all you have to do is put in an application and they will get you all the information that anybody else has.

Mr. NADER. Yes. You see, now after 27 years of secrecy they have assured you that the more pressure the Senate and the House puts on them, the more responsive they will be to the public interest. That is basically what they have assured you. But in 1968 before the controversy began in the public sphere over this Act and its administration, an individual citizen, a lawyer had to go through extraordinary exertions just to get his name put on the list.

Senator METCALF. I am aware of that. In fact, I sent a couple of people down to one of the meetings and they had a very difficult time getting in, and were admonished that they couldn't say anything after they got in. But I want to emphasize that we were told this morning that there is a reform down there, minor reform, and so I want you to have a copy for your reference the next time you make an application.

Before you continue, I read in the morning Post that Mr. Petkas was admitted to the practice of law.

Mr. PETKAS. Passed the bar examination.

Senator METCALF. Passed bar examination.

Mr. PETKAS. The most important step, I think.

Senator METCALF. Is this your first case?

Mr. PETKAS. As it were.

Senator METCALF. Congratulations on your presentation.

Mr. NADER. Senator, that comment you just made dealing with the change at OMB leads to my final section of the testimony——

Senator METCALF. Before we get into that I want to read, and I read it before today, a statement from the minutes of the Committee on Petroleum and Natural Gas of Thursday, November 21, 1968. Mr. Stewart was the industry chairman of the Committee.

Mr. Stewart explained how he had operated so as to make maximum use of the committee without excessive demands on the time of the members. Contacts had been handled by mail or telephone and no meetings were held in fiscal year 1968. The industry chairman also reviewed some of the special problems referred to the committee, panels in which the chairman participated. They included reporting on "foreign direct investment, air and water pollution, disposal of solid wastes, classification of gasoline and jet fuel and census surveys, feasibility of reporting more detail for certain items requested in the census of mineral industries."

Now, this bears out the statement that Mr. Petkas made. This is where the foot-high stack of manila folders came from. There were contacts by mail and telephone where everything was settled before the meeting took place and before you had an opportunity to do anything about it.

Go ahead.

Mr. NADER. This is exactly the syndrome that is now appearing. As more public spotlight is thrown on to OMB's administration of the Act, you will see an emergence of more ex parte contacts, more informal communications, more informal caucuses and more informal meetings that really decide the business at hand. That is why it isn't so much a reform as it is a kind of blubber shift; it is succumbing to a little pressure and bending in one area only to emerge full-blown in another far more secret area.

Senator METCALF. This is the reason that it is necessary to have more people on the committee rather than having them say, well, we will let anybody participate. They have to be members of the committee to get in. Maybe they will be outvoted, but at least what you call the spotlight will be on so that there will be at least some public revelation. Go ahead.

Mr. NADER. Senator, I have a more expansive proposal to make, with your indulgence. But before I go into it, I would just like to say that the term "agency action" in the Federal Reports Act is now being interpreted by OMB to even cover when individual commissioners send out a series of questions to various respondents, even when it isn't an official agency action approved by the agency. Even a voluntary questionnaire sent out to a number of respondents by commissioners is chastised and hit hard on by OMB as being really agency action.

Now, that is a far, far more liberal interpretation of the law than I think can be at all justified even within the goals of OMB

I would like to discuss the following proposals. First, I think that the situation over there is so endemically rotten that it cannot be ameliorated by minor amendments. I think that S. 3067 while noble as far as it goes simply can't begin to cope with the process. There will be all kinds of evasive strategies, ex parte contracts and informal communications that will overwhelm the representatives on these committees, who, by the way, usually don't have anywhere near the time, the resources or the expenses to even hold their own when they meet in Washington.

This is part of the reason why all these advisory committees should be funded in terms of daily expense by the Federal Government to eliminate this differential whereby a multi-billion dollar corporation can send their people but public interest or consumer groups have a very difficult time so doing.

I would recommend the entire repeal of the Federal Reports Act as it now stands and begin the following legislative process: First, for the subcommittee to develop a complete investigation of the views and experience of other agencies in dealing with the OMB's administration of the Federal Reports Act, not just encouraging but demanding under the pendency of a congressional order that this material be forthcoming, if not in testimony then in affidavits or some other authorized documents.

In order to do this, and to do this efficiently, the subcommittee staff may call ex officials of the regulatory agencies who are more free to talk.

Senator METCALF. I want to say since you have started to testify I just instructed the staff to set up such hearings you propose immediately after the recess.

Mr. NADER. Excellent. Such ex officials, for example, as Lee White, former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and his general counsel. They could tell you a great deal of experience that they have had now that they are out of the commission and are more free to talk.

I would also suggest that the subcommittee develop its own questionnaire to submit to the Office of Management and Budget detailing with exquisite meticulousness all the information that has been sought in order to get the entire panorama of experience out in the open, to see, for example, to what extent this Act and OMB administration has really defended the average citizen and the small businessman from questionnaire harassment.

Senator METCALF. I doubt if we could get our questionnaire past the advisory committee.

Mr. NADER. The point is that fortunately, Congress exempted Congress from the impact of the Federal Reports Act.

I would also take the opportunity that only you have as a subcommittee of Congress to develop an intensive analysis of the personal qualifications and background and administrative experience of those individuals who have been at the core of the Federal Reports Act administration in the Bureau of the Budget. It is very important to realize that when you don't have public legal standards and public focus on administrative processes you increasingly have a rule of men rather than a rule of law. And in direct proportion to the expansiveness of the unbridled discretion you see the direct importance of the particular individuals who are involved and their ex parte and fraternization with the industrial advisory committees. Where there is no law, there is a dominant importance as to the quality of personnel involved in the activity.

Following these twin inquiries or hearings, be that as it may, I would ask the agencies to submit detailed proposals on what they think should be done by way of reform—that is, what they think of the Federal Reports Act, how they would modify it, whether they would repeal it, and how they would deal with the abuses that are potential in undue harassment of citizens and small businesses. These inquiries also would deal with the burden of proof. I see throughout the literature the most wild inflationary estimates by business as to what it costs to fill out these questions, and with no substantial documentation of these cost estimates. So part of the administration of law such as this is to require a substantial negotiation of these cost estimates rather than just take it on faith from the business advisory committees.

These agencies are replete with the kind of experience that will enable the subcommittee to determine precisely how limited the regulations have to be and how permissive they have to be, depending on the purpose of the Act, whether to protect individuals against invasion of their privacy or whether to permit the enforcement of the laws. The enforcement of the laws in an administration that shouts about law and order, depends in the economic regulatory area on the critical obtaining of information about business and industrial practices. Instead of the vice president being sent around as a political pitch man to raise funds from elitist Republican groups, he might be spending more of his time for which he is paid by the taxpayer on law and order enforcement in the administrative branch of the government which deals with billions of dollars and which deals with hundreds of thousands of casualties, diseases, and other harms pursuant to the inability of the government to enforce the laws partly because they don't have the requisite information. I refer you to the industrial water pollution survey. I refer you to the mercury pollution epidemic. And I would expect that if that survey was out in 1965, there would not have been the devastating poisonous epidemic resulting from dumping millions of pounds of mercury into rivers, streams, lakes, consumed by fish which are then consumed by humans.

That is an illustration of the importance of a hearing such as this. Without any qualification it can be said that this is by far the most single important information problem in all of government, and this hearing is the most important hearing ever held in congressional history on this issue, because this is the critical bottleneck through which the entire regulatory and administrative and subsidy process has to funnel its requests in order to enforce the laws equitably.

I would also request that the subcommittee review the adequacy of the Executive Order 11007 dealing with advisory committees. It is quite clear that all the loopholes are taken advantage of by the Office of Management and Budget in order to devise an advisory system that is a mockery of orderly due process procedure and fair access on the part of all citizens. Executive Order 11007 which has its problems throughout the whole advisory setting definitely needs a hearing, definitely needs an inquiry to redefine it and to propose, if not by Executive Order then by statute, a series of guidelines for advisory committees. Advisory committees in government number literally in the thousand. They are a fourth branch of government.

In many areas they make policy without any quibble. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare area these advisory committees decide who gets research grants for what projects, in the petroleum area the petroleum advisory committees are very, very key. And in one area after another the whole advisory setup is operating in a kind of ram-

pant anarchy with massive ex parte contact and without any transcripts or any controls whatsoever. Executive Order 11007 has been turned into a multipunctured mockery.

Next, I would think that the subcommittee would consider the following displacement of the Federal Reports Act. First a recognition that there can be abuse of the information procurement power by government agencies particularly toward unrepresentative defenseless institutions or people.

Second, that there has to be I think some sort of appellate process by which the aggrieved respondents can take their case if they can't get a suitable accommodation with the regulatory agency that puts out the questionnaire. And so perhaps the subcommittee may want to consider a formal open appellate process, sort of like a super-adjudicatory process that deals specifically with these questionnaire and information problems. This would mean full transcript, open doors, open access, counsel on both sides. It would have all the safeguards of a formal judicial procedure, no ex parte contacts permitted, no secret meetings, no industry inputs like under the present setup of the Federal Reports Act. And also to provide for each appellate matter a public representative or an omsbudsman that would represent the public's interest in securing the most just decision through the formal and open and fully transcribed process. The costs—may I say in conclusion, the cost of continuing the present system are of course manifold, direct and indirect. It is quite clear, for example, that around this country there are people eating contaminated fish which will result in the shortening of their life or other diseases, directly attributable to the fact that the government has been unable to get the kind of pollution information years ago which it should have in order to strengthen its enforcement of the law and in order to ask Congress for even tougher laws that are needed in the water pollution area.

It is quite clear also that the political process at the state legislative and regulatory level as well as the federal level is being corrupted and undermined because of the lack of disclosure by regulated industries such as utilities of their payments indirectly into the political process through accountants, lawyers, and other independent retainers.

It is quite clear, for example, that the costs of electric utilities, the cost of other regulated industries is increasing and is perpetuating such in its increase simply because the government doesn't have the information to crack down on the manipulation of the rate base and other fraudulent accounting data that throughout the country increases rates.

In other words, I am just giving three examples, one in health and safety, one in the corruption of the democratic process, one in consumer gouging, (which, of course, inflates the dollar, depreciates the value of the dollar, reduces the consumer's income just as if he took a pay cut at the office) which result from this critical strangulation of the information procurement process by federal agencies through the Office of Management and Budget.

There are also other costs, of course, which all of us have to take into account. The democratic sequence is a very perilous chain. If it is broken in one of the links, it is not going to be democratic. And I ask you when you see in this city hundreds of reporters and hundreds of writers whose jobs it is to find out what is going on in government and what the government is collecting about the situation throughout the country in areas of health, safety, and economics, that if you have this bottleneck in the Office of Management and Budget you in effect deprive hundreds of reporters from the ability to get at the facts that they need to fulfill their trust in communicating the situation to the citizens throughout the country.

So this activity in this handful of offices in the Office of Management and Budget is in effect weakening the ability of the media to do the job that it must do if it is going to be faithful to its highest professional standards.

Now, this is just one illustration of how other institutions in this country that we rely on for democratic contributions and for upholding the posture and the pretense of our system of government, how their efforts are cut down by this critical, strategic hold at the Office of Management and Budget.

It is very hard to make a subject like this glamorous. It is very hard to make it of massive public interest. It is very hard basically to even interest people who should be interested in this subject. But information policy dealing with the Federal Government both in and out, what it gives out and what it can take in, is obviously the currency of power. And without this free flow of information most of the things which we treasure in this country will be submerged or atrophied or overridden silently without the benefit of headlines or political rhetoric. And I would highly commend the efforts of this subcommittee to continue relentlessly in probing this area so that others who study this area will have a body of knowledge to extend your concerns throughout the country in whatever profession they may have been involved in, law, journalism, science, engineering, medicine, and also to prepare the kind of materials that are necessary for the repeal of the Federal Reports Act and the development of a far more secure and equitable system of controls and liberation in the procurement of information by Federal agencies in the fulfillment of their congressionally mandated duties.

In conclusion, I would like to request the permission of the Chair in the next several days to prepare materials for submission for the hearing record to beef up many of these comments with elaboration and examples.

Senator METCALF. We will provide you with a transcript. You may amplify, modify or as you say beef up any of the testimony you have made.

We have plenty of time. The hearings are not going to be printed for awhile. And as a result of your suggestions made here today, I am sure that we are going to extend the hearings into inquiry from, especially, former members of regulatory agencies.

Mr. NADER. I would include, Mr. Chairman, also, Mr. Charles Schultze——

Senator METCALF. Oh, yes.

Mr. NADER. —former Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator METCALF. Former Director of the Bureau.

Mr. NADER. Yes, as well as other former directors of the Bureau of the Budget who may be able to look with a little more perspective on the role of the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator METCALF. From a little more distant point of view.

Mr. NADER. Yes.

Senator METCALF. Well, we have kept you a long time, Mr. Nader, and your testimony has been tremendously valuable. I introduced S. 3067, and you made the analogy of an iceberg. I feel the introduction of the bill is just an iceberg, too. Many of the witnesses who have come in here, who have had more experience than I with the actual working of the advisory committees, have said that we should eliminate them, we have to restructure them.

Mr. NADER. Certainly the rule-making apparatus permits the full submission of views on the public record and the requisite appellate processes, and when some of these forms are subjected to a rule-making proceeding, they certainly shouldn't have to go through a second-stage miasma which can certainly delay or defeat the entire proposal. This is in effect like a bureaucratically imposed amendment to the Administrative Procedures Act. Talk about legislating from the Executive Branch, this is a kind of leigslation without a scintilla of hearing and submission of views and the like.

Mr. TURNER. May I just make the comment that I have not been able to find any witness that would tell me that there is a right of appeal from the decision of the Bureau of the Budget in this particular matter.

Mr. NADER. There once, sir, was Olympus. Now there is the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. TURNER. Now, I might just make this one comment, that I would like to ask you to read in the transcript that I will give you my interpretation and colloquy with respect to the study of fuel, in particular gas and power, requests which have been made from Representative Joe Evins and from Senator Philip Hart to the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Trade Commission taking up the Hart proposal for an oil industry study, where according to the Washington Post today they were quoted as not being happy with the proposed delayed action until next week. In our colloquy I indicated that under Section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act that request for study would go to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance inasmuch as no pending adjudicatory proceeding existed, and secondly that the Federal Power Commission has a proposed rule-making procedure in connection with the nationwide increase of gas rates, and there was a question in the Bureau of the Budget's mind as to whether studies under that proceeding even requested by parties to it would not go to the Bureau of the Budget. And I would like you to look at that and give us your advice on it.

Mr. NADER. Look at, for example, the so-called boxcar shortage, the so-called natural gas shortage, the so-called fuel shortage. How could this be continued, how can this be continued without any public access or understanding unless federal agencies have either been deterred or frightened from submitting the questionnaire forms to the Office of Management and Budget or unless OMB denied these forms? This is the kind of information which we should have all the time in government so that we are not caught short, so that these frauds like the boxcar shortage do not occur, which is basically taking huge numbers of boxcars and setting them aside empty and unused waiting for immediate dispatch for preferred customers. That is the boxcar shortage. And yet the ICC didn't have publicly available this kind of information. The ICC doesn't even know who owns the railroads. The Civil Aeronautics Board doesn't even know who owns the airlines. They are required by statute to have this information. If every questionnaire is going to go through this formidable obstacle course at OMB taking up hundreds of hours of time and involving risks of budget cuts in terms of retaliation by the OMB, we are not going to get this kind of agency information as well. OMB in other words succeeds in preventing agencies from obeying their own laws which require the provision of information in order to fulfill these statutory mandates.

Senator METCALF. Not only doesn't CAB know who owns the airlines, the Federal Power Commission doesn't know who owns the utilities and the Federal Trade Commission doesn't know who owns the conglomerates, and so forth, and they are not able to find out, are they?

Mr. NADER. I think there is one way where you can find out, Senator. I think if you can find some small evidence that directly or indirectly Communist shareholders have holdings in the railroads or in the airlines through Swiss banks or other indirect conduits, then and only then will we get a full investigation in this matter.

Senator METCALF. I have a feeling if we would create a select committee which would be analogous to the old O'Mahoney Commit-

tee, which had the TNEC investigation, a congressional investigation to really see who does own America, we would find out most of the ownership is in the banks in New York and Chicago. But at least we would know where the real power lies. Pending that, however, we have to find out, at least send out some interrogation forms to find out so that these various regulatory agencies can perform the functions of law that you have enumerated.

Well, you have made a very helpful and informative presentation, Mr. Nader, one of your usual forceful ones, and we look forward to your additional remarks in the record. And already underway is one of your suggestions and that is we will make arrangements for the further hearings, and we may ask you back after we have had some additional information. Delighted to have you here.

Mr. Petkas, delighted to have you here as one of our newest lawyers.

Mr. PETKAS. Thank you

Mr. NADER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator METCALF. The subcommittee will be in recess until tomorrow at ten.

(Whereupon, at 1:15 p.m., the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene, at 10:00 a.m., Friday, October 9, 1970.)

BUDGET BUREAU: DO ADVISORY PANELS HAVE AN INDUSTRY BIAS?

(NOTE.—Vic Reinemer, author of this article on certain little-known but apparently influential advisory committees to the federal Bureau of the Budget, serves as executive secretary on the staff of Senator Lee Metcalf (D–Mont.). Both he and Metcalf believe the shadowy committees have neglected the public good to benefit business and industry. Metcalf has even suggested that the committees might best be abolished. A contrary view of the committees' value is presented on page 39 in a brief rebuttal by Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which has recently been reorganized as the Office of Management and Budget. Reinemer, a Senate staffer since 1955, has served as associate editor of the Charlotte (N.C.) News and has had articles published in several national magazines. Reinemer and Metcalf coauthored Overcharge, a critical examination of utility regulation (reviewed in the February 10, 1967, issue of Science).)

Early in World War II, many small businessmen appealed to the chairman of the Special Senate Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business. The government, they complained, was sending them too many questionnaires. The chairman introduced a bill, which became the Federal Reports Act of 1942, specifying that information needed by federal agencies would be obtained with a minimum burden upon business, especially small business. The law also empowered the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to coordinate the collection of information from ten or more business firms or persons.

The Budget director asked some of his big-business friends to help him administer the new law. They formed the Advisory Council on Federal Reports. They asked some of their industry friends to help them help the Budget director. Soon they had formed 16 Budget Bureau advisory committees, dealing with banking, broadcasting, chemicals, equal employment, fats and oils, meat packing, natural gas, oil, railroads, trade, and utilities. The cost of the council and its 16 committees is borne entirely by industry. The council terms itself the "official business consultant to the Federal Bureau of the Budget" yet notes that it is "appointed by and is responsible only to the business community."

The advisory committees did not represent small businesses, for whom the law was enacted. The law was not violated, however, since the law said nothing about setting up advisory committees.

The law did say that information was to be collected in a way that would maximize its usefulness to the public. But the public was excluded from the committees. Indeed, the public was unaware of the committees' existence. No separate advisory committees were established for environmental, consumer, small business, labor, or other groups.

The advisory committee system, in effect now for 27 years, gives large industries and their trade associations exceptional advantages. The process of disclosing or withholding information goes to the heart of government decision-making and law enforcement. Members of the committees have a vantage point deep within an extraordinarily powerful agency. They can anticipate and affect government policy. They can better protect their own interests and adversely affect the interests of others. And they do—especially with regard to pollution.

Few people thought or cared much about pollution during the 1950's. In 1960, President Eisenhower vetoed a federal water pollution control bill, terming pollution a "uniquely local blight." Attitudes began to change during the early 1960's.

In June 1964, 17 federal officials, most of them from the Public Health Service (PHS) or the Budget Bureau, met with a 27-man panel from the Budget Bureau's advisory committees to discuss a proposed federal inventory of water-contaminating industrial waste disposal. The PHS was required by law to collect information, develop comprehensive programs for water pollution abatement, and to initiate regulatory action. Planning and regulation would be difficult if the officials did not know who polluted what, and where. Information on municipal waste disposal had been available for years, but, according to PHS officials, information on industrial waste disposal was inadequate.

All 27 members representing the Budget Bureau's advisory committees at the meeting came from industry—U.S. Steel, Consolidation Coal, American Paper & Pulp, American Electric Power, the American Petroleum Institute, the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), and others. They objected to the inventory.

The information that the government proposed to collect, they said, would be incomplete and outdated, misused by politicians and the press. They explained that the NAM was already collecting data on this matter but that some companies had not even responded to the NAM request. Those companies would be even more reluctant to respond to another survey—which would be burdensome and might reveal trade secrets. The electric utility spokesman wondered why his industry (which causes thermal pollution) was even included in the proposed inventory.

After 7 hours, the meeting adjourned and the Budget Bureau pigeonholed the proposed inventory.

BLOCKED AGAIN

The following year, the question of the inventory was raised again, and again it was blocked by industry. At a conference on pollution of Lake Erie and its tributaries, eight major industries said they would provide data on discharged waste water to federal and state agencies. Acting on this indication of cooperation, Chairman Robert E. Jones (D–Ala.) of the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power urged the Budget director and the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to approve the nationwide inventory. They replied that perhaps a pilot study should be made around Lake Erie; a study was made but produced little information.

The next year (1966) federal responsibility for water pollution abatement was shifted from PHS, in HEW, to the new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) in the Department of the Interior. The Clean Water Restoration Act approved in 1966 called for comprehensive studies by the Interior Department of the cost of controlling industrial pollution and of possible economic incentives to induce industry to abate pollution. In 1967 the House subcommittee again pressed the Budget Bureau to approve the inventory. But the Bureau recommended delay.

"We believe," wrote the Bureau, "that once data is [sic] available from the cost and incentives studies, we will have a much better idea about what types of data are available from industry and how best to structure any potential questionnaire for the industrial inventory." The Bureau did not want to collect information until it had information!

In contrast, the Interior Department held that the egg must come before the chicken—before it could count the cost of industrial pollution it would have to have an inventory.

In the summer of 1968, the Budget Bureau advisory panel again considered the proposed inventory. The 26 advisory participants represented most of the companies and trade associations that had been at the 1964 meeting and included several of the same individuals. None of the 13 federal participants had attended the 1964 meeting. At the meeting, FWPCA officials reported that the need for adequate and accurate data on industrial water pollution was becoming more and more acute at both the state and the federal levels. The advisory committee members reiterated the argument that they had previously made to other federal officials. After 4 hours of discussion, the meeting adjourned and the Budget Bureau again returned the inventory to the pigeonhole.

And that is where it remains today. The new FWPCA commissioner, David D. Dominick, blames the Budget Bureau for halting the inventory. But he is not pushing it, having retreated to industry's position that the information should be collected at the state level, where it is unlikely ever to be collected. And so the federal government marches back down the hill, which is still securely held by industry and its advisory committees.

Air pollution control has also been slowed by a Budget Bureau advisory committee. In March 1968 the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA) submitted a proposed Air Contaminant Emissions Survey to the Budget Bureau. The advisory committee objected to disclosure of data relating to specific plants and set up a negotiation team, including representatives from the NAM, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Paper Institute, American Petroleum Institute, National Coal Association, and Manufacturing Chemists Association. At the industries' urging, NAPCA submitted weaker, general drafts. Last year the survey was finally innocuous enough to obtain industry approval, and the Budget Bureau cleared the form.

Nevertheless, NAPCA added further restrictions on the use of the information it would collect, according to the Task Force Report on Air Pollution issued late this spring by the Center for Study of Responsive Law (Nader's Raiders). The Chattanooga Manufacturers Association urged its members to withhold information sought through the emissions survey. NAPCA Commissioner John T. Middleton thereupon promised the Chattanooga manufacturers that the data they disclosed would never be made public, even in administrative or judicial proceedings. Government, said the Task Forse Report, was indeed a junior partner to industry.

OTHER INFORMATION WITHHELD

Pollution is but one of the areas in which Budget Bureau advisory committees foil collection of information on which enforcement and legislation are based. In 1963 the Federal Trade Commission submitted to the Budget Bureau a questionnaire designed to obtain information on ownership and interlocks of the nation's 1000 leading corporations. The advisory committees strongly objected, then carried their inside information to Capitol Hill, where they obtained prohibition of expenditures on the survey. Electric and gas

utilities used the advisory committees to weaken Federal Power Commission (FPC) attempts to obtain more information on utilities' expenditures for professional services, including payment made to law firms, advertising, public relations, and lobbying.

The budget of the advisory committees' parent organization, the Advisory Council on Federal Reports, is approximately $60,000 a year. This cost is borne by the American Society of Association Executives, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Retail Federation, the Financial Executives Institute, and a few individual companies. Expenses include a Washington office (1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.) and occasional picnics and dinners honoring the Budget Bureau officials who work with the advisers.

Many advisory committee members have served with the same Budget Bureau career officials for years. The Budget Bureau staffers are usually at grade 14 or 15 ($19,643 to $29,752 per year); some junior members may be as low as grade 9 ($9,881 to $12,842 per year). They could be awed by association with prestigious industry officials who serve on the committees—for instance, Robert S. Quig, vice president of Ebasco Services, Inc. a utility service organization. Quig has chaired the three electric and gas utility advisory committees for years and also serves on the parent Advisory Council on Federal Reports.

Camaraderie between industry and government blooms into soft policy. One Budget Bureau official eased industry anxieties by reminding them of the policy on corporate disclosure that he had laid down 7 years earlier:

"When you are in doubt, resolve the doubt to your own advantage. Even when instructions are implicit there are cases where the reporting requirement may not be consistent with the manner in which some of you maintain your records. In that case report the data you have—in most cases it will be acceptable."

Until recently, the advisory council and committees have enjoyed anonymity. A long-standing advisory committee "principle" has prohibited publication of "recommendations which have been made to the Bureau of the Budget but on which action by the Bureau has not yet been taken." Outsiders have thus been prevented from obtaining information until it was too late to act on it. Until a few months ago, the Budget Bureau's limited circulation "yellow sheet"—a daily list of reporting forms and plans received for approval—was marked "Not for Publication." Congressional inquiry as to the reason for confidentiality prompted removal of the restriction.

Representatives of nonindustry organizations who only recently have attended advisory committee meetings as observers, have not felt welcome. Last year, when an advisory committee began consideration of FPC forms relating to plant pollution control at steam-electric generating plants, entry was sought by the National Wildlife Federation. It represents the interests of state and local affiliates throughout the country and is deeply interested in water quality standards. Louis S. Clapper, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, described the experience of his organization's representative in these words from his 3 December 1969 letter to Budget Director Robert P. Mayo:

"On Nov. 18, 1969, a member of our staff, Gerald W. Winegrad, an attorney, was told by Mr. Harry B. Sheftel of your office that he would have to clear attendance at this Public Utilities Committee meeting with a Mr. Dana Barbour, Acting Director for Clearance Operations of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Winegrad on calling Mr. Barbour was advised that "we just can't have any more people," that there was no more seating room. Mr. Winegrad advised him that he would stand during the meeting but was still told he could not attend. Mr. Barbour advised Mr. Winegrad that he would send him a copy of FPC Form 67 in lieu of his attending the meeting. At the meeting which Mr. Winegrad did attend, there were no less than 14 empty chairs in the room at all times.

"Mr. Sheftel made a point of stressing to Mr. Winegrad on the phone that 'no policy was being considered' and asked: 'What is your interest?' and 'How did you know of the meeting?'"

However, the Budget Bureau's assistant director for statistical policy, Julius Shiskin, says that under recently adopted policies there will be plenty of seats for all interested parties at advisory committee meetings and that "any American—including Rap Brown" will be welcome. (Shiskin later said use of this quote, by singling out one controversial individual, inaccurately reflected his attitude.)

Revision of the Budget Bureau advisory committee system was suggested last year by Senator Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.). His bill (S. 3067) would require consumer, labor, and small business representation on the committees and "timely, conspicuous public notice" of their meetings. In March Senator Metcalf told the House Government Operations Special Studies Subcommittee that the public interest might best be served by abolition of the committees.

The Budget Bureau opposes the Metcalf bill. Discomfitted by the attention given its advisory committees, the Budget Bureau now emphasizes "the need for agency consultations with user and other interested groups" prior to submittal of agency requests to the Bureau. The disadvantage to the public in that approach is the same as the one it has with the Budget Bureau committees—"user and other interested groups" do not have the entree with agencies that industries have. Edison Electric Institute (EEI), trade association of the investor-owned electric utilities, quietly planned a meeting in March of this year with the FPC staff. The EEI wanted to discuss, privately, the plant pollution control data reports, which had interested the National Wildlife Federation last winter. Only after congressional and press comment on the closed nature of the planned meeting with industry did the FPC invite the outsiders who had sat in on last winter's discussion.

The Budget Bureau has specifically refused to include on its advisory committees representatives of the Consumer Federation of America. Instead, the Bureau has invited Virginia Knauer, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, to send staff members to some advisory committee meetings. Mrs. Knauer's small staff has neither the expertise nor the zeal to offset the representatives of large industries and their trade associations.

On 9 April, President Nixon announced still another committee through which businessmen can "communicate regularly with the President, the Council on Environmental Quality, and other government officials and private organizations which are working to improve the quality of the environment." The new committee, the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, is composed of board chairmen or presidents of major oil, automobile, electric utility, mining, timber, coal, airline, and manufacturing companies plus presidents of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Industrial Conference Board. (The Administration recently contracted with the National Industrial Conference Board to make a selective study—electric utilities are not to be included—of industrial pollution costs.)

The President's choice for chairman of the council is Bert Cross, board chairman of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing. His company still has not complied with a 1966 state order in Wisconsin to stop discharging sulfurous waste into municipal sewers.

The Presidential council headed by Cross is composed exclusively of polluters. Informed ecologists, old-fashioned conservationists, vocal students, or silent majorities are not represented, nor do they have separate advisory councils. They are excluded, at the Presidential and the Budget Bureau levels. They can get their information from industries' anti-pollution advertisements. Meanwhile, inside the White House and the red brick executive office building of the Bureau of the Budget, the rabbits guard the wilting lettuce.

THE BUDGET DIRECTOR RESPONDS

We appreciate the generous offer to your article on the Bureau of the Budget, but there is so much half-truth carefully interwoven through the article that you leave us with almost no rebuttal except to say the article is unfair and misleading. Furthermore, it is in large part ancient and not very accurate history.

First, here is the situation as it exists today. Meetings with committees and panel of the Advisory Council on Federal Reports are open to all interested parties, without exception. Anyone who wishes to receive advance notice of these meetings may simply request that his name be placed on our mailing list. Write to Office of Statistical Policy, Bureau of the Budget, Federal Office Building No. 7, Washington, D.C. 20503.

The important point your article misses, I feel, is that it is only in the last year or two that the Bureau has been receiving for review an increasing number of forms and reporting requirements involving complex and controversial socioeconomic issues, such as consumer protection, pollution, civil rights, equal employment opportunity, and so forth. We were responsive to the need for broadening consultation with groups wishing to present their views.

The Advisory Council on Federal Reports provides a channel through which various segments of the business community advise and consult with the Budget Bureau on reporting problems attendant to requests of government agencies for information from business.

You make the point that small business has not been represented. The National Small Business Association has been a member of the Council for the last 10 or 15 years. Furthermore, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has been a full-fledged member since the inception of the Advisory Council, and the majority of the Chamber's membership is comprised of small business.

The Bureau, now reorganized as the Office of Management and Budget, is composed of dedicated public servants with a long tradition of dealing fairly with all who are claimants on the national resources. As for the annual banquets, Budget directors and some of their aides have attended them, as did President Truman and President Johnson. To suggest an official of the Bureau could be corrupted by a meal is surely beneath the dignity of so fine a publication as *Science*.—ROBERT P. MAYO, *director, Bureau of the Budget.*

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1970]

UNITED STATES TO REQUEST POLLUTION DATA FROM PLANTS USING WATERWAYS

WASHINGTON, September 17.—The Department of the Interior announced today that it would soon begin sending questionnaires to all segments of American industry in order to compile an inventory of the plants that are polluting the nation's waterways, and the nature and amount of the pollutants.

The inventory will be "voluntary," that is, companies will not be forced to supply the information requested by the department.

The announcement was made by David D. Dominick, head of the department's Federal

Water Quality Administration. Fittingly, it was made at a hearing on the issue by the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources of the House Committee on Government Operations, which is headed by Henry S. Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin.

For seven years this subcommittee has been pressing the Department of Interior to make such an inventory to collect the necessary data for a national program to clean up streams and lakes.

PERMISSION WAS DENIED

Three times—in 1964, 1967 and 1968—the department agreed that such an inventory was necessary and asked the Bureau of the Budget to approve it. Each time, the bureau refused. Under the Federal Reports Act, the Bureau was given authority to approve such collection of information in order to avoid duplication. However, it has also assumed the right to determine whether a collection should be made at all.

Mr. Reuss charged today that the Budget Bureau had withheld consent in the past because "many industries opposed it."

He noted that in 1968, for example, the bureau met on the Interior Department's request with the Advisory Council on Federal Reports, an organization that is organized and financed by the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and other national business organizations.

Mr. Reuss said, "When the council opposed the inventory, the Budget Bureau withheld its approval."

Mr. Paul F. Krueger, a Budget Bureau official who testified today, acknowledged that in 1968 the bureau did not invite representatives of conservation and environmental groups to attend the meeting on the proposed inventory.

"At the time," he said, "it was not the practice of the Bureau of the Budget to notify other interest groups of such meetings and no such groups had expressed to the bureau any interest in the fact that the survey was being planned."

But Mr. Krueger said that the bureau two days ago "informally approved" the questionnaire that the Interior Department will send out, and that formal approval will follow.

Members of the Reuss subcommittee and its staff believes that the Budget Bureau has finally given its consent to the inventory because the environment has become a national issue and because President Nixon has responded to the public concern about it.

However, it was learned from informed officials today that there had been an intense struggle within the Interior Department over whether to ask industry to supply information which, if honestly reported, would—as Mr. Reuss said—mark many companies as "miscreants."

Mr. Dominick, it was said, vigorously supported the inventory, and Carl F. Klein, the Assistant Secretary for Water Quality and Research, vigorously opposed it. It was said that Secretary Walter J. Hickel finally had to referee the dispute and sided with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Reuss said that the Interior Department had failed to respond to many of his letters, and he had learned that Mr. Klein had held up the replies. Among the unanswered letters were invitations to Mr. Hickel and Mr. Klein to testify.

STATUTE IS CITED

Mr. Dominick told the subcommittee that the information supplied "will be considered confidential" within the meaning of a statute that provides penalties for disclosure by Federal officials of "trade secrets, processes, operations, style of work or apparatus" of an industry.

Exceptions to this ruling would be information needed to carry out provisions of the Federal Water Pollution **Control Act**, Mr. Dominick said.

Mr. Reuss strenuously protested this provision. He said he did not believe trade secrets should be revealed, but he said he did not believe such revelation was involved in making public the names of polluting industries, the streams in which effluents are being discharged and the nature and the amount of the industrial waste.

Mr. Dominick did not say whether the names of noncomplying industries or those making insufficient response would be made public, but in an answer to a question, Raymond C. Coulter, Interior's Deputy Solicitor indicated that they would, and Mr. Reuss assumed this, according to Phineas Indritz, the committee counsel.

Robert E. Jordan 3d, who supervises the Army Corps of Engineers for the Secretary of the Army, said the Corps was going to require every plant discharging waste into navigable waters to get a permit, as required by an 1899 law, and to get such a permit an industry would have to disclose its discharges.

"For our program," he said, "supplying information is not going to be voluntary."

[From the Missoulian, Sept. 25, 1970]

A LIFE AND DEATH CALCULATION

A recent news item brought to mind the macabre thought that the next major war between nations might be fought on the basis of pollution, not politics.

The news item mentioned that the Interior Department soon will send questionnaires to American industries asking them to provide information on the nature and amount of the pollutants they put into the nation's waterways.

The intent is to take an "inventory" of the pollution getting into the water. Since answering the questionnaire will be purely voluntary, the "inventory" will be another exercise in futility. But it will help hold down bureaucratic unemployment, and if the questionnaire collects some useful information, that is better than having no information at all.

Someday a real inventory will be made, and answering will be mandatory, not voluntary. The voluntary inventory is a step toward that day.

When that day comes, then for the first time this country will be able to calculate reasonably accurately how much pollution it puts into the water. From that data other calculations will follow, including the calculation that if so much pollution enters so much water under such-and-such conditions, mankind either will (a) live, or (b) die. And if the latter, approximately when the dying process will commence. An accurate inventory also will let this country project its findings on a world-wide basis.

The macabre part is this: If the conclusion is that we will poison ourselves to death by a certain time if pollution is not swiftly controlled, then all nations must know of this because all must control pollution. So we would give our basic data and conclusions to every major polluting nation.

The imagination turns. What if the Soviet Union and Common Market countries checked our data and agreed with it, but Britain, Japan and China rejected our findings? What then? To save ourselves we would feel we had to stop their pollution.

And one can imagine the United States and Common Market nations moving militarily (though not with nuclear weapons) against Britain, the Soviet Union moving, with American help against China, and the Americans moving against Japan.

The mind can paste together any combination of powers moving against other powers. The motivation would be to stop pollution. The objective would be survival.

Will such a day come? Nobody knows, though some scientists think mankind will start to strangle on its pollution within the next few generations. The calculation cannot be made without data. It is a calculation worth trying to make.

Which brings us back to the Interior Department's voluntary "inventory." It is a tiny step in the right direction, but it is a tiny step when a giant stride is needed. An accurate inventory must be taken. Taking an accurate inventory could be a matter of life and death.

THE TEXTILE LOBBY AND THE TRADE BILL

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there is the possibility that the House will be considering the Trade Act of 1970 after the recess. I am opposed to many sections of this legislation. However, I feel that it is important for all Members of the House to be aware of the arguments used to justify passage of this bill.

Recently John M. Leedy, former Assitant Secretary of State for European Affairs and U.S. Ambassador to the OECD, wrote a brief article outlining some of the assumptions that are used to justify this trade measure. I feel that each Member should give careful consideration to Mr. Leddy's arguments. At this point I insert Mr. Leddy's article, "The Textile Lobby and the Trade Bill" and I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues:

THE TEXTILE LOBBY AND THE TRADE BILL

(By John M. Leddy)

As the trade bill nears the final stage of congressional action, it is important to understand what the driving force behind that bill is: the textile industry. Does this important industry have a legitimate case for special treatment or is it leading the county down a false and costly trail?

The pushing of special interests at the expense of the general public is not the oldest profession in the world, but is venerable enough so that the hallmarks of its come-on are unmistakable. The prevalence of half-truths is among them.

One is the use of the Soviet statistical technique of citing large increases, percentage or other—in this case of imports—without providing the relevant basis for comparison. There has been talk of the tremendous upsurge in textile and apparel imports to double their level at the beginning of the decade. It is important to remember, however, that while textile and apparel imports increased from 340 million pounds in 1961 to 813 million pounds in 1968, U.S. production increased by seven times this amount, or from 6,581 million pounds in 1961 to 10,259 million pounds in 1968. Thus production at home increased by 3.7 billion pounds while imports increased by less than 0.5 billion pounds. Do such figures suggest that imports have put the industry in deep trouble?

Some other half-truths need spotlighting: We are told that the domestic apparel industry, in which average hourly earnings in 1969 were $2.31, cannot be expected to compete successfully with imports produced by labor which is paid as little as the U.S. equivalent of 26 cents per hour (in Hong Kong) or 39 cents per hour (in Japan). But how is it that, if the domestic textile and apparel industry cannot compete with low-wage for-

eign labor, net profits after taxes of domestic U.S. firms producing textile mill products were reported at 7.9 per cent on equity last year, and that U.S. firms producing apparel and other finished products reported an 11.9 per cent profit figure?

To be sure, wage rates are one element in costs of production which, over a period of time, play a role in the ability of the industry of one country to compete in the market of others. But it is precisely the object of a sensible trade policy to promote international competition on the basis of all elements of comparative advantage—capital, resources, geography, and technology, as well as wage rates.

Then it is suggested to the inflation-conscious American consumer that imports tend to increase domestic prices. These days even the kiddies know better than to swallow this kind of breakfast cereal. If textile producers don't want high domestic prices, why do they want import quotas, whose major purpose is to keep domestic prices higher than they would otherwise be?

We are also told that protection is now necessary for our industries because other countries are not treating us fairly—in fact, playing us for an easy mark in the commercial field. Of course, foreign countries still have trade barriers, and Japan has been notably laggard in liberalizing trade and investment. But so do we have trade barriers—witness our oil quotas; our agricultural import restrictions—including sugar, dairy products, and meat; our "escape clause" actions on glass, carpets and rugs and pianos. The problem is to bring all these barriers down, at home and abroad. The way to get them down is through multilateral and hard-headed negotiation. Legislating textile quotas won't do this and isn't intended to.

In 1970, as a result of a persistent U.S. effort to promote liberal world trade, tariffs and trade barriers among the industrialized countries have been brought to their lowest point in the twentieth century and the economies of the industrialized countries are more open to one another than ever before in history. International monetary cooperation has been intensified in a way that is little short of revolutionary. Interdependence among the countries of the non-Communist world in trade, money and investment is far greater than at any time in the past. The way to destroy this structure is to let loose a new trade war a la 1930's. Action to legislate quotas on textiles, given the pressure for restrictions on many other products, could do just that.

If apologists for the current bill would simply tell us, "Boys, if you want to continue along the path of freer trade you'd better knuckle under to the textile industry because that's where the political clout is," this would at least have the merit of candor. But it would probably also be wrong. The administration and the unfortunate (and probably uncomfortable) Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee are now discovering to their sorrow that the ancient art of log-rolling is still alive and well on Capitol Hill. The trade bill reported by the committee would provide legislative quotas not only for textiles and apparel, but also for shoes. In addition, quotas become the mandatory technique for dealing with petroleum imports and a "trigger" mechanism is established to spread quotas all over the landscape, whenever imports become a little uncomfortable to domestic producers. A chain of retaliation and counter-retaliation would be almost certain to follow. The resulting damage to the international economic and monetary structure so painstakingly built up over a quarter of a century would be something to behold.

The risk is great. And the main argument for running this risk—that the U.S. textile industry needs protection—won't hold water. If these simple facts can be brought to the fore of public debate, we may yet be saved.

RESULTS OF CAMPUS VIOLENCE POLL

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, more than two-thirds of the American public believe that college administrators have been too lenient in dealing with campus disorders, according to the results of a national poll taken by Chilton Research Services.

The poll, taken September 19–20, shows that only 4 percent of the U.S. public feel that college administrators have been too strict, another 14 percent feel that the handling of the disorders is about right, and 71 percent believe that the administrators are too lenient.

The poll indicates that 64 percent of those interviewed approve of the way Mr. Nixon is handling his job as President, and only one-fourth of those interviewed disapprove.

Asked about the justification of the strikes or protests of college students, 40 percent of the respondents said that the protests were not justified at all, 24 percent thought they were a little justified. Another 26 percent felt that the strikes and protests were somewhat justified, while only 3 percent felt they were completely justified.

Only one-third of those questioned felt that the Federal Government should become involved in the problems of student demonstrations, while six out of 10 respondents believe that this is a problem for college administrators and local authorities to handle.

Mr. Speaker, attached for the RECORD are the results of the campus violence poll.

RESULTS OF CAMPUS VIOLENCE POLL

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Richard Nixon is handling his job as President?

Approve, 64%; Disapprove, 26%; No Opinion, 10%.

2. What about college students—do you think their strikes or protests are completely justified, somewhat justified, a little justified, or are they not justified at all?

Completely, 3%; Somewhat, 26%; Little, 24%; Not at all, 40%; No Opinion 7%.

3. Do you think the Federal Government should become involved in the problem of student demonstrations on college campuses, or should this problem be left to college administrators and local authorities to handle?

Federal Govt. Involved, 32%; Left to College, 59%; No Opinion, 9%.

4. In general, how do you feel college administrators have been in dealing with campus disorders—too strict, too lenient, or about right?

Too Strict, 4%; Too Lenient, 71% About Right, 14%; No Opinion, 11%.

It has long been my personal view that bulging enrollments and tight budgets have created special problems for institutions of higher learning. There is reason to be concerned about class size; about the lack of teacher-student relationship; about the student's loss of identity. A student who enrolls in a class to be under the tutelege of a certain instructor is short changed when the class is taught, not by the master, but a graduate student or worse, by a series of graduate students. These are legitimate complaints of students who want an education.

Answers must be found, but they will not be found in violence.

PROPOSED AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR VIRGINIA

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, it was my privilege to submit testimony yesterday before the Virginia State Air Pollution Control Board on proposed air quality standards for carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants, and hydrocarbons.

The standards, if adopted, would be applicable statewide as well as to the National Capital Interstate Air Quality Control Region. The political subdivisions within the region include the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, and Falls Church, and the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William in Virginia; the District of Columbia; and the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland.

Mr. President, I expressed objection to the proposed standards on the grounds that they could present a hazard to the health and welfare of the citizens of the entire State. I proposed that they be strengthened in order to insure protection of public health.

In view of the widespread concern over environmental problems, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CARBON MONOXIDE, PHOTOCHEMICAL OXIDANTS, AND HYDROCARBONS

I am pleased to have this opportunity to comment on the proposed air quality standards for the Virginia portion of the National Capital Air Quality Control Region. The standards under discussion are for carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants and hydrocarbons.

The precedent set in establishing these standards is of particular concern for the region, but is of equivalent importance to the total statewide program. Should these standards not provide for the protection of public health, the consequences conceivably could extend across the entire state.

In my statement I will present documentary evidence which suggests that the proposed Virginia ambient quality standards for carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants, and hydrocarbons, if adopted, could constitute a hazard to the public health of the citizens of the entire National Capital Interstate Air Quality Control Region. The proposed standards appear to fail to provide for the protection of public health, and in some instances would present a potential hazard to public health. Therefore, I suggest that the Virginia proposed standards be strengthened in order to insure protection of public health.

I would now like to present the basis for my conclusions. Prudent public health policies cannot await a perfect knowledge of the cause-and-effect relationships between environmental pollution and health. When the best available evidence indicates potential health hazards from environmental exposure,

barriers must be interposed between the public and the causative evidence causing biological stress. In interposing these barriers, concern must extend beyond the normal segments of the population to include consideration for the effects on the very young, the aged, and other susceptible individuals. Effective environmental health policies do not allow the freedom to ignore current knowledge or postpone actions indicated by the best available evidence of causation.

The Federal Air Quality Act of 1967 establishes a mechanism for achieving a systematic reduction of harmful atmospheric emissions. This mechanism provides for the establishment of ambient air quality standards and a plan for their implementation. The plan, in turn, contains emission standards and a time schedule for implementation.

Critical in this procedure is the setting of air quality standards. In setting an air quality standard, a State is defining the quality of air that its residents are prepared to breathe.

In establishing ambient air quality standards we should consider both public health and the enhancement of air quality. The Senate Public Works Committee was explicit on this point when it stated (Senate Report 90–430):

"The Committee feels that under any circumstances protection of health should be considered a minimum requirement, and wherever possible standards should be established which enhance the air quality of the environment."

Air quality standards which, even if fully implemented, would permit continuing deterioration of air quality in any major portion of an air quality control region or would fail to enhance air quality would clearly be in conflict with the expressed purpose of the law.

The most common and widely distributed atmospheric contaminants is carbon monoxide. In urban areas the primary source is the incomplete combustion of carbonaceous materials used as fuels for vehicles, space heating, industrial processing, and the burning of refuse.

Those segments of the population most susceptible to the adverse effects of atmospheric exposure to carbon monoxide are individuals sensitive to a decreased oxygen supply. This susceptible group include the developing fetus and individuals with anemia, cardio-vascular disease, abnormal metabolic rates, and chronic pulmonary disease.

The carbon monoxide air quality criteria indicates:

"An exposure of 8 or more hours to a carbon monoxide concentration of 12 to 17 milligrams per cubic meter (10 to 15 parts per million) will produce a blood carboxyhemoglobin level of 2.0 to 2.5 percent in nonsmokers. This level of blood carboxyhemoglobin has been associated with adverse health effects as manifested by impaired time interval discrimination. Evidence also indicates that an exposure of 8 or more hours to a CO concentration of 35 milligrams per cubic meter (30 parts per million) will produce blood carboxyhemoglobin levels of about 5 per cent in nonsmokers. Adverse health effects as manifested by impaired performance on certain other psychomotor tests have been associated with this blood carboxyhemoglobin level, and above this level there is evidence of physiologic stress in patients with heart disease. There is some epidemilogical evidence that suggests an association between increased fatality rates in hospitalized myocardial infarction patients and exposure to weekly average CO concentration of the order of 9 to 16 milligrams per cubic meter (8 to 14 parts per million). Evidence from other studies of the effects of CO does not currently demonstrate an association between existing ambient levels of CO and adverse effects on vegetation, materials, or other aspects of human welfare. It is reasonable and prudent to conclude that, when promulgating air quality standards, consideration should be given to requirements for margins of safety that would take into account possible effects on health that might occur below the lowest of the above levels."

The National Air Pollution Control Administration, on the basis of data in the air quality criteria documents (United States Senate Report No. 91–1196) has said that a carbon monoxide ambient air quality level of 9 parts per million (8 hours average) must be attained to insure the protection of public health within the requirements for a margin of safety. Yet the proposed Virginia air quality standard for carbon monoxide is 30 parts per million (8 hours average). This proposed standard, if established, could authorize health effects on the citizens exposed.

The standard also does not reflect existing air quality levels. The air quality criteria document indicates that the maximum 8 hour carbon monoxide level attained in the Washington area in both 1966 and 1967 was approximately 23 parts per million. The proposed standard would allow the existing level to be further degraded with accompanying further health effects.

Similar comments can be made regarding proposed annual average and one hour average carbon monoxide standards.

The air quality criteria for hydrocarbons suggests that primary concern is their role as precursors of other compounds formed in producing photochemical smog. This relationship was considered in the development of the air quality criteria documents for hydrocarbons. The upper effect limit given in the criteria document for hydrocarbons is a maximum one hour average concentration of 200 micrograms per cubic meter. The proposed Virginia standard for hydrocarbons is 200 micrograms per cubic meter. This value fails to provide any margin of safety. I understand that photochemical oxidants result from a complex series of atmospheric reactions by such organic substances as hydrocarbon and nitrogen oxides when exposed to sunlight. The scientists tell us an array of new compounds are formed, among which are found oxidants. The air quality criteria document for photochemical oxidants indicates that:

"Under the conditions prevailing in the areas where studies were conducted, adverse health effects, as shown by impairment of performance of student athletes, occurred over a range of hourly average oxidant concentrations from 60 to 590 micrograms per cubic meter (0.03 to 0.3 parts per million). An increased frequency of asthma attacks in a small proportion of subjects with this disease was shown on days when oxidant concentrations exceeded peak values of 250 micrograms per cubic meter (0.13 parts per million), a level that would be associated with an hourly average concentration ranging from 100 to 120 micrograms per cubic meter (0.05 to 0.06 parts per million). Adverse health effects, as manifested by eye irritation, were reported in several studies when photochemical oxidant concentrations reached instantaneous levels of about 200 micrograms per cubic meter (0.10 parts per million), a level that would be associated with an hourly average concentration ranging from 60 to 100 micrograms per cubic meter (0.03 to 0.05 parts per million)."

The National Air Quality Control Administration has indicated (Senate Report 91–1196) that based on data contained in the air quality criteria for photochemical oxidants and on the requirement for a margin of safety, an ambient air quality level for photochemical oxidants of 120 micrograms per cubic meter (1 hour average) must be attained to insure protection of public health. Yet, the proposed Virginia standard for photochemical oxidants is 200 micrograms per cubic meter, not to be exceeded more than 10 per cent of the time in a 90 day period. This has been extrapolated to allow a one hour maximum value of 400 to 500 micrograms per cubic meter. Although I am not a scientist, this level appears excessive to me and provides no margin of safety. Again I refer you to the air quality criteria document for photochemical oxidants and the recommendations of the Metropolitan Washington Coalition for Clean Air.

For the reasons stated, I must oppose the proposed Virginia ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants, and hydrocarbons for the National Capital Air Quality Control Region. These standards as adopted could present a hazard to the health and welfare of the citizens of the entire metropolitan area. The proposed standards are weak and should be strengthened.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE J. BURGER

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent commendation issued by the city of New Rochelle, N.Y., in tribute to George J. Burger, a resident of New Rochelle and vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. Mr. Burger has devoted many years of service to the small business community of America. The commendation comes in recognition of the citations offered Mr. Burger by both the House and Senate Select Small Business Committees.

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

RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING GEORGE J. BURGER UPON RECEIVING CITATIONS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEES ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE UNITED STATES SENATE FOR A HALF CENTURY OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE SMALL BUSINESSMEN OF AMERICA

Whereas, George J. Burger, a resident of the city of New Rochelle since 1923, has received the commendation and congratulations of the select committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate for a half century of outstanding service to the small businessmen of America, and

Whereas, these commendations have been entered in the CONGESSIONAL RECORD of the Proceedings and Debates of the 91st Congress, Second Session, and

Whereas, George J. Burger commutes between his home in New Rochelle and his Washington office and is vice president in charge of the legislative office of the National Federation of Independent Business, and

Whereas, the citation lauded Mr. Burger as the great champion of small business and as the creator of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency in 1953, and as a permanent agency in 1958, whose advice and counsel were largely responsible for the events that led to the achievement of the significant milestones in small business history in America, and

Whereas, George J. Burger has lived a full and useful life of service to the nation and to Congress and to small business throughout the country, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that this council hereby congratulates George J. Burger on receiving the citations of the Select Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate for a half century of outstanding service to the small businessmen of America, and extends its best wishes to him for continued good health and continued service to the small businessmen of America, and be it further

Resolved, that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the council and a suitable copy thereof presented to him.

TEXAS COMMUNITY LAUNCHES DRIVE TO CREATE NIMITZ MUSEUM

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Fredricksburg, a community of just over 5,000, located in the rolling Texas hill country, is currently working to raise over a million dollars for the creation of a museum honoring a great American and one of its most famous residents, the late Adm. Chester W. Nimitz. Nimitz, last of the five-star admirals, commanded the famous Pacific Fleet during World War II, a command that included some 5,000 ships and over 2 million men. Under his brilliant naval leadership, the American forces made a stunning recovery from the disaster of Pearl Harbor, gaining the offensive on the Japanese soon after his triumph at the Battle of Midway.

The focal point of this spirited fund drive is the old Nimitz Hotel, which was built by the Admiral's immigrant grandfather, Charles W. Nimitz. Because of the senior Nimitz's great love for the sea, the hotel was modeled after the Atlantic steamers of the day and was appointed with three decks and a captain's bridge. The hotel has since become a Texas landmark and its register reflects a long list of famous notables, including, among others, Generals Grant and Lee, Jessie James, and Rutherford B. Hayes.

Funds collected from the drive will be used to restore the hotel to its original pre-1920 condition, including the unique decks and captain's bridge. The Department of the Navy has graciously offered their services in the planning of the exhibits to be contained within the hotel and have pledged more than a million dollars worth of World War II naval paraphernalia and Nimitz memorabilia.

I commend the citizens of Fredricksburg for their fine efforts to restore this historical landmark as a permanent memorial to a great American. I know that it will be of interest to a great many Americans and bring a good deal of pleasure and satisfaction to all who visit it.

I invite the attention of Senators and the American people to an article by Mildred Newman, published in the September 1970 issue of Texas Parade, which goes into greater detail on this most worthwhile project. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks today.

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

NIMITZ REMEMBERED: SOME 300 MILES FROM OPEN WATER, THIS COMMUNITY OF 5,000 WORKS TO RAISE A MILLION DOLLARS TO CREATE A NAVAL MEMORIAL MUSEUM HONORING A FAMOUS SON

(By Mildred Newman)

A landlocked Hill Country town is the home of a projected $1 million naval museum honoring a great naval commander and, as he requested, "all men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States." The Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz Memorial Naval Museum is being created in Fredericksburg to pay tribute to the native son of World War II fame. Nimitz, who was the last of the five star admirals, rose to command five thousand ships and two million men during the battles in the Pacific leading to the surrender of Japan in World War II.

Chester W. Nimitz was born before the turn of the century in a pioneer home in Fredericksburg. His paternal relatives lived a block away in the famous old Nimitz Hotel built by his grandfather, Charles H. Nimitz.

Grandfather Nimitz, born in Germany, joined the German Merchant Marine at 14. Eventually, however, he followed other members of his family to America and dropped anchor in the newly-organized German colony of Fredericksburg where, in 1852, he built his hotel. Because of his love for the sea, he modeled his hotel after a steamship, complete with three decks and a captain's bridge. The Nimitz Hotel, operated by his family for nearly a century, soon became a famous landmark.

This ship-shaped hotel is where the late Fleet Admiral lived and played as a boy. History reveals that it was on the "decks" of this "steamship" that young Chester heard many stories of his grandfather's seafaring expeditions, which undoubtedly fired his ambition, though Nimitz maintained his naval career "was a career by chance."

Perhaps harboring some trepidations about the vast oceans he had only heard of and never seen, Nimitz applied for appointment to West Point rather than Annapolis. He failed in his bid for appointment to the military academy and was assigned instead to the Naval Academy, Annapolis.

So, off he went for his first look at an ocean and his first boat ride which left him seasick. He graduated from Annapolis in 1905 and shipped aboard the battleship Ohio, later flagship of the Asiatic fleet.

In later years, the late James V. Forrestal, then secretary of the Navy, once asked Nimitz, his Chief of Naval Operations, whether an officer convicted by a court-martial had ever risen to flag rank (rank above that of Captain).

"You're looking at one," replied Fleet Admiral Nimitz, who had commanded the most powerful fleet in the history of man during fighting in the Pacific in World War II.

As a young officer, the soft-spoken Texan had been found guilty and reprimanded by a Navy court for running a destroyer aground in Manila Bay.

During World War I, Nimitz was chief of staff to the Commander of the submarine forces in the Atlantic Fleet. He was serving as chief of the Bureau of Navigation when his appointment came on December 31, 1941, to assume command of the Pacific Fleet when, after Pearl Harbor, it consisted almost entirely of worn-out ships.

In five months, Fleet Admiral Nimitz so handled his responsibility that he was able to surprise and outmaneuver the Japanese Fleet in the Battle of Midway while outnumbered in ships and planes more than three to one. This marked an ending to the defensive phase of the Pacific War and a turning point with Japan never winning a major battle after that.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz headed the naval fighting forces in the Pacific throughout World War II. In December 1944, he was made Admiral of the Fleet (a five star ranking) and a year later, Chief of Naval Operations.

Nimitz died February 20, 1966, at 80, thus ending his long and illustrious naval career spanning from his Annapolis graduation in 1905, through two great World Wars to the birth of the Atomic Age.

In the 1920's, the steamship hotel from which he and his grandfather "commanded the seas of the world," was remodeled and the superstructure was removed, but the building visitors see today is primarily the same. All the original rooms, including the huge Casino Hall, for so long the center of social life in Fredericksburg; the flagstone kitchen; and on the grounds, the old bathhouse (the only public bathhouse in town in those early years); and the stables with their high stone walls to keep Indian marauders out, are still there.

It is an historic old building. Prior to the 1870's, when El Paso became civilized, the Nimitz Hotel was the last real hostelry between Fredericksburg and San Diego, California. Many of the guests who signed its register had a significant part in the shaping of this country—both for the better and for the worse. They included Rutherford B. Hayes, Adolphus Greely, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, Phil Sheridan, John Ringo and Jesse James (who signed in using his famous alias of C. H. Howard).

It is this hotel that will be restored to its original state with three decks and a captain's bridge, to house the Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz Memorial Naval Museum. In fact to accomplish this transformation, the past session of the Legislature provided for a nine-member state commission to assist in raising funds for restoration and development of the museum.

The United States Navy, through Rear Admiral E. M. Eller (Ret.), chief of Naval History of the United States Navy, of Washington, D.C., is assisting in planning and will supply exhibits for the Nimitz Memorial Museum. Admiral Eller has estimated the United States Navy can provide more than a million dollars worth of exhibits to honor Fredericksburg's famous son and feels the building will become one of the world's unique structures. He predicts that the memorial will grow in stature to become a multimillion dollar monument within a few years. Those planning the project are hopeful that at least 24 nations will contribute, even Japan.

Rear Admiral Eller relates this story: "Japan, the nation Fleet Admiral Nimitz crushed with his Pacific Fleet, today idolizes him almost next to their Emperor all for one little incident so typical of him. Japan had surrendered. Her flagship stood in the harbor and was being mutilated and desecrated. Admiral Nimitz, made aware of this, immediately placed a Marine Guard on board and stopped the mutilation. He also helped raise funds to restore the ship to its original condition. For this Japan will be eternally grateful."

Fund raising is slowly taking shape. A local drive raised some $60,000. However, museum officials estimate they need at least a million dollars before remodeling the building, after which time the museum will be officially dedicated.

But the Navy and museum officials are not idly waiting for this date. The official opening of the Nimitz Memorial Museum was on February 24, 1967, the 81st anniversary of the birth of the renowned naval leader.

(The museum is currently open from 1 to 5 p.m. daily.)

The first floor is already filled. Displayed are hundreds of photographs taken during World War II, vividly recalling the history of that period, many depicting the prominent part Admiral Nimitz played in the decisive battles. There is a rare collection of Nimitz memorabilia, including the model from which the famed statue of the flag raising at Iwo Jima was built.

The surrender flag of the Japanese Battleship Nagato is a cherished addition. It is called a prize of the war as the Nagato was the only battleship captured, not destroyed in the conflict.

The Navy has promised almost anything officials can use and that can be transported by land or air (the nearest port is some 300 miles away). Many items are already on display: signal flags, compasses, plotting board, Bureau of Ordnance Ammunition Displays, 20 MM mount, signal light used to send morse code, clinometer, loran, torpedoes and numerous other navy artifacts. At this point the museum is viewed as a gigantic "from here on" project and officials are enthusiastic about its future.

As you tour the rooms and grounds of the museum and review its historical past, you will hear of the ambitious plans for the museum and the august accomplishments of Chester W. Nimitz.

It has been said that Fleet Admiral Nimitz belongs to our nation's richest heritage, the same as does George Washington. He had the greatest responsibility ever placed on a naval leader's shoulders and only a handful of other men have meant so much to our country.

Promoted over 25 senior admirals following Pearl Harbor, his command spanned the Navy's greatest days—at Coral Sea, Midway, Guadalcanal, Leyte Gulf and, finally, Tokyo Bay.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower said: "Admiral Nimitz was one of the most distinguished officers of World War II. The entire nation will always owe him a debt of gratitude for his brilliant service in World War II."

And in Fredericksburg, creation of The Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz Memorial Naval Museum as an enduring memorial to this great warrior is but a small payment on the debt.

COUNT CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 the country paid tribute to Count Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish-American hero of the American Revolutionary War. At this time I would like to say a few words in honor of this man who gave his life in the battle against tyranny.

Count Pulaski's dedication to freedom manifested itself early in his life when he actively participated in Poland's struggle against Russian domination. Exiled from his native land, Pulaski saw in the American resistance to British domination the same goals he had strived for in his native land. Immediately won to the American cause, the Polish nobleman volunteered his services to General Washington and soon commanded the newly formed American cavalry. He died on the field of battle during the siege of Savannah on October 11, 1799.

To Pulaski, the American Revolution signified mankind's struggle for freedom and he willingly gave his life for that righteous cause.

Americans of Polish descent are justifiably proud of General Pulaski's role during our Revolutionary War. This great man's untiring devotion to freedom and liberty is a lesson to all of us. We must appreciate the gift of freedom that we possess and continue our efforts to insure it for our children and all mankind. We must remember General Pulaski and all soldiers of freedom so that they will not have died in vain.

Mr. Speaker, when we honor the memory of General Pulaski we also honor all Americans of Polish descent who have contributed their lives, their talents and their energy to help our Nation attain its present level of achievement and prosperity. I salute them and voice the fervent hope that Pulaski's dream comes true and Poland takes her place among the free nations of the world and attains that liberty which rightfully belongs to her.

EXCESSIVE U.S. SPENDING

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has been striving mightily to contain inflation by stemming the trend of irresponsible Government spending, the major cause of inflation.

The President's struggle has been hindered by many in this and the other body who still feel a commitment to big spending, with little regard for the consequences.

The Vidette-Messenger, a daily newspaper published in Valparaiso, Ind., has published a very perceptive editorial on the subject, which I would commend to the attention of all my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

EXCESSIVE U.S. SPENDING

There can be no doubt that prices for goods and services are higher today in the U.S. than ever before. Or to put it another way, our money doesn't go as far as it used to.

U.S. Department of Commerce statistics show that our dollar has lost about 15 per cent of its purchasing power in the past three years.

These are the days that inflation is eating away at our savings for those rainy tomorrows. Currently there is no end in sight.

Many economists contend that the main reason for inflation is excessive government spending. It is no secret that our government has been spending far beyond its income.

Looking at, and speaking on this gloomy front, earlier this month was Arch N. Booth, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. He said:

"There are two ways Congress could hold inflation in check, if it would. It could increase taxes, or it could slow down the rate of federal spending. Or it could do both.

"The businessmen of America feel that the sensible place for Congress to start is by reducing spending."

It has been pointed out that Congress, with Democrats in the majority in both Houses, has been acting as though it would like to perpetuate inflation.

In this respect, Booth made the following observations:

1. Action by the Congress will add $17.5 billion to the President's 1971 budget request, if the House action is sustained by the Senate.

2. Appropriations bills already passed by both the House and the Senate total $2.8 billion more than the President requested—and final action has been taken on only five of the 15 regular appropriations bills.

"As originally proposed by the Administration," the chamber executive contends, "the budget for this fiscal year projected a surplus of $1.3 billion.

"Subseqent changes in estimated revenues, and spending actions taken by Congress, have put the budget in the red. The estimated defiit is now $10 to $15 billion.

"For fiscal 1972, forecasts of the deficit run as high as $23 billion."

There is much thought given to the fact that the Democrat-controlled Congress may be playing politics with inflation to embarrass a Republican President.

This is not to say that the Administration has all the answers to all our monetary problems, but it would seem reasonable if President Nixon had a Congress controlled by a Republican majority his program against inflation would be given a much better shake.

If the American people will that Republicans control both Houses when they go to the polls this November, at least the Nixon program could get a more expert test than is being provided under today's Divided Government, in which the executive branch is directed by Republicans and the legislative division by the Democrats.

To us this would be a refreshing time for a change to a more unified program from Washington. But again, it's up to the people to speak at the polls later this fall.

DRYCLEANING WEEK

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, there are some 38,000 small businesses in this country that help keep us happy and well groomed—our drycleaners. Today I would like to call attention to these organizations. In the Second District of Tennessee there are nearly 300 drycleaners, most of them in Knoxville.

These men and women send us off to work, to school, to church, and to social engagements in clean, pressed clothes. If we look good, then chances are we will feel better too.

Members of the National Institute of Dry Cleaning are planning a special week of commemoration to good grooming during November 16 through November 22. This special time will salute the 300,000 persons who operate and work in the drycleaning establishments.

Just like we are the best-fed nation, we too are the best-groomed people in the world. Many thanks go to the hard-working people in the drycleaning field.

Last year we in the United States spent over two and a third billion dollars on drycleaning. This shows that we are very much concerned about cleanliness, good grooming, and good health.

The week of November 16 should give us an opportunity to highlight the importance of good grooming habits in everyday life. It will be an excellent time to say thanks to our drycleaners for helping to keep us well groomed and happy.

CHARGE AGAINST ACLU ANSWERED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members of the other body inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper column in which the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission made various charges against a broad variety of people and organizations. I refer to the remarks of Senator WILLIAMS on page 30333 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28, 1970. It is regrettable that neither Senator WILLIAMS nor the columnist were aware that the Illinois Crime Investigation Commission tends to be a great hip shooter more concerned about the quantity of shots than the accuracy of those shots. I have had a previous experience in which the commission listed the names of members of SDS chapter at a high school which never had an SDS chapter. The commission has since acknowledged its error.

In the present instance, the article which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD suggests that the American Civil Liberties Union—ACLU—contributed moneys to the SDS. It turns out, as a letter from the commission acknowledges, that the ACLU did not make such a contribution, and that in fact the ACLU specifically condemned the violence of the SDS demonstrators.

Unfortunately, the retraction never catches up with the charge. Fortunately the ACLU needs no defense from me in its zealous and meticulous protection of our civil rights, whether they are being attacked by columnists to the right of them or communists to the left of them.

The correspondence of which I speak follows:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Chicago, Ill., October 5, 1970.

Congressman ABNER J. MIKVA,

DEAR Cong. MIKVA: Enclosed is a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 28, in which—as you notice—Mr. Williams of Delaware places a column by Henry J. Taylor into the record, reporting on the Illinois Crime Commission's Report, including an inference that the ACLU contributed funds to the rioters.

The ICC never did bother to check why the money appeared in the SDS bank account; however, when we brought it to their attention, they did send us the enclosed retraction. Can this be gotten into the record?

Sincerely yours,

JAY A. MILLER,
Executive Director.

ILLINOIS CRIME INVESTIGATING COMMISSION,
July 31, 1970.

To: All recipients of the April, 1970 S.D.S. Report

From: Charles Siragusa, Executive Director

Subject: Clarification of S.D.S. Financial Data

Your attention is referred to the Commission's April Report on the Students for a Democratic Society. The section on S.D.S. Bank Deposits contains the following paragraph on page 641:

"Included in the deposits were checks received from such organizations as The Young Socialist Alliance, The Michigan S.D.S., RESIST (an anti-draft organization located in Cambridge, Massachusetts), CORE, The Liberation News Services (the largest of the militant press news services) *and The American Civil Liberties Union . . .*" (Emphasis supplied.)

The Commission acknowledges that ACLU check was not a contribution.

The check referred to above was payable to the Students for a Democratic Society in the amount of $313.90. The check grew out of courtesy by the American Civil Liberties Union, Illinois Division, to attorneys representing individuals arrested during the activities of the October weekend of S.D.S. turmoil, permitting the use of its telephones to contact families of defendants so they might be informed of the arrests and the amount of bail. The ACLU insisted upon and received a $500 advance deposit to guarantee payment of phone bills arising from those calls. Subsequently, when the ACLU received their telephone bill for the period in question they deducted $186.10 from the deposit to pay for the calls made on behalf of jailed defendants and returned the $313.90 representing the unused portion.

It is noted that in the week following the S.D.S. Weatherman Riots in Chicago last October, the ACLU wrote letters to Mayor Daley and Police Superintendent Conlisk attacking the violence of the demonstrators and complimenting the conduct of the Chicago Police.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES SIRAGUSA,
Executive Director.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF POLITICAL BROADCASTING

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto yesterday of legislation that would limit expenditures for television and radio in future political campaigns was a blatantly political act. It is tragic. The legislation rejected had widespread support from both sides of the aisle. Distinguished members from both parties recognized the need to protect the political system from the dangers of manipulation by rich candidates through saturation radio and television techniques.

This veto reflects the utmost cynicism about political office on the part of the President. This veto can only be considered an admission by the White House that the President is wedded to the political concept which is increasingly infecting our body politic—that political office belongs exclusively to the rich.

It is ironic that wealthy candidates' campaign coffers are overflowing, while the rest of those running for office are struggling to be seen and heard on the Nation's airwaves in spite of the well-heeled competition. But more importantly, this veto violates the most fundamental principle of American democracy—that every man has a right to run for office, regardless of wealth. This veto will affect the people's right to know campaign issues objectively through full presentation of all pertinent facts.

The Political Broadcasting Act would have permanently suspended section 315(a) of the Communications Act for the Presidential and Vice Presidential election. This means that the television networks in 1972 would be able to sponsor debates between major candidates for President and Vice President, similar to the ones that were held in 1960. This veto denies American voters the opportunity to compare and evaluate the major presidential candidates by this method in open debate.

CONGRESSMAN CHESTER MIZE, REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS OF THE SECOND DISTRICT OF KANSAS

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition in the second district of Kansas for the Representative to make a report to his constituency during the month of October. As we begin the recess prior to the election, I am mailing to each postal patron in the second district of Kansas my observations on the work of the second session of the 91st Congress as it applies to the major issues of the day, plus an explanation as to why I voted as I did on certain bills, and finally, a list of the bills I voted for or against. In a capsulized summary of this kind it is not possible to cover all of the activities of the session, nor all of my activities. I have touched on the priority items as I assess them and where more specific information is needed, I will look forward to hearing from these individuals concerned.

I wish to place the Mize report on the second session of the 91st Congress in the RECORD.

The report follows:

OCTOBER 1970: THE REFORM CONGRESS

If one word can be used to describe the motivation of the 91st Congress that word is REFORM. The legislative branch responded to the recommendations of the Administration which had REFORM as its watchword. The groundwork was laid in the first session of the 91st Congress when a comprehensive tax reform measure was enacted into law and the first steps were made toward draft reform. Other far-reaching changes in the institutions and programs of government were proposed and discussed in preparation for the landmark steps to be taken during the Second Session.

Certainly, the reform of the postal system will have to go down as one of the most noteworthy achievements of this Congress. For the first time since its inception this governmental function was taken out of

politics and a businesslike corporation was set up to improve the system of handling the growing volume of mail. The U.S. Postal Service will now take shape on a quasi-government basis with high hopes of upgrading service and eliminating losses.

Everyone agrees the Nation's welfare system is a mess. Welfare reform under the Family Assistance Plan has been adopted by the House as an attempt to getting the disadvantaged off of welfare rolls and on to payrolls.

Reform of the method used to choose the President and Vice President also came in for attention. The Electoral College was scraped by the House in favor of a system of direct election. This action may or may not be upheld in the Senate. It was the subject of extended debate when this report was written.

AND MORE REFORMS

The House took action on more reforms during the Second Session of the 91st Congress. Another step was made toward home rule for the District of Columbia. Congress approved a non-voting delegate for the District, and it is expected this will eventually lead to full representation in both the House and Senate. Social Security reforms were also adopted by the House and are expected to be signed into law by the time the 91st Congress adjourns. Of great significance is the fact the House finally got around to reforming its own procedures. In one of the major achievements of the 91st Congress, Legislative Reform was approved. For the first time in a quarter of a century, the House modernized the way it conducts its business and did away with much of the secrecy which has interfered with the people's right to know.

HOW YOUR CONGRESSMAN VOTED ON REFORM

Reform to make the government more effective and responsive was certainly long overdue. I supported the action the House took in all of these areas although I did not always agree with the method selected to carry out the changes. I voted *for* Postal Reform, Legislative Reform, Reform of the Social Security program and Reform of the D.C. Government. I voted *against* adoption of the Family Assistance Plan as it was presented in the House. I do not agree with the guaranteed annual wage principle, nor the extension of the program to bring more people onto the welfare rolls. The more prudent approach, as I see it, would be to give this plan a thorough testing in selected areas. I agree that the Electoral College system needs to have some safeguards incorporated into it to more accurately reflect the will of the voters, but I don't think the system should be abandoned altogether. I voted *against* Electoral Reform because I felt the District plan would retain what is good in the Electoral College and still make the necessary changes to insure the final outcome reflects the will of the majority.

VIETNAM AND THE ECONOMY

This is the sixth annual report I have made to my constituents during the time I have been in Congress. In each of the preceding reports, I have listed the Viet Nam conflict and inflation at home as the overriding issues. Unfortunately, I could not report, prior to this year, a great deal of progress in dealing with either. This year of 1970, however, has been a time when we have seen the war wind down in Southeast Asia and when many of the economic signs point to an easing of inflationary pressures. Our troops are being withdrawn on schedule, and in some instances, ahead of schedule. The prospects are good for the troop withdrawal rate to be increased. The reduction in the level of the conflict should have a favorable influence on the Peace talks in Paris. Congress has taken a stronger voice during this Second Session in an effort to mold policy. The apparent result has been to move the American people, the Congress and the Administration closer to an understanding on what has been the main issue all along—how best to discontinue the war.

Although the Congress voted standby authority to put wage and price controls into effect, the Administration's policies of reducing Federal expenditures and tightening up on the flow of money appear to have stemmed the inflationary tide. Interest rates are coming down, new housing starts are increasing and the increase in the cost of living is slowing. Changing from a wartime to a peacetime economy has brought about some dislocations in employment but these have been held to a minimum, and affect only certain areas of the country.

TOWARD A BETTER ENVIRONMENT

The Second Session of the 91st Congress has continued to build on the start which was made in 1969 toward the rescue of the environment from man-made pollution. This year we have approved legislation to establish a Population Growth Commission. We enacted the Solid Waste Disposal Act; we amended the Clean Air Act and we set up the Environmental Quality Education Act. We approved funds for the operation of programs already in existence to fight air and water pollution. The Environmental Decade is off to a good start; the Administration and the Congress are cooperating in the all-out fight against pollution.

VOTES ON MAJOR ISSUES VOTED FOR

Population Growth Commission.
District of Columbia Crime Bill.
Railroad Retirement Adjustments.
Reorganization of Bureau of Budget.
Social Security Adjustments.
Financial Disclosure for Members.
Amendments to Clean Air Act.
Postal Reform.
Restoration of Golden Eagle Passport.
Solid Waste Disposal Act.
Elementary and Secondary Education.
Prohibition of Obscene Mail.
Emergency Home Finance Act.
Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Act.
Environmental Quality Education Act.
Agriculture Act of 1970.
Equal Rights for Women.
Legislative Reorganization Act.

VOTED AGAINST

Guaranteed Annual Income.
Youth Conservation Corps.
Product Promotion.
International Travel Act.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE LEAA'S GRANT PROGRAMS

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard W. Velde, associate administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration appeared yesterday before the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee. He presented an excellent statement in which he thoroughly discussed the grant programs of the LEAA. Both the method and direction of the agency's allocation have been criticized recently and I believe Mr. Velde has provided very valuable information which rebuts those allegations of inefficiency.

Crime is a widely debated topic which is receiving increasing legislative attention. While agreement is universal that we must act to assure the safety of the public, we are not in agreement about the most efficient means of disbursing funds to fight crime. Mr. Velde's statement shows convincingly that a block grant program should continue to be the primary vehicle for Federal aid to local law enforcement projects. It follows:

STATEMENT BY RICHARD W. VELDE, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 12, 1970

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee today to discuss the program of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Since its beginning slightly more than two years ago, LEAA has been the object of intense interest and considerable scrutiny, by both the public and private sectors.

Such attention is not only proper, but in a sense it is mandatory. Part of the reason is that LEAA awards in grants and contracts large amounts of funds. They are public funds, and the public has a right to know whether they are judiciously used and whether maximum value is extracted from every dollar.

But there is another reason, and it may be even more important. LEAA was created by Congress to provide financial and technical assistance to help improve the nation's entire criminal justice system at the state and local level. The reduction of crime and the improvement of law enforcement comprise one of the nation's most urgent domestic priorities.

It is a demanding and complex task. It also is one of considerable sensitivity, because the rights of people are involved—the rights of our citizens to be free from crime and the fear of crime, the rights of the people to be properly served by their criminal justice system, the rights of those who are defendants or convicted offenders to be treated fairly and humanely.

The nation's criminal justice system has long been in a state of disrepair, in large measure because there has been deep apathy on the part of both the public and public officials for decades. That apathy is ending, as it should, for lasting improvements in crime control can be fashioned only if there is deep-rooted and broad commitment to the enormous task of making this society safe and just for all of its citizens.

During the past two years, there has been both interest in and study of the LEAA program by the general public, public service organizations, public officials and their organizations, criminal justice officials, and the Congress. We not only welcome all scrutiny and criticisms of the LEAA program, but we encourage it as well. In addition, we pay attention.

Your Subcommittee, in inviting me to testify today, indicated it had questions involving a number of the areas embraced by LEAA's operations. I am pleased to respond and to answer all of the questions—some in this prepared statement, others in the questions and answers you indicated would follow my formal remarks.

Because of your Subcommittee's interest in LEAA, we have given considerable thought on how to best relay to you the facts about the crime control program and how to convey our views on those areas which seem of greatest significance.

With your permission, I would like to deal, in part, with a number of criticisms that have been made of the LEAA program.

It has been alleged, for instance, that block grants to the states were being dissipated because LEAA had not assumed a leadership role in guiding expenditures; LEAA had allowed too much money to be spent on police programs; states involved the community to a very small extent in preparation and devel-

opment of programs to reduce crime. While we welcome criticisms, we feel those conclusions are inaccurate.

To put the total LEAA program in perspective, I think it is important to note that the first year budget, for fiscal 1969, was only $63 million—certainly not enough to meet the needs of all parts of the criminal justice system across the country, no matter how it was stretched. In addition, it should be remembered that this program began from scratch in fiscal 1969. Every state had to create a state planning agency, and then work in cooperation with its city and county governments to first draft statewide criminal justice improvement programs and then to implement them. When we consider this had to be done in every state, in a matter of months, it is clear it was a complex and demanding task. It also must be stressed that these things were accomplished, and the nationwide crime control program became a reality in its first year of operations.

In addition, fiscal 1969 was the year in which several months passed before Administrators were appointed and LEAA actually went into operation. We have never denied that this late start caused problems. We have never denied that because the police were equipped to make immediate requests they often received a larger share of their state's grant money from the state planning council than might have been the case had the council been operating for longer, had more experience or had more time. We never denied that other areas such as corrections and courts posed more difficult problems for criminal justice planners and were slower in seeking funds. We never denied the fact that a number of large cities were very slow to request funds from their state councils and therefore received inadequate funding, even though they often got everything they asked for. We never denied those problems existed—but we set out vigorously to correct them at the end of fiscal 1969.

We believe we made substantial progress in fiscal 1970 in dealing with those problems. Fiscal 1970 was not only the first full year of operation for LEAA, but also was a year during which our funding level was more than four times as great as in that first difficult year—a total of $268 million. In fact, as far as action grants are concerned, fiscal 1970 funding was nearly seven times as great as fiscal 1969—$215 million compared to $29 million. We would be the first to admit that fiscal 1969 funding, no matter how carefully distributed, was grossly inadequate when compared to the nation's criminal justice needs.

It has been alleged that the vast bulk of LEAA's funds have gone for police, with corrections and juvenile programs being virtually ignored. But for fiscal 1970, nothing could be farther from the truth. Far from ignoring corrections, during fiscal 1970, LEAA made improvement in the corrections area its major priority. The result we feel was an outstanding success. The facts are:

—In fiscal 1970 we doubled the percentage of state block action grants devoted to corrections programs, from 13.5 percent to 27 percent.

—In dollar terms that improvement was even more striking. We estimate that as a result of later re-programming, states may have devoted only $2 million of fiscal 1969 funds to corrections programs. In fiscal 1970, if discretionary funding, technical assistance and corrections-related programs such as juvenile delinquency prevention are included, the total spending for corrections programs was more than $68 million, more than 30 times the amount in fiscal 1969.

—LEAA has a great concern about juvenile delinquency programs. We're proud of the fact that of that $68 million total, some $33 million went to fund various juvenile delinquency programs, substantially more than the total amount of money distributed in block action grants to states during fiscal 1969.

—We are concerned over recidivism, for our corrections institutions simply don't correct. LEAA thus has put great emphasis on community-based programs to rehabilitate offenders, to get them back into the community as quickly as possible in a constructive way. Of that $68 million for corrections-related programs in fiscal 1970, some $22 million went for these various types of community-based corrections programs.

Last November, President Nixon directed Attorney General Mitchell to move immediately to mobilize federal resources to improve the national corrections situation. Corrections in the United States today is inhuman, it is a national disgrace and finally, I believe that many corrections institutions breed crime instead of rehabilitating prisoners. I am particularly proud of LEAA's record in corrections during fiscal 1970. There is much work that remains to be done. But I think that we have certainly met our obligations head on, and I believe that the corrections improvement program funded by LEAA in fiscal 1970 represents our outstanding achievement in that year.

Police programs occupied a large share of the money spent by states from their block action grants during fiscal 1969. This was the result of a number of factors including the very short time for preparation of grant requests, the fact that planning agencies were just getting organized and the fact that the police were probably better equipped than any other area to make specific requests. As a result some 75 percent of the state block action money in fiscal 1969 went for police programs.

However, it is very significant that during fiscal 1970 the percentage fell from 75 to 51 percent of state block action grant money devoted to police programs. That drop was directly the result of our emphasis on corrections as well as other factors. This year, fiscal 1971, we intend to emphasize court programs without letting up our pressure on corrections and so it's quite possible that the police share of state block action grant money might fall even lower.

Let me also stress that those figures do not include discretionary action grants—one of the best measures of LEAA leadership since LEAA itself determines how this money will be spent. In fiscal 1970, police programs accounted for only 31 percent of the $32 million LEAA distributed in discretionary grants.

Total federal, state and local expenditures for the criminal justice system in the United States are estimated at roughly $6.5 billion. Of this amount it has been estimated that roughly 67 percent goes to the police. Against that 67 percent figure nationwide, I believe that the 51 percent and 31 percent police program expenditure levels for LEAA in fiscal 1970 substantially refute any charge that LEAA overemphasizes police programs.

At the same time, LEAA certainly is not downgrading the importance of police, or ignoring their needs. We are well aware that police are the most important means of curbing crime, and as such have responsibility for performing a major service in the community. We are working with the police to develop programs which will provide real improvement and innovation. In the fiscal 1970 plans, for instance, less than 25 percent of the police program block action money was earmarked by the states for equipment purchases—and more than half of that was for communications equipment.

It has been alleged that LEAA has given inadequate attention to the needs of cities with urgent crime problems. This committee has received testimony earlier from a distinguished police chief in which an eloquent plea was made for more funds for police equipment and training. I can assure this committee that LEAA and the states will continue to be responsive to these basic needs.

There have been problems in the crime control program. No nationwide effort in a field as complex as criminal justice could escape having some difficulties. But we have been aware of them and have moved promptly to resolve them. We have shared the concern that large cities with urgent crime problems might not receive enough action funds from state block grants, for fighting crime in the cities is a priority. Preliminary results of the Fiscal 1969 expenditures of block grants indicate that 60 percent of all action funds distributed by states to local government went to the nation's 411 cities of over 50,000 population. Those 411 cities contain less than 40 percent of the nation's population and about 62 percent of its serious crimes. Fund usage was running in nearly direct proportion to incidence of crime. It must be noted that the 60 percent figure includes only direct grants to cities and counties. The percentage would be larger if it included programs funded separately which are of substantial benefit to cities—for instance, programs to improve corrections and courts, which normally are operated by states but into which the cities send the bulk of offenders. There have been instances of inadequate participation by large cities. In some instances, states did not move quickly enough in sub-granting funds, but this is being resolved. In other instances, cities themselves did not take needed initiatives, but we are taking special efforts to help them become fully involved. Most of the criticism of large cities stemmed from the funds they received from the fiscal 1969 budget—which was only $63 million and included only $25 million in block action grants. That was not enough to satisfy the needs of anybody, no matter how it was stretched.

With the much larger budgets of last year and this year, we are confident the needs of the cities will be met adequately. Some responsibility for delay must also be borne by the federal government. No implementing agency was established by the prior administration until four months after the Safe Streets Act became law.

In our own Annual Report we published a table showing that the 15 cities with the highest crime index in the United States had, on the average, only about 44 percent of the crime in their state and received, on the average, only about 28 percent of the state block action grants distributed by the state councils to the communities in their states. Those were fiscal 1969 figures, and we all agree they are not good enough. Since the states have not distributed all their fiscal 1970 money, comparable figures for last year are not yet available.

I think it is important, however, to point out that a number of the cities which did not receive adequate funding did not receive it because they did not ask for it. A great deal was heard last Spring about the city in Indiana which received only a polaroid camera and a fingerprint kit. The simple fact is that at the time this was made public, that was all the city has asked for.

Furthermore, city requests are often in the police area, since this is where they most frequently feel the pinch. Corrections programs are almost always state or county run. Therefore, if LEAA state block action grant money is spent on corrections, while the cities may receive the principal benefits, LEAA corrections money would not go directly to those cities.

LEAA considers adequate funds to the cities very important. Apart from urging state criminal justice councils to make this a matter of primary concern, LEAA set aside $11 million—more than a third of its total discretionary funds for fiscal 1970—solely for programs to help the large cities. Even in cases where direct funds had been given to

cities through LEAA discretionary grants, some projects were still not started at the local level after six months. LEAA technical assistance efforts are available to cities on request. Furthermore, we recently made an award of almost a quarter of a million dollars to the League of Cities and the Conference of Mayors to find ways to help the nation's largest cities take advantage of the opportunities available to them under LEAA programs.

We have managed, in less than two years, to create and coordinate a nationwide criminal justice planning system, which has mounted a comprehensive attack on crime in every state and every major city in the United States. Certainly it will be some time before the results can be seen, but we believe the promptness with which this program took hold, and the breadth of response, compares favorably with almost any other federal grant program.

It has been alleged that LEAA has failed to exert proper leadership in the crime control program. But if anyone thinks that the share of action grants devoted to corrections was doubled without leadership from Washington they simply don't understand how state criminal justice programs operate. Striking evidence of LEAA leadership can be seen by comparing the fiscal 1969 plans submitted by all the state agencies with the fiscal 1970 plans. It isn't merely that the 1970 plans are more sophisticated. They are far more detailed, far more specific, far more insightful, far more comprehensive, far more integrated. At the same time, there is room for increased LEAA leadership in the future, and we intend to take advantage of it.

It must be remembered that the intent of Congress, and overwhelming so, is that the Federal government be a partner, not a dictator, in assisting states and local governments in improving law enforcement.

Critics often have completely ignored important parts of the LEAA program—including the discretionary grant program, the academic assistance program, and the research program carried out by LEAA's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. During fiscal 1970, funds for those areas totaled approximately $60 million—more than twice the amount of money spent in fiscal 1969 on the entire block action grant program.

During fiscal 1970: LEAA made 426 discretionary grants totaling $32 million (compared to 29 discretionary grants totaling $4.2 million in fiscal 1969.)

LEAA for the first time had appropriations of $1.2 million for technical assistance, of which more than a third, about $410,000, went for technical assistance in the area of corrections. Examples of other technical assistance expenditures included $228,000 for preparation and dissemination of technical assistance materials on bombs, bomb threats and related police procedures; and $128,000 to support a study of campus disorders.

LEAA spent $18 million for academic assistance to help finance college studies for some 50,000 persons—some 43,000 criminal justice personnel, and 7,000 students preparing for criminal justice careers.

The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice used its appropriation of $7.5 million to support more than 100 research and development projects in the areas of crime prevention, police operations, courts, prosecution, and prisoner rehabilitation.

During fiscal 1970, LEAA established the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service with an appropriation from Congress of $1 million. One of the projects undertaken by the Service was Project SEARCH: a System for Electronic Analysis and Retrieval of Criminal Histories. This project involves 15 states in a cooperative effort to pool information on criminal histories by establishing computerized information systems connected to a central coordinating point.

I also would like to submit, for the Committee's record, a copy of LEAA's Annual Report for Fiscal 1970, which covers our program in great detail.

From this summary, I hope a more accurate perspective has emerged regarding a number of key points in the LEAA program. Much already has been accomplished, thanks in large measure to the untiring efforts of state planning agencies and both criminal justice personnel and public officials at the local and state levels. However, much remains to be done. We cannot be content until the crime rates begin to drop. And not even then, for crime must be reduced to the absolute minimum, and we must greatly enhance the efficiency and fairness of the entire criminal justice system.

It is impossible to predict when crime rates might begin to decline nationally. But I believe that day will come, perhaps sooner than many of us suspect. Let me cite one example of what a dedicated, progressive police department can accomplish. Washington, D.C., recently reported a substantial reduction in its monthly crime rate—the first one in more than four years. Metropolitan Police Chief Wilson gave most of the credit for this reduction to two programs, increasing the number of police on the street and the use of methadone to control drug addiction. LEAA last year gave the District some $2 million—more than twice its total block action grant—solely to help fund these two important programs.

Some who have examined LEAA have criticized the fact so much of LEAA's action funds have gone for police programs. I have tried to make it clear that the LEAA program is dealing with the comprehensive improvement of the entire criminal justice system, and is making every effort to make certain that this mandate of Congress is carried out so that police, courts, and corrections have their proper share of funds.

But I would like to take a moment to discuss those criticisms of aid to police. For the most part, the criticisms have been broadgauge—too much money has gone for police, and there is always the implication that the bulk of police funds have gone for equipment.

The police comprise the overwhelming bulk of the criminal justice system. Their needs are enormous. In addition, they comprise the first line of efforts in crime prevention and crime reduction. It will do little lasting good to improve the fairness and efficiency of the courts and the rehabilitation efforts of corrections if we fail to give police the aid they need to prevent more crime and apprehend more suspects.

The critics often overlook the fact that aid for police involves a variety of vital programs. Equipment certainly is important—and an examination of equipment purchases shows heavy emphasis on communications equipment. This type of gear, as well as other kinds of equipment, is designed to permit police to respond faster and more efficiently to crime, and to protect the lives of policemen.

Studies have shown, for instance, that the faster police arrive at the scene of a crime, the greater chance they have of solving it. Heavy emphasis has been placed by police on training—from the rookie through the patrolman through the middle and upper-level command ranks. The training will not only make police more effective, it will make them fairer in their contacts with citizens. Emphasis has been placed on prevention and control of civil disorders—with prevention programs and training of personnel as priorities. Development of better relations with minority groups has also been given major attention, both through disorders prevention campaigns and through enhanced police-community relations programs. Organized crime control is another area of prime concern. Organized crime is not only a law enforcement problem, but in ghetto areas is a civil rights problem as well—for organized crime preys on the poor and disadvantaged.

Some of those who have examined the LEAA program seem to forget what the Congress said in creating the new national crime control program. Congress decided, first of all, that law enforcement is and must be primarily a local and state responsibility. Congress decided that the LEAA program is not one where the federal government implants its will on law enforcement throughout the country or begins development of a federal police force. Rather, the LEAA program is designed to give financial and technical assistance to state and local governments. It is up to those state and local governments to not only contribute much of the money for improvement programs, but bear the overwhelming burden of work as well.

The LEAA program is basically a block grant program. State and local governments set their own priorities, develop their own programs. Then each state receives a block action grant to carry out its statewide improvement plan, and gives most of the block grant funds to its local units of government. This is a partnership program. We work cooperatively with state and local governments to develop programs and program directions we feel are important—as in the area of corrections, as I cited earlier. But we do not dictate to state and local governments, and anybody who thinks we should had better go back and read Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. Congress did not intend this to be a program of Federal dictation.

Concern also has been voiced that planning funds have been inadequate thus far in the program. All of the planning funds are given to the states in block grants, based upon population. States use these funds, in cooperation with their units of local government, to help draft and implement statewide law enforcement improvement programs and to help pay administrative costs of the state planning agencies. In the first year of the LEAA program, planning grants totaled $19 million, compared to $25 million for block action grants. In fiscal 1970, planning grants were $21 million, compared to $182 million in block action funds. Our proposal for fiscal 1971 calls for $26 million in planning funds, some $350 million for block action grants. We feel the planning funds are adequate. Planning is of great importance, but a good base already has been created and the funds proposed are adequate to continue the work. I might add here that LEAA plans to request more funds for planning in fiscal 1972.

As I indicated earlier, we feel that plans submitted to LEAA so far have been generally of good quality. In the program's first year, it was something of a wonder that states were able to submit plans at all. Despite whatever other problems they may have had, the first-year plans were brutally candid in discussing shortcomings of the states' criminal justice systems. For fiscal 1970, we required the states to plan for more than one year—to begin development of long-range plans and goals. Generally, the long-range planning work was not as adequate as we felt it should have been. The third round of plans will be submitted to LEAA by next December 31. We have worked closely with the states to improve planning and we expect these next plans to be of uniformly high quality.

I would like to turn now to a discussion in some detail of two other important aspects of the LEAA program—The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, and the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.

The National Institute is the research and development arm of LEAA. In fiscal 1970, the Institute had a budget of $7.5 million, and Congress has appropriated the same amount for this year. We do not feel that is enough, but Congress has indicated that it will permit us to request re-programming of some funds if we feel they can be adequately utilized by the Institute this year.

In many ways, police and courts and corrections all are still operating in the 19th century. We must bring them fully into the 20th century, and enable them to use the benefits of science and technology. Three basic elements are needed for intelligent research and development: first, there must be a solid, broad base of research projects, being done in cooperation with the states, that are built on a master plan of long-range goals; second, there must be great emphasis on technology transfer, applying to criminal justice the techniques and equipment already developed by private industry, the space program, and the Department of Defense (it will do us no good to simply go on re-inventing the wheel); and third, there must be impartial evaluations of the state of the criminal justice system today, its needs, and what is being done to meet them.

The federal government is a later-starter in regard to criminal justice research, both in terms of money and years. To cite only one example, the Department of Agriculture has been conducting agricultural research since 1862—the year the agency was created. Even before that—as far back as 1828—the old patent office conducted agricultural research. This fiscal year the Agriculture Department's pending budget request contains $255.2 million for research, and since 1862 it has spent $4 billion on research. That research and development has been a key factor in this nation's incredible productivity in foodstuffs. Research for criminal justice—properly funded and directed—could provide comparable results, and I believe it could be done in a fairly short time.

During the past fiscal year, the National Institute supported more than 100 research and development projects in the area of crime prevention, police operations, court procedures, and correctional methods.

One of the Institute's most promising efforts is the Pilot Cities Program, which emphasizes system-wide improvement of all criminal justice operations—police, courts, and corrections—in cities and metropolitan areas.

Pilot cities are being established throughout the country to test the impact of such across-the-board improvements. San Jose and Santa Clara County, California, and Dayton and Montgomery County, Ohio, are the first pilot sites selected for the program. Within the next two years, five additional municipalities will be selected. Eventually, one pilot program will be located in each of LEAA's seven regions.

There are several criteria for selecting pilot cities. One of the most important is size. The municipality must be large enough to have problems of street crime, drug addiction, drunkenness, and delinquency, yet small enough that a limited investment of LEAA funds can produce measurable improvement.

In each pilot city, a research team, in cooperation with law enforcement and community officials, studies criminal justice operations and identifies areas for improvement. A comprehensive group of action programs aimed at basic system-wide improvement is then designed and carried out. In this way, the pilot cities program will test the performance of the best criminal justice system that current knowledge and technology can offer.

LEAA's Office of Law Enforcement Programs is collaborating with the Institute on the program and is the principal source of funding for action programs. Nearly $1 million in LEAA funds has gone to this program so far.

The Institute is sponsoring a number of projects to improve police capabilities. One priority is better police communications. We are well on our way to developing a small, reliable transceiver radio which can provide communications for policemen away from the patrol car. The Institute has issued a request for proposals, and over 100 firms are competing for funding to build the best version, both technically and economically.

Other projects are developing robbery and burglary alarm systems linked directly to police communications centers.

Improvements in weapons systems have long been requested by many police officials. With Institute support, the International Association of Chiefs of Police has established a Police Weapons Center to conduct research and dissemination of information regarding police weapons—including nonlethal weapons. The Center will also provide information on bomb disposal equipment—one of a number of Institute projects designed to meet this growing threat to public safety. Other Institute efforts are being directed toward development of truly effective equipment and systems to locate, identify, neutralize and dispose of hidden explosive devices.

To help police control the widespread use of narcotics, the Institute is working on two projects to develop equipment capable of detecting hidden quantities of heroin.

The Institute's research efforts go beyond developing new equipment, however, crime prevention is a major focus of research supported by the Institute.

The University of California at Davis is using a $148,121 grant to develop effective methods for preventing and controlling robbery, muggings, and other forms of attacks on the person. Other projects are studying ways to make residences and commercial establishments less susceptible to robbery, burglary, and vandalism. The theory behind these projects is that architectural and environmental design can enhance the security of homes and businesses.

In corrections and rehabilitation programs, the Institute has focused on such areas as prison architecture, work-release, and alternatives to incarceration.

Reducing court delay, which many experts view as a crucial element in controlling crime, is a primary aim of several Institute projects. Notre Dame University received $200,000 for an operations research study of courts in Illinois and Indiana. To assist in the training of local prosecutors, the Institute granted $290,000 to the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility to create special education programs in law schools and prosecutors' offices.

To develop sound improvement programs, we need sound planning programs. But to develop sound planning, we need comprehensive and reliable information and statistics on every part of the criminal justice system. Today, that information simply does not exist on a national scale. Record keeping is fragmented, at best, and not uniform. Some cities and states keep good records, but only on some portions of the system. Others keep hardly any reliable statistics. We don't even know for sure how much crime there is, or how many ex-offenders commit new crimes after release from prison.

The Uniform Crime Reports of the FBI represents the greatest advance to date in collecting information about crime. It is the best that exists. But it is forced to rely on the reports submitted to it by police departments—and some departments do not report all the necessary information, and many don't report at all.

What is the cost of crime to victims? The costs of prevention and control? We must know in order to measure—in dollars—the value of various anti-crime efforts.

How many offenders are repeaters and with what frequency? What are the correlations with such factors as age, seriousness of crime, length of sentence? We must know so we may make sound decisions about rehabilitation programs.

There is such a dearth of information that no one knows the aggregate expenditures for criminal justice activities in this country. Few state law enforcement officials can say positively how many jails are in their states. Courts do not have data about the amount of time required to process criminal cases, average sentences, or even on their own personnel.

To develop a sound, nation-wide criminal justice data system we have created the Information and Statistics Service in LEAA.

LEAA is spearheading programs to create or improve information and statistics gathering. The agency has done this by earmarking substantial portions of its discretionary action funds for such programs, and by creating the Information and Statistic Service (NCJISS), which was established last year. This was a million-dollar program in fiscal 1970, and its requested budget this year is $4 million.

NCJISS helps states and local communities develop statistical systems and it guides the states in using computer and information systems. In essence, it is providing the national leadership that has been critically needed.

For example, NCJISS has begun pre-tests for a series of three surveys on crime victims. These surveys will examine the individual as a victim, businesses as victims, and governments as victims and will provide estimates on such matters as victims' characteristics, geographical distribution of crime, the number of crimes being committed.

As part of this effort, NCJISS is negotiating with the Census Bureau to include questions about victim experience in the Bureau's Quarterly Household Survey, conducted in January and July, 1971. If this is arranged, then this will be the first attempt to collect hard data on crime incidence at the national level. Then, in 1972, NCJISS expects to begin its extensive National Victimization Survey.

The important national survey of jails has just been completed and will soon be released. This survey report contains a wealth of information on jail facilities and prisoners.

Under another NCJISS project, the Census Bureau is preparing a directory of criminal justice agencies in the United States. The LEAA will publish this directory in March.

The LEAA has also arranged for the Census Bureau to expand its collection of statistics on criminal justice expenditures and employment. In December, when the Bureau publishes the annual compilation—*Employment and Expenditures in Criminal Justice for Fiscal 1969*—data on prosecution and indigent defense will be included for the first time.

The first step in LEAA's long range goal of developing national court statistics is a NCJISS survey of court organization. The initial phase will cover about 8,000 court systems in the nation—trial courts, courts of general jurisdiction, state appellate courts, courts of limited jurisdiction. An inter-agency agreement to conduct this survey is now pending; the LEAA expects to complete this agreement shortly so that it may begin the survey and finish it by the end of 1971.

The agency has already begun development of the first module of what will become a management information system for the LEAA itself. This is an important project for it will enable the LEAA to manage and monitor its rapidly growing grants-in-aid more effectively—not only improving the fol-

low-through on individual grants but eliminating possible duplication or waste in the various grants.

The LEAA is establishing a criminal justice reference service. Among the information services now available there are wide gaps in coverage and in quality. LEAA's new service will be a service-oriented system filling the information needs of the entire law enforcement and criminal justice community—police, courts, corrections, prosecution, probation and parole. The National Institute has awarded a grant to George Washington University to define potential users and to assist in planning the new service. The University will complete this project in January.

NCJIIS' statistical efforts figure importantly in the National Institute's pilot cities projects. The incidence of crime is being measured by NCJIIS in these cities—a "before" and "after" project that will help determine the effectiveness of the demonstrations.

One of the most important LEAA efforts is encouraging the development of information systems which will serve the state's operational needs while providing—as a by-product—the required statistics. The LEAA surveyed the 50 states to assess the present status of existing systems, and will be guided by this data in further advising and assisting the states.

A number of prototype systems are being developed, for example, the public safety information sub-system in Long Beach, California, that is part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Municipal Information Systems Project.

The most significant of all such information system projects, of course, is Project SEARCH—System for the Electronic Analysis and Retrieval of Criminal Histories. SEARCH is designed to give criminal justice agencies needed information on offenders in a matter of seconds. It contains data on arrests, results of trials, prison sentences, etc. Using such a system, a state holding a suspect could query a central point, find out whether there is information on the person, and which state or states has it. The LEAA has thus far financed the project with some $1.5 million. SEARCH is being demonstrated by the project states—a demonstration that will continue through December—and the preliminary evaluation indicates that every goal of the demonstration has either been met or exceed. The 15 project states have made the decision to go operational. A system embracing all 50 states is essential.

In the SEARCH project, you see a cornerstone of information and statistics system for criminal justice. The development of this system is a landmark, auguring well for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted in this statement to discuss candidly many of the criticisms that have been raised about LEAA and to discuss a number of key parts of the program which often are overlooked. I would now be pleased to answer any questions.

SEX ON THE STAGE

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, during the next few weeks, a lot of the Members of this body are going to be talking about the state of American morality today. For an example of just how low our standards have shrunk, I call to your attention an article in the Washington Post the other day entitled "Sex on the Stage."

I do not know what can be said about this article that won't automatically come to mind anyway. The general permissiveness of the Spock generation; the appointment of Supreme Court Judges with greater devotion to leftwing causes than to moral principles and constitutional precepts; public officials who used the divisions among our people for their own personal gain and thereby widening those gulfs—all of these things have led this country almost beyond the point of no return.

How can the gaps between the races and the generations be closed when it is so profitable for those on both sides to continue the hate? Can American democracy survive some of the tortured decisions of the courts? Or, in this instance, has the general morality of our Nation sunk so low that there is little left that is worth preserving in any event?

Perhaps this is the real issue in the November elections. The article follows:

SEX ON THE STAGE

(By David Shaw)

In the last two months, four bars and three movie theaters in Los Angeles County and a bar and a movie theater in San Francisco have begun staging live, unsimulated sexual intercourse for their audiences.

Despite mounting arrests, the number of shows is growing.

The shows may be tamed down for a few days after repeated arrests or, as this week, after an adverse lower court decision, but each time they resume their ranks have swollen—another bottomless bar has gone to simulated sex or a simulated sex show is no longer simulated.

"In six months, at most," predicted one Los Angeles bar-owner, "there'll be 10 or 15 shows here and even more in San Francisco. And none of them will be simulated or just suggestive dancing.

Money is the answer most of the owners give to the question "Why?"

"I had a regular beer bar here, 45 cents for a bottle of beer that cost me about 15 cents," said one Los Angeles bar owner. "I was lucky if I took in $80 a night.

"Now I've got a couple on stage. I charge $1.25 for a glass of tap beer that probably costs me a nickel. I get a $3 cover charge and on a bad night, I take in $500 to $600."

There is little question that the live sex shows now available are the inevitable result of the trend that began in San Francisco's North Beach in 1964.

The first bare-bosom waitresses there were the forerunners of a whole range of erotic entertainment—from "Hair" and "Oh! Calcutta" to "I am Curious (Yellow)" and "Pornography in Denmark," as well as topless and bottomless dancers.

Tourists flocked to North Beach, and many overnight fortunes were made.

"It wasn't unsual for a club to take in $4,000 on a week night and $6,000 on a Saturday night," said Voss Berretta, owner of Off-Broadway, perhaps the most successful of the 14 topless-bottomless clubs now in operation within a 3-block stretch of North Beach.

There is an added bonanza in the live love-making business: You don't get just the male trade as in the topless-bottomless business, you also draw women. Several California sex show impresarios report that they play to a great many couples, something they could never do in tamer days.

The prevailing law on obscenity in love performances in California now seems to be the decision by the state Supreme Court earlier this year that the controversial play "The Beard"—which ends in a simulated sex act—is not obscene.

The court said, in effect, that drama is the act of simulation (whether acting out a murder, a laugh or sex act) and that the presentation of these simulations in a theater is protected by First Amendment guarantees of freedom of expression.

More important, the court seemed to say that any sexual activity—even actual, not simulated, sex—that is not otherwise proscribed by the penal code has the same constitutional protection.

Thus, sexual intercourse would be legal; many other sex acts would not be.

There was a catch, however. The performance had to be in a theater to be so protected—and police have decided that bars with makeshift stages are not what the court meant by theaters.

So there have been arrests, hundreds of them, over the last two months.

But in San Francisco's Folies Burlesque, which has a tradition of live shows and a live band in the pit, a couple make love five times a night without fear of arrest.

"It's a theater," said police Lieut. Gerald Shaughnessy. "Our hands are tied."

And, said John Daly of the Los Angeles city attorney's office:

"If they decided to put on a sex show in any legitimate theater, we couldn't stop it."

DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENTS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the question of electoral reform has been batted back and forth in this and the other body for a number of months. As the debate continues, one thing has become quite clear; the trend is toward a modification of the present electoral college and away from direct popular election of the President.

At first, direct popular election was "an idea whose time had come," and all but a few jumped aboard the bandwagon. It was the "Motherhood and the Flag" of the 1970's. But cooler heads have prevailed. Now we look beneath the surface of direct popular election and we see new dangers and pitfalls that were not at first apparent, including the potential end of our entire Federal system.

An indication of this trend reversal can be found in an editorial in the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus, which originally had supported direct popular election. I commend the Herald-Argus on being open-minded enough to change its stand upon closer examination of the facts; many publications would have adamantly stuck to their guns despite the mounting evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this excellent editorial at this point in the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENTS

Tomorrow may prove to be a crucial day in our constitutional history as a nation.

Tomorrow the United States Senate votes on a cloture motion, introduced by the majority leader, which can effectively decide whether the Congress (the House already having acted favorably) will submit to the legislatures of the several states a constitutional amendment abolishing the Electoral College and providing for popular election of U.S. presidents by a 40 per cent plurality, or, lacking that plurality, by a run-off election between the two top contenders.

This newspaper has in the past favored direct election of the president.

As late as May of this year, we reaffirmed that position, but suggested that insistence upon adoption of the direct election proposal in toto—put forward, and still being pressed, by Indiana's own Democratic junior senator, Birch Bayh—might well defeat the possibility of presidential electoral reform altogether for the time being: if not in Congress, in the state legislatures.

In that same editorial last Spring, we asked therefore that consideration be given to two possible politically acceptable alternatives: (1) apportionment of a state's electoral vote along lines of congressional representation; or (2) outright division of a state's electoral vote according to the popular vote for president in that state.

As the debate on this many-faceted question has developed—and it is a problem which troubled the Constitution's framers, even after they had worked out their ingenious "solution," as well as scholars and practical politicians ever since—we have begun to entertain doubts about the wisdom of making any fundamental change at all—at this time.

We do still believe that some urgency exists for constitutional change to provide for prompt and more democratic resolution of the situation in which no presidential candidate wins an absolute majority of the electoral vote.

While the election of "minority" presidents John Quincy Adams, Rutherford B. Hayes and Benjamin Harrison raised no real constitutional crisis per se in the nineteenth century, a repetition of the J. Q. Adams-Andrew Jackson contest of 1824 in the House of Representatives (the last such decision the House was called upon to make) could, in our opinion, conceivably create an intolerable situation against the background of present-day politics and the exacting requirements for continuity of presidential power in a nuclear age.

As to the method of selecting a president in the first instance, however, we have become ambivalent (as were the founding fathers of the Republic for that matter). And in ambivalence there is doubt. And in doubt there arises a serious question—in fact a growing negative conviction—about tampering with the nearly 200-year-old system at all, until more comprehensive study has been undertaken and a more deliberate consensus has been reached.

We say this in the face of the 339 to 70 vote of the House to submit the amendment to the states, and despite support for the change on record from former President Johnson, President Nixon, the American Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, what we believe to be a majority of the mass media, including most newspapers, and what the polls show to be the initial reaction of roughly four-fifths of the American people.

We do in fact find it somewhat alarming—and perhaps symptomatic of the "revolutionary" times in which we live—that so many respected citizens and groups (including—almost—this newspaper, which at least strives for its readers' respect) should be thus stampeded into performing such radical surgery on one of our most vital democratic institutions.

We do not deny that the present electoral college system is, in an historical sense, "archaic."

But around it has grown a host of respected and vital and distinctively American political institutions and practices which uniquely reflect in presidential elections the diversity and viability of our heterogeneous culture.

In this regard, we cite the two-party system, the preservation of regional identities via "states' rights," the counter-balance of rural and urban influences and the strong thrust of ethnic and economic minority power under the "winner-take-all" tradition which magnifies the voice of the more populous states in presidential elections.

Surely, the electoral college system, which has become something of a fulcrum upon which all these subtle levers of popular power must turn, is not to be lightly cast aside in the name of "one-man-one-vote" and an uncompromising majoritarianism, however appealing to our democratic instincts.

We therefore candidly share this change of heart with you, our readers, and join such strange ideological bedfellows as the liberal New York Times and the conservative Southern coalition in the Senate to urge that the legislatures, if not the Senate, defeat this ill-considered proposal in favor of more modest electoral reforms to meet undeniable needs.

REMARKS OF ROBERT T. STEVENS AT THE NORTH CAROLINA TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, I participated in the annual meeting of the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers' Association's annual convention on October 1 at Pinehurst, N.C. I was fortunate to be among those attending the meeting where Robert T. Stevens discussed the problems facing the textile industry.

Mr. Stevens, who is currently chairman of the executive committee of J. P. Stevens, has had a long and illustrious career in textiles. He began his textile career 49 years ago and rose rapidly to a position of industrywide leadership.

His tremendous talents and abilities were recognized by his associates when he was elected president of the American Textile Manufacturers' Institute in 1963.

Bob Stevens has not only served the textile industry. He has served his Nation. During World War II he was in Army procurement and during the latter stages of the Korean war he was appointed Secretary of the Army by our late President Eisenhower.

Mr. Stevens' remarks follow:

A few months ago Bob Twitty, your outstanding President, asked me if I would appear on the program some time during the course of your Annual Meeting. He caught me in an unguarded moment and, being the long-time close friend that he is, I could not refuse. That part was easy but, as today drew nearer, the question became more binding as to what a textile veteran like me could say of interest to a sophisticated 1970 textile gathering like this.

Yes, I could reminisce, going back to my start in textiles 49 years ago in September of 1921. We had just three fibres in those days—cotton, wool and silk. So called "artificial silk," later renamed rayon, was just around the corner. The cotton and wool industries were big. Silk manufacturing was moderate in size. All three were almost unrelated in manufacturing processes and machinery. Blends were unheard of.

Compare that with today and the hundreds of fibers currently available for every conceivable purpose. Quite a change. And quite a challenge! One could get by in those earlier days without too much of a technical staff. Look at it now—research, development, technology, quality control, pollution control, automation and computers are the order of the day. All of this raises a big question.

What is the textile industry going to be like 49 years from now? We all know we are living in an age of more rapid change than ever before. Therefore, it is obvious that our industry, despite the vast changes we have seen, particularly in recent years, will change even more rapidly from here on out. We are all going to have to move fast even to stand still! Technical considerations are bound to play a larger and larger part.

It would take a far wiser man than I to project what our American textile and apparel industry is going to look like even 10 or 20 years from now, to say nothing of a half century hence. Of one thing, however, I am absolutely certain. The American people, through the Congress, are going to have to make up their minds as to whether they want this great industry to retain its leading position as a job provider in the American economy or whether they are willing to sacrifice jobs and permit access to our markets of ever increasing floods of textile products made offshore by cheap foreign labor.

The combined industry with its 2,000,000 employees is listening very attentively right now to catch the voice and the opinion of the American people on this subject so vital to where our industry goes from here. The chips are down. The case has been argued for more than a decade. Study after study has been made. It is now in the hands of the Congress. The White House has sought action to limit textile and apparel imports. Secretary Stans has battled valiantly to achieve this. The verdict will, in my opinion, have a profound effect on textile and apparel planning for the future. It is for this reason that I hope the Senate will proceed immediately to attach the textile apparel amendment to pending legislation. Let's get on with the job.

Failure to act will stimulate offshore manufacturing by American companies for the American market. In this connection, Mr. Eugene E. Stone, III, President of Stone Manufacturing Co. was quoted recently as saying, "I'll believe we will get import relief when the Mills Bill is signed and sealed—and not before. If that relief is not forthcoming, my company will have no choice but to go offshore." That is surely a definitive statement. The Stevens Company has not and does not use foregin made fabrics. But we may have to review that policy.

Other textile companies will be reviewing their policies too. Will they increase capital expenditures overseas? Will they reduce these expenditures here in the United States? These and many other related questions will soon be up for consideration by textile and apparel planners, if import limitations do not materialize.

We all know there is very formidable opposition to limitation on imports of textiles and many other manufactured products. From the sheltered, non-competitive, confines of the classroom, for example, the economist preaches free trade. He gives little consideration, if any, to the fact that free trade does not exist except in theory. The American market is open to the products of the world. The vast majority of foreign markets are not.

We are all familiar with the dozens of devices that have been created as non-tariff barriers by foreign countries. American goods are discriminated against almost everywhere. Japan is a prime example of a discriminator against American products.

For instance, they can ship their small automobiles to the United States in unlimited quantities by the payment of a nominal 4½% tariff. American cars, on the other hand, are, to all intents and purposes, barred from the car market in Japan. Is this free trade? Must we do all of the giving?

Besides the opposition of the economists, there are other groups that have a business

interest in being able to saturate the American market by using low cost offshore labor. These groups include some American manufacturers with overseas plants, high mark-up retailers, meat importers, foreign steel users, and others. While some unions, especially in textiles, apparel, shoes and steel, have shown an increasing awareness of the inroads on United States employment of the current flood of imports, it would seem that a much stronger and broader posture might be taken.

18 years ago, in September of 1952, I had the honor of acting as Chairman of the American delegation to the International Cotton Textile Conference in England. This came to be known as The Buxton Conference and was attended by all of the principal cotton textile producing countries of the free world. During the course of the Conference it became increasingly clear to the members of the American Delegation that Japan would, in all probability, become a most disturbing element in international trade in cotton textiles down the road in the future.

Our feeling on this point was despite the concluding paragraph of the opening address by the Chairman of the Japanese delegation. This ran as follows:

"As I mentioned at this morning's session, our greatest hope is placed on increasing world cotton textile trading through international cooperation, and I assure you that our coming to England from distant Japan has for its object the planning of the furtherance of Japan's interests on the basis of the principle of live-and-let-live and acting hand-in-hand with all of the countries concerned."

It has been difficult to observe over recent years just where the principle of "live-and-let-live" or action "hand-in-hand" has been in evidence where Japan's relations with the United States on the subject of textiles have been concerned. Rather, it has appeared that Japan is determined to gobble up directly or indirectly, more and more of the American textile and apparel markets. Not just in cottons, which they have done, but in woolens and worsteds, which they have done, and now in man-mades, which they are rapidly doing.

Coming back to the economist, this gobbling up process appears to be O.K. with him. Most of them would just let the textile companies fall by the wayside and suggest training our employees, at Uncle Sam's expense, for some other job. Usually, they do not say what other job, where it is to be located or indicate what degree of adaptability they hope to achieve. It's an easy solution to propound. It is probably impossible to accomplish. In any event the fine people who work in these plants deserve a better fate than the depersonalized shifting about which the economists suggest.

I often wonder, when foreign governments fight so hard to protect and build up their industries, why American foreign policy seems willing at times to have many of its industries suffer severely under the banner of alleged free trade. And the bogeyman of retaliation is always set forth by opponents of any limitation on imports. It is the golden dollar market in the United States that foreign countries have their eyes on and they are not about to do anything which could adversely affect their access to our markets.

Then there is another point the free trader persistently tries to evade or ignore. Suppose our country should find itself faced with an all-out military emergency some time in the future. What would we do then? With our textile and many other industries decimated by free trade, would it be a good way to face that emergency by having to rely on Japan or some other distant country for military fabrics and other essential war requirements?

I doubt if the American people would be content with military dependence on overseas production, if they realized this is the position the free trader might put us in. Where would we have been in World War II if we had to depend on foreign sources of military fabrics and other vital war products. We might not have survived—that is how critical the well being of strong domestic industries can be. I hope we don't take any such awesome chance.

Having served in Army procurement throughout World War II and as Secretary of the Army during the latter phases of the Korean War, I feel qualified to a degree to discuss and stress this defense aspect of our industry. I have testified before committees of the Congress on this subject and am prepared to do so again whenever called. Referring to the woolen and worsted industry, my testimony includes a statement that what is left of this part of our industry could no longer fulfill the military and essential civilian requirements of an all-out emergency. This is a serious matter for our country.

Another consideration that opponents of import limitations overlook is the position of the American farm and ranch producer of cotton and wool. What would the American farmer do without the cotton textile industry? Surely he could not replace domestic consumption with profitable exports. And, as for the wool producer, he has only one customer—the United States woolen and worsted industry. Would the free traders wipe him out completely? Where then would wool come from in time of war? Is it not possible for the free traders at least to concede that a substantial fibre-growing segment of American agriculture is a desirable thing?

Let's look at another segment of American agriculture—the beef producers. Judged by the pressures around Washington from foreign beef producing countries, we really don't need a large cattle production here. I presume the free trader agrees with this because the cost of producing beef in the United States is much higher than in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay and other countries.

Again, in an emergency, where would we get our beef? Or, without an emergency, what will the housewife pay for beef when the foreigners have taken charge of our supply of beef? Plenty, you may be sure, thus showing again the folly of theoretical free trade. Let's at least preserve the farm production necessary to feed, as well as clothe, our growing nation.

This may be my swan song in public appearances and, if so, I am sure there are a lot of free traders who will be delighted. I have argued with them in public and in private ever since I was an undergraduate at college. In my opinion, they overlook the fact that our forebears made a very major decision 150 to 160 years ago. They decided that the United States was going to be an industralized nation and whatever measures were needed, would be taken. Since we could not compete with Britain and Europe at that time, they deliberately adopted a course of protection of American industry.

If they were wrong, please blame them—not us for feeling the same way they did. After all their keen foresight resulted in the creation of an industrial machine which, twice during our life times, have made possible the preservation of freedom and prevented our possible defeat by dictators. If they were wrong in their policies, then I am perfectly willing to be wrong with them now. The preservation of an all-around, strong, healthy industrial and agricultural complex is even more important now than in some of those dangerous days in the history of our country.

While on this subject, I would be derelict if I did not interject that the so-called military-industrial complex is, in my opinion, the basic foundation of our national security. That complex, controlled by our duly elected civilian leaders, is the best insurance we can have for the survival of our freedom. In their understandable desire to cut government expenditures, it is to be hoped that the Administration and the Congress will not cut our defenses too deeply.

It might surprise you to know that the Navy, in the budget for the 1972 fiscal year now under consideration, may, according to the Armed Forces Journal, have fewer ships than the Navy of 1934! That concerns me in this world of 1970 and, especially so, in view of the rapid emergence of a large, completely modern, Russian Navy.

Just three days ago Chairman L. Mendel Rivers of the House Armed Services Committee warned the nation that unless the "deterioration in our military capability" is reversed, he foresaw the United States being "pushed out" of the Mediterranean, forced to accept a Soviet submarine base in Cuba and eventually unable to deter Soviet aggression. He said, "We are on the brink of disaster." And he urged that our nation provide itself with a modern Navy second to none. I join him as I am sure you do in the great hope.

Now then, the Stevens Company is an old one—157 years to be exact. Its history closely parallels that of the nation. We've gone through every war since the War of 1812, every depression, every boom and bust and have succeeded in rolling with the punches. We intend not only to maintain our business but, one way or another, changing with the times, to grow in the future as we have in the past.

With this in mind, we have recently broken ground for an important new Stevens plant. And where will it be located? Why, not surprisingly, in North Carolina! It will be our 23d plant in this wonderful state.

And now, I thank you very sincerely for the privilege of appearing before you this morning. It is a great pleasure to be here with so many good Tar Heel friends. I wish all of you continued success in this great industry to which we are all so devoted. I am confident our combined efforts will find solutions to our problems that will mean we are, once again, on the way to greater things.

HON. WILLIAM MOORHEAD SPEAKS AT THE PITTSBURGH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, recently delivered a speech at the Pittsburgh Theological Seminary.

In his remarks Congressman MOORHEAD analyzed the current state of the war in Vietnam and correctly pointed out the ambiguities in the President's policy in liquidating this war. Mr. MOORHEAD also touched in the problems of control of civil disturbances.

I am sure that the readers of the RECORD will find Congressman MOORHEAD's remarks informative and provocative. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert his speech in the RECORD:

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, AT THE PITTSBURGH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, OCTOBER 6, 1970

I would like to discuss three such issues with you tonight. The first is our present

Vietnam policy. The second is our post-Vietnam policy for Asia. The third is a little known policy decision which should be damned in every pulpit across the nation.

First on our present policy in Vietnam.

I don't think the facts have been stated properly on the cost in terms of American lives as well as dollars of the vague withdrawal plans of the Nixon Administration.

Recently Arnold Kuzmack, an analyst at the Brookings Institution in Washington, made estimates of the casualties and costs for different withdrawal plans from Vietnam. Nixon has neither set a date for withdrawal nor specified the number of men he would leave in Vietnam for technical, logistic, artillery and air support after the main part of our force has been withdrawn.

SUMMARY TABLE—U.S. CASUALTY AND COST PROJECTIONS FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL PLANS [1]

	Cost (billions of dollars)		Killed in action		Total casualties	
	Total cost fiscal year 1971–75	Increase over case 1	Total deaths fiscal year 1971–75	Increase over case 1	Total fiscal year 1971–75	Increase over case 1
Case 1: McGovern-Hatfield plan	11.5	----------	2,500	----------	22,600	----------
Case 2: Current withdrawal rate, out by early fiscal year 1973	19.7	8.2	5,400	2,900	47,900	25,300
Case 3: Current rate, residual force of 50,000 men	25.7	14.2	7,400	4,900	65,450	42,850
Case 4: Withdrawal delayed in fiscal year 1972, residual force of 50,000 men	31.5	20.0	9,500	7,000	84,000	61,400
Case 5: Continuing force of over 200,000 men	46.4	34.9	14,700	12,200	130,300	107,700

[1] Arnold M. Kuzmack, "Casualty and Cost Projections for Different Withdrawal Plans," Congress of Young Professionals for Political Action, August 1970.

Apparently he believes a weekly casualty rate of 50–70–100 Americans is acceptable to the American people. When total estimates of American deaths and dollars are made for different withdrawal rates the results should shock the American people into putting more pressure on the President and the Congress to end this war.

For example, this analyst estimated that withdrawal at the current rate with a residual force of 50,000 men would cost the United States (between fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1975) $25.7 billion, 7,400 additional American lives and 65,450 additional casualties. If the Administration (as Laird has been quoted) left a residual force of 200,000 men the cost to the United States would be $46.4 billion, an additional 14,700 American lives and 130,000 additional casualties.

Now the relevant question that has to be put to the American people is how many more American lives are we willing to invest in this ill-conceived operation—how much more of this nation's resources and how many more of our boys are we willing to bring home maimed? Is our national interest in Vietnam worth another 14,000 more American lives? I think not.

The second issue I would like to discuss with you is our emerging Post-Vietnam policy with respect to Asia. This is the policy that Mr. Nixon affectionately refers to as the "Nixon Doctrine."

More than a year after its enunciation at Guam, and after several elaborations and explanations—the President's television address of November 3, 1969, and his report to the Congress of February 18, 1970, ("U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's")—the Nixon Doctrine appears obscure and contradictory in its intent and application. It is not simply that the wider pattern of the war in Indo-China challenges the Doctrine's promise of a lower posture in Asia—but close analysis and unfolding events raise some serious questions about the Doctrine.

How does the promise of a lower posture in Asia and no more Vietnams correlate with platitudes such as "we are a Pacific power," "We will maintain our interest in Asia and the commitments that flow from them," and "The United States will keep all its treaty commitments."? [2]

Despite the rhetoric of the Doctrine we are still committed to the confrontation and containment of China, the maintenance of our Asian allies and de facto commitments and at the same time we intend to scale down our conventional military capability in Asia.

The gut question is whether the Administration has diminished our potential involvement in Asian conflicts?

The American people seem to have little stomach left for another Vietnam not only morally—the devastation of a population and a nation with our military power—but on more pragmatic grounds—the cost in terms of American lives and resources. I think the American people—if not the military—are beginning to understand the limits of the use of military power in gaining our objectives around the world.

It seems clear that the Nixon Doctrine is not a change in policy but merely a change in technique. The new technique is merely the substitution of indigenous forces, equipped with enlarged U.S. military assistance—for American troops.

The President's foreign policy message expanding on his Guam declaration, takes cognizance of political and economic changes in Asia that "enable us to change the character of our involvement."

". . . the planning of general purpose forces must take into account the fact that the manpower of our friends greatly exceeds our own . . .

"The responsibilities once borne by the United States at such great cost can now be shared.

"In cases involving other types of aggression (conventional attacks or insurgency) we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested and as appropriate. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense."

This Asianization policy may have the impact of only postponing—not avoiding—U.S. involvement in an Asian conflict.

Our inability to win decisively in Vietnam has caused a trauma among policymakers who as a result have suggested limitations on future involvements on the basis of a distinction between external or overt aggression on the one hand, and insurgency, political subversion, and civil war on the other.

What happens if an ally is unable to deal with an insurgency through its own police and military action? Under these conditions, what kind of solution does the Nixon Doctrine envision? Might the United States be impelled to intervene with combat forces? The President's message states:

". . . a direct combat role for U.S. general purpose forces arises primarily when insurgency has shaded into external aggression or when there is an overt conventional attack." [3]

Shades of 1965! When our first troops were being landed in Vietnam in 1965 I invited the then Under Secretary of Defense to come up to Capitol Hill to explain what the Defense Department was going to do in Vietnam, to a group of concerned Congressmen. He explained that so long as Vietnam was essentially an internal insurgency involving guerrilla warfare we had not landed any troops. He said that the advent of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam constituted an external aggression, and because the North Vietnamese would not know the territory they would be unable to carry on guerrilla warfare. Therefore, they would have to resort to conventional warfare which the superior U.S. firepower could swiftly defeat.

In Mr. Nixon's State of the World Message of February, 1970, I seem to hear again the words of the Under Secretary of Defense of 1965.

At what point does an insurgency become "external aggression"? When enemy main-force units are introduced rather than individuals? What about the verification problem? Would not the shifting sands of rationalization merely suit our purposes? Is it credible that we would sacrifice our still-held objectives to the vagaries of circumstances? As long as our policy remains the confrontation and containment of China and the repression of Asian communism, we are inclined to view even largely indigenous revolutions as the work of Peking or Hanoi or Pyongyang. Consequently, if an insurgency in an allied or even a neutral country began to succeed, we would probably first increase logistic aid, and then extend the role of advisors and provide air support. Since such moves might bring a countervailing response from the Asian communist sponsors of the insurgency, we might have to choose between sending ground forces and allowing an ally to lose by our default.

Thus, with our formal or implied commitments and the President's open-ended prescription, the United States might yet be drawn into a land war on the Asian mainland, or have to confront equally dire alternatives—such as use of tactical nuclear weapons. In this respect the Nixon Doctrine does not improve on the policy that led to Vietnam. And, of course, our exposure to involvement in case of more overt aggression, such as a Chinese-supported invasion of Korea or Southeast Asia remains undiminished.

What are the budgetary impacts of the Nixon Doctrine? First, there should be short run savings in manpower, procurement and overhead as we reduce U.S. forces in Asia—turning, of course, on our ability to avoid intervention. However, Asianization depends on a significantly expanded Military Assistance Program (MAP). Secretary Laird made this clear in his Fiscal Year 1971 Posture Statement: [4]

"An important element of national security policy—one that will be more important in the future under our new policy is the Military Assistance Program (MAP) . . .

"I cannot stress too strongly the need for increased understanding of the importance of this program to the success of the Nixon Doctrine.

"The Military Assistance Program (MAP) is the key to this approach. It is the essential ingredient of our policy if we are to honor our obligations, support our allies, and yet reduce the likelihood of having to commit American ground combat units."

---

[2] Richard M. Nixon, *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's, A New Strategy for Peace,* (February 18, 1970).

[3] Richard M. Nixon, *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's, a New Strategy for Peace,* (February 18, 1970).

[4] Melvin R. Laird, *Fiscal Year 1971 Defense Program and Budget* (March 2, 1970).

I think Laird recognizes fully the declining level of popular support and Congressional appropriations for military assistance. Requests were cut about 20% this year—and even deeper in the Senate.

The MAP program is not handled by the friendly and constantly obliging Armed Services Committees in the Congress, but by the critical Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the more obliging Foreign Affairs Committee in the House. Laird's solution under these circumstances is a legislative ploy—that I will fight—which will integrate the MAP program into the defense budget and assign it to the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees. This would remove military assistance from the broader concerns of foreign policy and would render the debate more technical and less political. The focus would shift from the question of involvement to the question of relative cost. It would also tend to wrap the program in the flag and make it immune to a meaningful debate.

There is already over $3 billion of military aid meshed into the defense budget for certain "forward defense countries", including South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos under the category "support of other nations." As a result, little debate takes place on these programs.

This policy, in fact, smacks of the pre-World War II "merchants of death" debate and the Marx thesis that capitalist economies depend on wars and preparation of wars for prosperity. International arms sales have doubled in the last ten years, with the U.S. alone accounting for 40 percent of that.

The actual causes of this situation are diverse. The post-war arms race began with the Cold War rivalry between Russia and the United States, and the two superpowers remain the principal arms dealers. But there has to be demand as well as supply in the weapons market. The superpowers have used their particular "defense" blocs as a market for their weapons. But military power seems to be a mark of sovereignty. The new countries, which can least afford the cost of war, have actively competed for the hardware in the market.

The United States could unilaterally do something to discourage the arms race, simply because it is the chief arms merchant.

That is now, however, what is happening. Recently, what might be called an arms brokerage house has been created in the Pentagon and President Nixon in creating the Nixon Doctrine of equipping friendly powers to defend themselves has extended this move. That Doctrine may serve as a perfect cover for increased sales and loans for military equipment.

One would think that $50 billion worth of arms merchandising since World War II might have taught the United States to question the excuses for it. Ideology for example, is not necessarily exported with the weapons. Guns made in the United States have sometimes been used by one supposed ally against another, have been used for anti-democratic repression in other areas, and have been employed to overturn elected governments. In the hands of the smaller nations especially, these guns are no guarantee of so-called free world security.

Where does all this leave us? It seems to me if the Administration is to be consistent in revising our defense posture and limiting defense budgets, it must consider a commensurate curtailment and revision of our foreign policy objectives in Asia. Merely adjusting the short term strategy and rhetoric will not resolve the more long term Asian defense problem—but it's simply another formula for permanent confrontation with China.

We have to face realities—we can't control events in Asia—we are in a box where we can't even control our own response to events. Somehow we have to move toward relaxing this confrontation and automatic enmity and move toward normalizing our relationship with China.

A third issue is unrelated to Vietnam, but one that should disturb seminarians very deeply.

I am sure you are aware that the President's Commission on Campus Unrest filed their investigative report on the deaths of four students at Kent State University.

The Report[5] said that the shootings by the Ohio National Guard, causing injury to nine students in addition to those killed, were the results of an unlearned lesson of civil disturbance control.

"The general issuance of loaded weapons to law enforcement officers engaged in controlling disorders is never justified except in the case of armed resistance that trained sniper teams are unable to handle.

"This was not the case at Kent State, yet each guardsman carried a loaded M–1 rifle. The lesson is not new. The National Advisory (Kerner) Commission on Civil Disorders and the guidelines of the Department of the Army set it out explicitly.

"No one would have died at Kent State if this lesson had been learned by the Ohio National Guard.

"The Kent State tragedy must surely mark the last time that loaded rifles are issued as a matter of course to guardsmen confronting student demonstrators."

Against this backdrop I was shocked and outraged to discover that the Army—without public announcement—has been arming the National Guard with its newest rifle, the rapid-firing M–16, for use both in its war fighting role and in putting down civilian disturbances. This rifle would increase the fire power and kill capacity of the guard several hundred times. It would be impossible to estimate how many more students would have been killed or maimed had the National Guard been carrying M–16's. By any measure it would have been a veritable bloodbath.

The characteristics of this gun are frightening and totally improper for crowd control.

The M–16 rifle is an automatic weapon—virtually a submachine gun—capable of firing up to an incredible 825 rounds per minute out to a maximum effective range of over 600 yards. The sustained rate of fire for this weapon on automatic is up to 825 rounds per minute—not the actual number of shots that can be fired in one minute. The Army advises me that they are phrasing in a standard clip of 30 rounds and a well trained man can fire at the rate of 6 seconds per clip or 10 clips per minute, which means up to 300 shots per minute.

Its ballistic characteristics are such that it covers a considerable "beaten zone"—target pattern when on automatic—thereby increasing its kill capacity. Its low caliber high velocity bullet is light weight—just a fraction above that allowed by international law—and thereby prone to richochet about within the body of the victim producing a maximum wound capability. Because of its light weight and high velocity the bullet tends to tumble causing internal shock which is similar to an explosion going off inside the victim's body generally mangling organs and bones.

There are other significant reasons why the M–16 is ill-suited for riot control duty. It is too short to effectively hold a demonstrator at bay. It is altogether too light to knock him down with a butt-stroke and it has no bayonet with which to shove a crowd back.

Although it is true this weapon can be cycled to fire a single round—the Army advises me that the man must be well trained to achieve a single shot capability. Also considering the confusion and fear of the Guardsmen in past situations as well as the possibility of the rifle itself being jarred it is not at all unlikely that this weapon could be mistakenly set for a deadly burst.

With these characteristics it seems incredible and outrageous that the Army is not only placing, but apparently has already started to place over 228,000 M–16's in the hands of the National Guard by April, 1971.

A spokesman for the National Guard Bureau was quoted in the Washington Post as saying, "it will be the only weapon issued to them and if the Governor of the state elects to have them carry weapons when called to quell riots or other disturbances then this would be the weapon they would carry . . . It is standard practice for guardsmen to carry rifles in such instances."

It disturbs me that the first word that the National Guard would be issued M–16's came during testimony before the Presidential Commission on Campus Unrest when Adjutant General Sylvester DelCorso of Ohio disclosed that units in his state will receive the new rifles this fall. Asked about DelCorso's statement, the National Guard Bureau said the first units began receiving M–16s four to six months ago.

Leaving aside the question of the proper role of the National Guard in riot control—National Guardsmen ordered to control the actions of fellow Americans must have responsible alternative means of enforcing such orders. They must certainly have some intermediary response between throwing tear gas cannisters and then mowing down fellow citizens with deadly automatic M–16 rifle fire.

What is puzzling is the general lack of interest in non-lethal weapons such as special riot guns, wooden bullets, irritant gasses and riot batons. If menaced by snipers, specially trained counter-sniper teams could be deployed.

I understand that there is a substantial inventory of standard Army riot guns that are non lethal in nature which have never been issued for riot control outside of military base areas. The Army Materiel Command advised me that the standard Army shotgun—12 gauge, 20-inch barrel—is their preferred riot weapon.

It is equipped with a double safety and can be reduced both in charge and shot to be non-lethal. 9,000 of these weapons are in the hands of the troops and 4,000 in depot stock. These weapons can be requested along with tear gas, masks and rations by Guard units called up for duty during civil disorders. These weapons cost $59.60 a piece—a sensible investment, it seems to me. The hard question is why isn't the National Guard equipped with these weapons for their riot control mission?

The Berkeley, California, Police Department seems to be the most creative. The Washington Post of July 8 reported that the Berkeley police are now using anti-riot weapons firing wooden pellets "which sting like the dickens but don't penetrate the skin." The pellet thrower, which administers a blow equivalent to a billy club, has not caused any serious injury.

As reported in the New York Times on July 23, the Berkeley police are about to test a device that fires 4-inch wide bean bags about a hundred and twenty miles per hour. The blow is hard enough to incapacitate, but again, not to kill or maim. Oddly enough it is manufactured by a rocket maker—an example of responsible conversion from a wartime to a peacetime application of weapon systems.

There are clear alternatives to the M–16 and they should be taken immediately—before another National Guardsman is put in a situation where his alternatives are limited and he is faced with the option of using an automatic weapon on a fellow citizen. This is unfair to the guardsmen and destabilizing for the nation.

---

[5] The President's Commission on Campus Unrest, "Special Report—The Kent State Tragedy," October, 1970.

Probably, the most disturbing aspect of this whole affair is the fact that, to my knowledge, there has been only one rather insignificant report of the action of the Army—and that was an Associated Press report on the third page of the Washington Post on August 22, 1970. The Library of Congress clipping service, which is probably one of the most extensive around, could not find a single reaction to it editorially or by any columnist. Maybe I am overreacting to this, but I feel very strongly that the purpose of the National Guard when used to control disorders is to contain and control rioters, not to destroy them I believe, further, that when dispatched to control civil disorders the National Guard should not be permitted to load live ammunition except for well trained and disciplined anti-sniper squads.

Along the same lines—how many of you know that about half the police departments in the United States and a number of federal agencies have worked a quiet and radical change in the official application of deadly force in recent years by adopting the dumdum bullet as their standard service ammunition. This is the high velocity soft nose bullet that has been outlawed for use in international warfare for more than half a century—as being inhumane.

The dumdum is a bullet with a copper-jacketed case and a soft lead nose, often hollowed to look like the front of a jet engine. Because of an extra charge of powder the dumdum travels 50 percent faster than the police bullet. When it hits, the impact, especially in the hollow point, causes the lead to mushroom back over the copper jacket, expanding the bullet from .35 caliber to roughly .60 caliber in the first two inches of flesh. This violent expansion coupled with extremely high velocity, gives the bullet an explosive effect in the victim. I am happy to report that the Pittsburgh Police Department does not use dumdum bullets.

With the advent of high technology weapons being introduced into our civilian areas we must begin immediately to find ways of relieving the military and police departments of responsibility for decisions that ought to be the business of officials who are accountable to public opinion.

The crucial decision is about to be made by the Governor of this State and the Pennsylvania National Guard on the M–16 question. They will be issued M–16's over the next few months and have made no policy decisions on the use of this weapon in their civil disturbance mission. The Governor is Commander-in-Chief of the Pennsylvania National Guard, when they are under state control, and is responsible for setting policies on the use of weapons. I think that Governor Shafer and both candidates for Governor should immediately state their positions as to the use of this weapon by the Guard in controlling civil disturbances.

UNPRECEDENTED NATIONAL PERIL

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, by my speech on this floor last June 23, I sought to direct the attention of the Congress to the extremely serious and imminent danger which threatens the defense of this Nation and which jeopardizes the lives and property of our fellow citizens. The reality of this fantastic peril to which we are subjected by the machinations of the Atomic Energy Commission and its heirarchy can hardly be exaggerated, notwithstanding Dr. Glenn Seaborg's sustained publicity effort, drumming away to persuade us that all AEC decisions are good for America.

The district which I represent here in Congress, Luzerne, Carbon, and Columbia Counties in Pennsylvania, is about 125 miles west of New York City. We in my district are seriously alarmed that some 30 million people will one day flood over us in desperation, should any one of the superlethal nuclear power reactors be blasted by conventional explosives and dusted over the New York metropolitan area.

This unprecedented national peril exists as the direct result of having already emplaced some 20 huge experimental nuclear power reactors within our most densely populated industrial regions, not to mention the projection of an additional hundred soon to be constructed. Incredibly, AEC licensing regulations specify:

> . . . an applicant for a license to construct and operate a nuclear power plant is not required to provide design features or other measures for the specific purpose of protection against the effects of attacks and destructive acts, including sabotage, by an enemy of the United States.

Even more incredibly, a letter dated September 23 from the Department of Defense states:

> In regard to defense of nuclear plants against an enemy submarine attack utilizing conventional weapons, no specific countermeasures are taken to prevent attack on these facilities as such . . . Further, there is no particular reason to single out nuclear reactors for such consideration.

At full fission product inventory, the Calvert Cliffs nuclear power reactors, now a building 40 miles from the city of Washington, will each contain about 6,000 pounds of plutonium. If pulverized and dusted over the surroundings, this amount of plutonium would equate to the alpha-active fallout from several thousand nuclear blasts of atomic weapons.

Just to refresh our memories as to the awful toxicity of plutonium, according to international studies, this alpha particles emitting, bone-seeking, cancer inducing agent is in the order of billions of times more lethal per unit weight than the most virulent chemical poison. A single pound of plutonium, if suitably distributed in the air we breathe and in the water we drink, is sufficient to wipe out the population of the entire world.

The principal reason given by the AEC for urging the construction of the Calvert Cliffs type of power reactor, which is notoriously inefficient in converting uranium to electric energy, is that "fast breeder" reactors, if and when developed for the commercial generation of electric energy, will each require some 3,000 pounds of plutonium as the fissile core. Light water reactors are a convenient source of large quantities of plutonium. And here we get another peek at what these secretive, supergrade, self-appointed decisionmakers have in store for us.

While there is no doubt that either of these nuclear reactor types can be totally demolished and pulverized by conventional explosives, the fast reactor with the ton-and-a-half plutonium core is immensely more dangerous because it can by explosive compression, be caused to actually fission and vaporize the entire structure, becoming thereby, history's "dirtiest" and most effective radiological warfare weapon.

Mr. Speaker, to show by example one of the terrible traps already set for us, I am advised that repeated hits on Consolidated Edison's Indian Point nuclear powerplant by submarine-launched missiles delivering large conventional warheads could, under suitable conditions of wind and weather, immediately cancel out the New York metropolitan area as a viable section of the United States, with the attendant loss of millions of lives, following the unavoidable inhalation of pulverized plutonium and other alpha-emitting dusts.

In answer to my direct question in regard to effects of demolishing the Indian Point plant, an assistant to the Secretary of Defense has recently replied: "It is true that, in the extreme situation which you postulate, extensive areas could be contaminated to lethal levels of radioactivity."

Somehow, or for some reason, this assistant to the Secretary of Defense skipped entirely any comment on the more certain and widespread effects upon the population which would result from the inevitable ingestion and inhalation of plutonium particles.

Quite evidently, the combined Armed Forces of the United States of America are powerless to absolutely guarantee against the pulverizing demolition of any coastally exposed nuclear installation by conventional explosives, deliverable by rocket from submarines now on station off both our coasts. Even more chilling is the distinct possibility that some of these Russian-built missile-firing submarines are already leased to North Vietnam.

In the event of such non-Russian bombardment of our nuclear Trojan Horses, How do we reply in kind? How do we retaliate? How do we prevent the panic-stricken exodus from all other nuclear-powered industrial regions following the initial catastrophic demonstration of nuclear reactor vulnerability to conventional weaponry?

Now, in the face of all this, we learn that Pennsylvania has been selected to have an enormous, first of its kind, experimental "fast breeder power reactor" on the Susquehanna River at Tunkhannock, 35 miles north of my office in Wilkes-Barre. This nuclear experiment is to have as its fissionable core, a ton and a half of plutonium.

If sabotaged and explosively compressed, which I am assured can be accomplished in a variety of ways, this neighborhood gem will instantly become a huge, incomparably dirty atomic bomb. The resulting permanent, and a couple of centuries is fairly permanent so far as I am concerned, poisoning of the Susquehanna watershed from New York State to the mouth of Chesapeake Bay would probably eliminate this large and heavily populated section of the United States as a habitable region.

Should my worst fears be realized, a guerrilla group will some day sabotage a nuclear reactor in one of our more heavily populated areas. Following catastrophic proof to our citizenry that nuclear reactors are indeed vulnerable to conventional explosives and weaponry, we as a nation, without effective means of retaliation, shall be forced to capitulate upon threat of successive, unpreventable destruction of our nuclear Trojan horses.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. Again I insist that it has become imperative that we immediately move to dismantle all nuclear installations which can be considered vulnerable to demolition by conventional explosives.

As to the loss of credibility currently bemoaned by the hierarchy of the Atomic Energy Commission, I intend to examine on this floor the multitude of half truths and misleading statements which have contributed to this monstrous abuse of the public trust.

MEGALOMANIA WAS CLUE TO NASSER

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there have been many conflicting statements about Egypt's President Nasser and the extent of his influence. One of the clearest analyses that I have seen of the entire subject was contained in Jack Anderson's column in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 4. I include it in the RECORD:

MEGALOMANIA WAS CLUE TO NASSER

(By Jack Anderson)

The truth about Egypt's Nasser, despite the outpouring of words that have followed his death, remains buried in secret State Department files.

This column has been given access to the files and can now reveal the highlights—how Nasser rose to power in the Arab world with little more than a radio station and a genius for inflaming the masses, how he repeatedly bounded back from disaster like a cat with nine lives, why the United States helped to keep him in power despite his flagrant anti-American policies.

The story helps to explain the decline of Western influence in the Middle East, fountainhead of Western Europe's oil and historic crossroads of the world. For the ebb and flow of history over this scorched land has produced a new tide that has been running against us. Arab Nationalism has all but washed away the common ground that once joined the Arabian and Western worlds.

More than any other, Gamal Abdel Nasser has inflamed and guided this nationalism. As late as 1953, he pledged that "Egypt stands today in every respect with the West." But by 1970, he was screaming over Cairo Radio: "The aim of American imperialism is to destroy the Arab countries!"

The real clue to Nasser was his megalomania, his dream of presiding over an Arab domain stretching from the Atlantic and Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean. He seriously likened himself to the heroic Saladin who in the 12th century founded the last great Arab empire.

Nasser was willing to work with the U.S., it developed, only to the extent that the U.S. supported his dream. Here is some untold history that explains the deterioration in Egyptian-American relations:

President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, came away from his first meeting with Nasser in April, 1953, tremendously impressed with the dynamic young dictator. Dulles promised to pour economic aid into his country and to work with him in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, Nasser took this to mean the U.S. would work through him. He was bitterly disappointed over our refusal to help him raise 10 Arab divisions and put them under his command as his first step toward uniting the Arab world.

In 1955, Nasser summoned Arab leaders to Cairo. The secret minutes betrayed how his attitude toward the West had soured.

"Western policy is carefully laid down to destroy the strength of the Arab countries," he charged. "The West has succeeded in separating Egypt from the Arab world through Israel, which the West created. Do you accept such a situation? . . . .

"We must fully realize that the West's need for us is greater than our need for it. Our position, our resources and our manpower are such that the West will always need our assistance."

The State Department, seeking a counter to Nasser, turned temporarily to King Saud of Saudi Arabia. The hope was that the king, as ruler of Mecca, the holy city, would provide a spiritual rallying point for the Arabs.

But in the ferment against feudalism and old forms of government, the call of Cairo Radio extolling the creed of Nasser's new political Mecca was more powerful than the call of the Koran.

Cairo Radio carried Nasser's voice to all the Arab countries. Across the desert sands, Arabs listened enraptured as the Egyptian leader harangued them in simple language replete with references to Allah's will. Increasingly, the Voice of Nasser acquired a venemous, anti-Western edge.

Yet time and again, Nasser was rescued by the same United States he excoriated on Cairo Radio. First, we persuaded the British to withdraw their troops from Egyptian soil and hand over their huge Suez base to Nasser. After his seizure of the Suez Canal, we also talked Britain and France out of strong counter-measures.

The charismatic Egyptian leader never was able to fulfill his dreams. The Arab states, led by men even more volatile than himself, never would fall into place like pieces in a giant Egyptian puzzle.

In the end, Nasser backed away from the idea of a closely welded Arab empire. He spoke privately, instead, of a loose federation with each state running its own domestic affairs but taking its foreign policy cues from Cairo.

AUTO SAFETY: BUMPERS—NO. 6

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently criticized the National Highway Safety Bureau for its lack of action on the problem of poorly designed bumpers. On one aspect of the bumper problem, the Bureau is to be commended for at least moving, if not quite as fast as I would like to see. The Bureau has now issued a notice of proposed rulemaking on the subject of "Rear Underride Protection: Trucks and Trailers." This is a problem in which I have had a longstanding interest, and I commend the Bureau for acting on this important problem. The notice of proposed rulemaking follows:

[From the Federal Register, Aug. 14, 1970]

REAR UNDERRIDE PROTECTION; TRUCKS AND TRAILERS

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

A notice of a proposed new motor vehicle safety standard on Rear Underride Protection was published on March 19, 1969 (34 F.R. 5383). In view of comments received in response to that notice and other considerations, it has been determined that changes should be made before issuing the standard. This amended notice of proposed rule making is being issued to allow interested parties to comment on the requirements that are presently under consideration.

Many comments expressed concern for the economic and operational difficulties that might be encountered because of the proposed requirement for a maximum road clearance of 18 inches. Problems that were envisioned included stubbing on abrupt grade changes in roads and loading ramps, mismatches between vehicles and equipment used with them, as between dump trucks and paving machines, and interference with working equipment normally mounted at the rear end of the vehicle. Some persons were concerned that the structure necessary to provide strength at that height would add weight to the vehicle that would significantly reduce payload capacity and operating revenues. It has been demonstrated, however, that a rear-end clearance as high as 24 inches above the ground exposes a significant proportion of the vehicle population to a serious underride hazard.

The comments also contained suggestions that the proposal be altered to allow rear tires, axles, and other parts of the rear bogie to be used to satisfy the underride protection requirements. Although not expressly prohibited under the previous proposal, it was unlikely that these components could be used to meet the requirement, since a continuous horizontal section of the rear surface ("guard line") was required to extend across the vehicle, at no point more than 15 inches forward of the rearmost point on the vehicle. These suggestions have been found to be reasonable as long as the vehicle components meet the basic strength requirements. It was also suggested that the test block be enlarged, to engage more of the structure at the rear of the vehicle.

The proposed test requirement has been altered to take into account these objections and suggestions. It is now proposed that the face of the test block be a rectangle 4 inches high and 12 inches wide, and that its height for the test be uniformly set with its lower edge 16 inches from the ground. The vehicle would be required to meet the strength requirement at all points out to the outermost test points on the vehicle. All specific configurational requirements would be eliminated, and the vehicle could meet the strength requirement with whatever components are in position to contact the test block.

Test programs conducted by both the NHSB and concerned industries indicated that the 76,000-pound test force was unnecessarily large. The proposed requirement has been changed to 50,000 pounds in accordance with those findings.

Some comments suggested that the 15-inch penetration limit be increased to a larger figure. These suggestions have not been adopted. The likely crush distance of the impacting vehicle traveling at moderate speeds, added to a 15-inch penetration of the impacted truck or trailer, approaches the length forward of the windshield of many smaller vehicles. Therefore, allowing

a greater penetration could seriously derogate from the protection offered.

The outermost test points have been determined relative to a newly defined "side reference point", the outermost point on each side of the vehicle between 18 and 66 inches from the ground, in a transverse section through the center of the rear tires.

Further consideration will be given, after issuance of the standard and completion of technical studies, to the inclusion of energy management of underride protection to the sides of large vehicles. The standard proposed herein does not preclude the immediate use of energy absorbing elements in the protected areas, and it is hoped that manufacturers will include these elements in their designs.

Proposed effective date: January 1, 1972.

In consideration of the above, it is proposed that a motor vehicle safety standard on Rear Underride Protection be issued, to read as set forth below. Comments are invited on the proposal, particularly in regard to the changes made from the proposal of March 19, 1969 (34 F.R. 5383). Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to Docket Section, National Highway Safety Bureau, Room 4223, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20591. It is requested, but not required, that 10 copies be submitted. All comments received before the close of business on September 25, 1970, will be considered, and will be available in the docket at the above address for examination both before and after the closing date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the above date will also be considered by the Bureau. However, the rule making action may proceed at any time after that date, and comments received after the closing date and too late for consideration in regard to the action will be treated as suggestions for future rule making. The Bureau will continue to file relevant material, as it becomes available, in the docket after the closing date, and it is recommended that interested persons continue to examine the docket for new materials.

This notice of proposed rule making is issued under the authority of sections 103 and 119 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 1392, 1407), and the delegations of authority at 4 CFR 1.51 (35 F.R. 4955) and 49 CFR 501.8 (35 F.R. 11126).

Issued on August 11, 1970.

RODOLFO A. DIAZ,
Acting Associate Director,
Motor Vehicle Programs.

REAR UNDERRIDE PROTECTION—TRUCKS AND TRAILERS

S1. *Purpose and scope.* This standard establishes the requirement that the rear end of heavy vehicles be constructed so as to reduce the probability of underride by passenger vehicles in rear-end collisions.

S2. *Applicability.* This standard applies to trailers and trucks. It does not, however, apply to pole trailers, truck tractors, or any vehicles with gross vehicle weight rating of 10,000 pounds or less.

S3. *Definitions.* "Rear reference point" means the point on the vehicle, between 18 and 66 inches from the ground when the vehicle is loaded to its gross vehicle weight rating, that is farthest to the rear when cargo doors, tailgate, or other closing devices are in the fully closed position.

"Side reference point" means the point on the vehicle, between 18 and 66 inches from the ground when the vehicle is loaded to its gross vehicle weight rating, that is farthest outboard in a vertical transverse plane through the axis of rotation of the rearmost tires.

S4. *Requirements.* When the vehicle is tested according to S5 at any point between the outermost test positions specified in S4.1, the test block shall not move more than 15 inches forward of the rear reference point of the vehicle.

S4.1 At the outermost test position on each side, the outer edge of the test block shall be in the vertical longitudinal plane passing through the side reference point.

S5. *Test procedure.*

S5.1 Place the vehicle, loaded to its curb weight, on level ground, restrained to prevent forward, upward or lateral motion. The means used to restrain the vehicle must not inhibit forward movement of the portions tested relative to the rest of the vehicle.

S5.2 Prepare a test block of rigid material with a plane surface in the form of a rectangle 4 inches high and 12 inches wide ("the surface").

S5.3 Position the test block at a point between the outermost positions specified in S4.1, so that—

(a) The surface is vertical and facing in the direction of forward travel of the vehicle;

(b) The lower 12-inch edge of the surface is horizontal and 16 inches from the ground; and

(c) The surface is in contact with the rear of the vehicle.

S5.4 Apply a forward static force of 50,000 pounds to the test block. Maintain the force for 15 seconds. Restrain the block from lateral, vertical, or rotational movement throughout the test.

[F.R. Doc. 70-10663; Filed, Aug. 13, 1970; 8:48 a.m.]

SHOCKINGLY SLANTED CAMPUS UNREST REPORT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent days about the controversial report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. For several months now Human Events, the Washington-based newsweekly, has been keeping a close eye on the activities of the Commission and has probably given the best account in the press of the personalities and the behind-the-scenes manipulations of this questionable venture. It is not surprising to Human Events readers that the Commission's report was a capitulation to student radicals and that very little worthwhile resulted from its efforts. I insert at this point in the RECORD the article "Shockingly Slanted Campus Unrest Report" from the October 10 issue of Human Events:

SHOCKINGLY SLANTED CAMPUS UNREST REPORT

"The final report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest is atrocious, indeed, sickening," sputtered one source close to the Scranton panel last week, "but nevertheless it was far superior to the original version." And the original draft, he asserted, was altered only after the panel's obvious bias was blasted by Sen. Gordon Allott, Rep. Barry Goldwater Jr. and members of the press. Panel member Lt. Gen. Benjamin Davis is also said to have struggled valiantly against the majority of the commission members to try to insert some sanity into the initial product.

As drafted by the panel's staff over a month ago, the preliminary report went so far as to specifically blame President Nixon and Vice President Agnew for much of the campus turmoil. Its major recommendations, moreover, did not even counsel students to hold their fire—indeed, the major recommendations were not addressed to the students at all.

The final report is considered an improvement, and even conservatives found some small comfort in the panel's denunciation of violent students. Nor do critics take sharp issue with the panel in its condemnation of certain blunderings by law enforcement officials, particularly the fairly well-established over-reaction of the police at Jackson State College.

Despite tossing a few bones to the "Silent Majority," however, the commission's findings are loaded on the left side of the political spectrum. The White House, particularly the President, is believed to be furious with the panel. Indeed, White House aides have been busily trying to undercut the commission members. And there are critics beyond the presidential sphere as well.

Representatives Goldwater Jr. (R.-Calif.) and William Scherle (R.-Iowa) rounded up 64 of their House colleagues to sign a petition they had prepared condemning the report for declaring that it is the President's responsibility to solve the campus crisis without once mentioning all the things Nixon has done to relieve campus unrest, Reducing American involvement in Viet Nam, moving toward a voluntary military, pushing a voucher system of education, sending Administration officials out to the campuses, arranging special permits for protest demonstrations in the Nation's Capital—none of these efforts were mentioned.

The petition—which included the signature of Minority Leader Gerald Ford (R.-Mich.) and Minority Whip Leslie Arends (R.-Ill.)—also scored the Scranton panel for "ignoring reality" in its virtual non-recommendations for dealing with student terrorists.

Educator S. I. Hayakawa scoffed at the panel's conclusions, while Vice President Spiro Agnew, apparently with the President's approval, assailed them as "pabulum for the permissivists."

Agnew's rhetoric, in fact, is right on target. Upon a close reading, the panel's recommendations urge overwhelming capitulation to student militants. While stressing that students should not engage in violence, the members then turn right around and declare that virtually everyone—from the President on down—should give way before the firebrands. The commission appears to be with the youth all the way. It is "impressed and moved" by the idealism and commitment of American youth—even the violent ones—and "We share the impatient of those who call for change."

In sharing the students' impatience, the panel then insists that ". . . nothing is more important than an end to the Indochina war." And there is an implied thrust at Nixon's move into Cambodia: "Their [the students'] dramatic reaction to the Cambodian invasion was a measure of the intensity of their moral recoil."

Like the militant agitators, the report is also unsympathetic to defense research: "By encouraging universities to become actively involved in classified defense research, as well as by subsidizing the education and training of ROTC officers, the federal government has increased the likelihood that institutions of higher education will be the object of protest by those opposed to American foreign policy." The panel, of course, advises de-militarization of the colleges.

And while the commission disavows student violence, it would permit the students freedom to engage in a wide variety of extremely militant activities. Thus private as well as public universities, says the report, should "take the 5th Amendment as a guide to what is permissible on their campuses. They should not impose restrictions on meetings or rallies or marches . . . such as bans on 'subversive' speakers or on those 'who advocate overthrow of the government by force or violence. . . .'"

Shouting revolutionary slogans, "throwing a picket line around an ROTC building" and

even "foul, mindless or hysterical language and gestures" should not be outlawed.

The panel advises that virtually nothing should be done that even hints of repressing the militant student. The mere appearance—not the act—of repression is supposedly terribly damaging to the students' psyche. The term "repression," says the panel, includes talking out forcefully against student violence and even "ignoring some political views. . . ."

There is also the flat statement: "Legislation which deprives students of financial aid if they have participated in a disruptive or violent demonstration is a repressive effort to deprive students of political power."

While the panel commission fails to recommend a single, specific piece of legislation to deal with subversive groups like the SDS, the Panthers, etc., it urges that Congress should repeal the 10 separate authorization and appropriation acts it has passed "requiring institutions of higher education to terminate federally funded financial assistance to students involved in disruptive activities."

Aside from this incredibly permissive attitude toward the students, the panel adds, for good measure, "massive" financial aid for black colleges and universities, "increased aid for higher education generally, and expanded programs of student financial aid, particularly for those from low-income families."

In brief, then, the Scranton panel—whose creation and composition should be blamed on White House advisers John Ehrlichmann, Robert Finch and Len Garment—has been a disaster. President Nixon, it seems to us, should begin to look to other staff members for advice.

Not only was the Nixon Administration "taken" by the commission; so was the American taxpayer. Rep. Scherle discovered that the Office of Education, the Health Services and Mental Health Administration and the Navy Department initially funded the panel to the tune of $500,000. This allotment was supposed to last until September 30, when the commission was due to issue its report. By September 7—two months after starting—the Scranton panel went broke, having run through the half-million as if it were water. Since then the commission has piled up a $185,000 debt, spending at the rate of over $7,000 a day, and the final total is expected to hit $800,000.

Why the commission ran through its budget so quickly has not yet been determined, but half the money was eaten up in salary and expenses. Fully a dozen staff members were paid as much or more in overtime as in base salary, while the executive director was paid at the rate of $36,000 a year. A chauffeur, according to Scherle, was netting over $1,000 a month. And all of it went to help concoct a report that virtually calls upon the American people to kneel before the rioters and student militants in our midst.

NIXON A SALESMAN FOR AMERICA

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in "Nixon a Salesman for America," Columnist Walter Trohan writes that President Nixon "may go down in history as the most effective speaker in the White House in our day." He states that Mr. Nixon's ideas are more important than his delivery which is one reason why his speeches receive good reception abroad. He adds that the President is at his oratorical best under pressure and when he knows he has to sell himself and his ideas.

For my colleagues' benefit, I include Mr. Trohan's column in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Oct. 2, 1970]

WASHINGTON REPORT: NIXON A SALESMAN FOR AMERICA

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—President Nixon is a far better salesman for America than any of his ambassadors. This is amply evidenced by the tremendous receptions he is receiving on his European tour. Strangely enough the President is not recognized as a great orator by most of his countrymen. He lacks the mellifluous accents of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who could make "Good evening, friends," sound like a battle cry, or the limpid treacle of Everett McKinley Dirksen, who could make music of the oldest cliches. Still, he may go down in history as the most effective speaker in the White House in our day.

F. D. R.'s speeches, which precipitated frenzies of applause in their hour, are surprisingly dull when played back on recordings today. Dirksen's delivery was more amusing than his ideas, which spiraled and faded like smoke from a bonfire of autumn leaves.

Nixon's ideas are more important than his delivery, which is excellent but unnoticed as delivery. For this reason Mr. Nixon is more highly regarded abroad than most of us suspect. Most Americans consider foreigners flowery, when they are merely being courteous, and they forget that the European is far more hardheaded and demanding of his politicians than we are. They may be fooled, but not as long or as often as we are.

The President is frequently at his oratorical best under pressure and when he knows he has to sell himself and his ideas. Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., former chief of protocol, described this as well as anyone. In his 1964 book, "Red Carpet at the White House," he tells of an address by Mr. Nixon at Guild Hall in 1953, when he spoke before Queen Elizabeth and a host of British dignitaries when he was Vice President.

"Up to this point, Nixon had not been particularly popular in the British press," Buchanan wrote. "Most of the people at the dinner knew him only thru his political speeches or campaign utterances. The enormous room was absolutely silent when he stood up to speak, but when he finished the applause was tremendous.

"Lady Dorothy Macmillan, the wife of the prime minister, said that never in her life had she heard a better speech. Selwyn Lloyd [then foreign minister] thought so well of it that he telephoned the British ambassador in Washington and said that Nixon had made the best speech on the subject of Soviet-Western relations that had been made anywhere. When I think of that speech and the other notable services that Dick Nixon rendered, it is inconceivable to me that the American people will be content to have him out of public life very long."

Buchanan was a good prophet, but so was this commentator, after Mr. Nixon made an off-the-record speech to a group of more than 1,000 men in the open.

Most of the men were lying on the grass as he took them on a verbal world tour of American foreign policy. He spoke from a few notes. When he finished they leaped to their feet to applaud. This commentator told him he need only repeat this message around the country for a year in order to win the G.O.P. Presidential nomination.

Of course all his speeches haven't been as moving or as effective. Some have even been near disaster, as that he made after losing the 1962 gubernatorial race in California. But he was exhausted in body and unhappy in spirit over his defeat. Other things being equal, he can be the most effective of orators as he was the other day in his outstanding address at the University of Kansas, when he said:

"What corrodes a society even more deeply than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts as misguided efforts to accommodate the community's standards to those of the violent few."

THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography begins on page 4 by stating that it will not use the word "pornography," and throughout its voluminous pages it almost never fails to bracket the word "obscene" with quotation marks whenever that word is used. It is as though a Presidential commission on crime and violence refused to use the word "violence" and cast doubt on the existence of crime.

Nearly everyone has heard of the chief conclusion of this report, which the rejection of its own name made foregone: That obscenity and pornography—presuming they exist—do no harm, and therefore all laws restricting their sale to, and use by adults should be eliminated.

Americans, dumbfounded by such a conclusion, can only ask how in the name of reason and commonsense it could have happened. President Nixon's sole appointee to this Commission, Charles H. Keating, Jr.—other members were appointed by former President Lyndon Johnson—explains, in the best brief summary I have ever seen of how these prestigious bodies actually operate:

So-called Presidential commissions do not work. They never will. Such Commissions, in my opinion, are not a valid part of the American political system. The structure of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography was similar to that of other Commissions. This Commision was not responsible to anyone, either to the President who appointed it, the Congress which created it, or to the people whom the Congress represented . . .

The truth of the matter is that even the Commission members are not those who gather the facts, do the thinking, render the opinions, etc. The bulk of the work is performed by a staff basically hired by the Commission Chairman, and in the case of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, generally consisting of persons of mediocre talent, hangers-on in government, or individuals not yet settled on a course in life, who accept interim work on a Commission staff as a place to light and learn during the generally short life of a Commission.

The dispersal of authority and responsibility goes beyond the staff. The Commission on Obscenity and Pornography spent by far the greater part of its budget on 'contracts' which, as far as I can observe, were principally awarded to persons apparently having predispositions in favor of the staff's or the Chairman's attitude and philosophy on the subject. These 'contractors' are, generally speaking, academicians with ivory-tower views, who have little or no responsibility to anyone or anything, excepting their own thought processes which go unhoned by the checks and balances of a competitive, active, real world. And even beyond the contracting

academicians, we find a bulk of work done by their assistants, green graduates, and college students.

True as that is, it does not relieve the Commission members—excepting the three who dissented along with Mr. Keating—of their responsibility for a recommendation which, if accepted, would deal a devastating and perhaps final blow to the already crumbling moral foundations of this Nation.

The most significant point of all in Mr. Keating's dissent is made when he says:

Throughout history, nations have declined and disappeared coincidental with the rise of the liberties and the moral anarchists in their midst. Here one sees a corresponding denial of freedom and liberty to the dissenting and right-minded people in those societies. It is historically accurate to say that those who would free the creatures of vice would enslave the proponents of decency.

Recalling my experiences as a State senator, I am reminded at once of the drive to make public school sex education mandatory even for children whose parents find it morally offensive. And to prove his point by the most apropos example, Mr. Keating goes on to tell us how the Commission Chairman, who removed virtually all restraints on obscene expression, was so determined to prevent Mr. Keating from expressing his views on obscenity as a member of the Commission, that Mr. Keating had to get a court order to be permitted to do so.

This is the paradox of the "civil libertarian" approach to pornography—that, except among a handful of consistent but strictly ivory-tower theorists, it so often goes hand in glove with the tyrannical approach to government. Yet the paradox is more apparent than real, for it is a consequence of a basic moral truth: that some acts are intrinsically evil for all who commit them or view them with approval, and are therefore rightly prohibited by law. As the father of seven, obviously, I do not regard sex—which is man's participation in divine creativity—as intrinsically evil. But today's pornography is utter perversion of what man and woman were meant to be.

A society which recognizes the intrinsic evil in such pornography is morally well equipped to recognize also the intrinsic evil of tyranny. But a society which does not believe in intrinsic evil will more and more accept both pornography and tyranny.

THE LATE JOHN A. "BUCK" JENKINS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, Alabama and the Nation lost an outstanding citizen with the passing of John A. "Buck" Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins, a Birmingham attorney, joined the Veterans of Foreign Wars after his discharge from the Army following World War II.

In 1964, he became commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America. After his term, he continued to play an active part in the VFW, both nationally and on a State level. On August 17, while attending the national convention in Miami, Mr. Jenkins drowned in a hotel swimming pool.

I would like to submit for my colleagues' study, two articles which appeared in the September issue of the VFW News regarding the service Mr. Jenkins gave to Alabama, the Nation and the VFW:

[From the VFW News, September 1970]

A MAN WORTH LISTENING TO

(By Jerry Roden, Jr.)

Time rushes on, abiding not our convenience, frustrating our most cherished desires.

Once outside a ballroom in the Admiral Semmes in Mobile, a tall, distinguished man with a shock of unruly hair paused for a passing comment. The hour was late and the man weary: he had just concluded a busy day with a major address to his assembled comrades.

That passing comment provided me with a new and deeper insight into the nobility of John A. (Buck) Jenkins' character. "Someday, when you have more time, I would like to discuss that further with you," I said. "Let's do," he replied.

Since then, we have not found that leisure time. And now it is too late, unless somewhere in the hereafter, the Almighty in his wisdom and through his beneficence provides man an opportunity to fulfill all of those cherished desires he never achieved on earth.

In saying all this, I assume that I am not expressing a private and unique sense of bereavement. There must be thousands among our membership who would welcome an opportunity of sitting down for an enlightening chat with Buck Jenkins. For he was a man worth listening to—as a speaker and as a conversationalist.

Buck's speaking and conversational ability was great because he was in every important sense a man: a man of courage, a man of talent, a man of conviction, an unusual man with the common touch. He understood far better and appreciated much more deeply than most of us the special qualities that make American democracy great. And he saw with great clarity the role of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in preserving and strenthening our country's most vital and cherished traditions.

He added stature to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Alabama and throughout the nation, not only because he could speak well but also because he had the courage to speak out—to speak out when conviction demanded whether his sentiments were popular or not.

He gave us greater dimension because he had the wisdom to grant the other fellow the dignity of opposing convictions. One mark of Buck's greatness was his abiding friendship with Thomas B. (Benny) Dean. Anyone who has half-listened to a few of Buck's and Benny's forceful speeches must realize how different—and how much alike—these two dear friends were. Their style was different, their method different, and even their deepest convictions notably different on many issues. Yet they loved and respected each other because they both knew that they stood together on the most important issue: on the preservation of a government that permits every man the dignity of his unique convictions.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars will miss Buck Jenkins; in many ways it will be less without him. But it can be greater if those of use who remain will practice what he taught us by precept and example—what he taught us and what he learned from us. For in his passing comment outside that Admiral Semmes ballroom, Buck explained how his comrades in the VFW had brought this lesson home to him: The strength of America like that of VFW, lies in a great individual diversity and unified commitment to human dignity.

[From VFW News, September 1970]

TRAGEDY AT THE CONVENTION—LOSS OF A DISTINGUISHED ALABAMIAN

On Monday, August 17, 1970, Past National Commander-in-Chief John A. (Buck) Jenkins died from accidental drowning in the swimming pool of the Fountainbleau Hotel on Miami Beach.

The accident which deprived Commander Jenkins of his life left the Alabama delegation to the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in deep mourning for one of their State's most distinguished sons.

As a VFW leader and a practicing attorney, John A. Jenkins earned distinction for himself and deeper respect for the Veterans of Foreign Wars throughout Alabama and across the nation.

Of him, one of his comrades said: "Buck wore the honors that he earned with dignity and continued to serve with the humility of one who knows that he strives for a cause far greater than any individual."

John A. Jenkins was born and reared in Geneva, Alabama. He attended Marion Military Institute, Washington and Lee University, and Birmingham Southern College.

In 1932 he was admitted by the Bar of Alabama to the practice of law. From that time he was engaged in the general practice of law in Birmingham and was at the time of his death the senior partner in the law firm of Jenkins, Cole, and Calloway.

He joined the U.S. Army as a private in June, 1942, later graduated from Officers Candidate School, then served overseas, and was discharged as a captain.

Back in civilian life, he became a member of Kelly-Ingram VFW Post No. 668, one of the largest posts in the nation. At Kelly-Ingram he served through all the chairs. Then he served through all the chairs of the VFW Department of Alabama, serving as Department Commander in 1954–55.

At the national level, he served as a member of the Council of Administration—representing the departments of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. He was also on the National Legislative Committee and chairman of the National Security Committee.

Then he served as National Judge Advocate General prior to his election in 1962 as Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief. In August, 1964, John A. (Buck) Jenkins became the Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America.

After distinguished service as Commander-in-Chief, he continued to serve the VFW actively in Alabama and at the national level in a variety of capacities until the day of his death.

Surviving Buck are his wife, Louise; two daughters, Bonnie and Jenny, both of whom work in the Georgia educational system in the Atlanta vicinity; and his son, Jim, who is a junior partner in his father's law firm.

"Bloom forever, O Republic, From the dust to my bosom."

EDGAR LEE MASTERS.

THE TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, criminal activity has become an omnipresent aspect of American life. Yet, in its attempts to cope with and reduce this problem, our system of law enforcement has been beset with difficulties.

These difficulties and problems are exceedingly apparent at the judicial level. Courts are clogged with individuals who might best be treated by other agencies or institutions. The system of bail has been rightly deemed unfair. Penal institutions provide only the bare minimum in the areas of prisoner training and rehabilitation.

These abuses go far toward destroying confidence and respect for our system of justice. This fact takes on added significance when we realize that 70 percent of the people who have come before the criminal justice system return to crime. The time for action is now.

I would, therefore, like to bring to the attention of all concerned an editorial in the New York Law Journal which offers an analysis of the problem along with important suggestions for reform.

The editorial follows:

THE TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW!

"Society asks much of the criminal court," the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice declared three years ago. According to the commission, the "criminal court is the central, crucial institution in the criminal justice system. It is the part of the system that is most venerable, the most formally organized, and the most elaborately circumscribed by law and tradition."

Some of the glaring faults in the system of administering criminal justice have been crudely exposed to public view and concern by the revolt of prisoners in various city penal institutions. In the normal course of daily life, the public sees little and knows little about the penal system. It is only when there is a prison riot, or a scandal involving brutality and corruption in a prison that the public is awakened to the searing experience of caged humans.

There is no way of condoning the recent violence of prisoners in the city jails, the threats to the lives of the hostages, nor their destruction of prison property. On the other hand, no one involved in the administration of criminal justice can excuse himself from a share of responsibility in contributing to the sense of pent-up prisoner frustration that could find release only in desperation.

The tragedy of the prison rebellion is that it was both predictable and predicted. Reports of prison conditions submitted over many, many years remain as indictments of contemporary prison structures and administration. In recent years, surveys of penal institutions by legislative committees and by the State Investigation Commission emphasized anew the inadequacy of both the penal system and the criminal justice system.

The administration of criminal, as presently carried out, justice is a rigidly structured system that falls far short in meeting its responsibilities. Courts are clogged with alcoholics, prostitutes, vagrants and others who should be more properly treated by other social institutions or by other administrative agencies. The courts are handicapped by overworked probation staffs compelling judges to sentence in the blind.

Within the total complex of the judicial systems, our penal institutions suffer the greatest deficiencies, with the major part of all appropriations for the correctional institutions devoted to their custodial and security responsibilities and virtually nothing to their rehabilitative responsibilities.

Fortunately, no one was killed in the insurrections over the past several days. Another rebellion may result in loss of life among prisoners, guards held as hostages, or among officers attempting to quell a riot. Steps can and must be taken now to avoid such a disaster.

That involves the total mobilization of judicial and legal forces to meet the crisis in the courts and to serve the needs of those held in detention awaiting trial. As a first step, there should be an immediate short-term suspension of all misdemeanor trials involving defendants not detained in the prisons. This will release judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys to handle trials of those waiting interminably—in some cases—behind bars in overcrowded cells. Immediate consideration should be given to designating judges of the Civil and Criminal Courts to sit in Supreme Court to cope with the rising backlog of felony cases and measures taken to provide the court personnel to go with it. Courts should function fully on Saturdays and Sundays, if need be, to accord to prisoners their constitutional right to fair and speedy trials. Prison administrators should provide those detained with decent food and the simple amenities of towels, soap, toothbrushes, and urgently-needed social work services.

We are confident that judges will not object to weekend and night sessions of court during this emergency period and that competent attorneys will volunteer to assist the Legal Aid Society in a public effort to secure justice for prisoners.

From a long range point of view the fragmentation of law enforcement administration and responsibility that now afflict the judicial system should be ended by legislative action through the establishment of a unified court system, with the state assuming the full financial burden of the court system and the penal system. Fragmentation of the system has produced intolerable diffusion of responsibility and buck-passing between the state and the city and other local governments.

All citizens should be prepared to share with the Legislature the responsibility for increased appropriations to end the chronic shortage of prison guards, parole and probation officers, and of medical, psychiatric, social work, educational and rehabilitative services for prisoners.

To the extent that men and women are isolated in prisons without training or treatment and subsequently released to the community without guidance, jobs, or hope, crime rates will continue to mount and confidence in our law enforcement procedures and in our judicial system will corrode. The imperative needs for providing fair and equitable law and enforcement procedures and services must be given top priority at the next session of the State Legislature.

SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT BID—H.R. 19519

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my support for public service employment bill—H.R. 19519.

The mainstream program has demonstrated what public service employment can mean to our society through the Green Thumb program.

Whether it is work in conservation, building natural resources, or beautification, Arkansas' Green Thumbers have proven that there is no upper age limit on ability. With an average age of 69, Green Thumbers from 55 to 94 years of age have shown how a public service employment program can be efficient and effective.

The excellent work of Green Thumbers can be seen all over the State of Arkansas. Earlier this year, I attended the dedication on a Green Thumb project in my district along with the State Attorney General, representatives of the Japanese Embassy, and the American Legion, including the Japanese American-American Legion chapters. The occasion was the dedication of the Japanese-American Memorial Park at Rohwer, Ark. This was the site of one of the Japanese-American Relocation Camps during World War II. From this camp came the men who served so valiantly in the Japanese-American 442d Regiment in Italy, the most highly decorated unit in World War II. A memorial has been built there along with the graves of some of those who died during their internment in the camp. The memorial had become overgrown and abandoned. With the cooperation and help of the American Legion, Green Thumb refurbished and beautified the memorial.

All the Nation should be glad that Green Thumb has undertaken to preserve many important historical sites. Of course, the most visible Green Thumb projects in my district are the many roadside parks, road beautification, local parks, and conservation projects. Less visible but equally important is the contribution which the women are making in Green Light.

I submit for the RECORD an article about Green Light in Arkansas.

The article follows:

[From the Glenwood (Ark.) Herald, June 11, 1970]

GREEN LIGHT PROGRAM HELPS THE NEEDY HELP THEMSELVES AND OTHERS, TOO

(By Ray Ross)

If there were some way the needy could be helped by employment instead of outright charity, and at the same time, they could contribute to the social, economic and cultural betterment of the community, surely this means should be put into use.

The experimental Green Light Program, which is employing seven women at Norman, may be just such a plan. The needy are helped, and in the process they help others who are in need, because they are paid by the hour to help others, and their pay makes them independent and self-supporting.

In Norman, at least, the federally financed program which is sponsored in this state by the Arkansas Farmer's Union, is contributing to better meals and more sanitary cafeteria facilities for the public schools.

"The school district just couldn't afford the help we needed in the school lunchroom, and the Green Light program has helped keep the school lunch plan operating," said David Scott, superintendent of Norman School District.

The seven ladies who are participating in the experiment also lauded the Green Light program.

"Before we hired these women to help, we didn't have time to clean up the tables between the time the elementary school children finished and the high school children came into the lunchroom," said Mrs. Willie Dee Carpenter, cook who is in charge of the lunch room and of the women who work there.

"Since we've had enough help to keep the tables clean, there's been a big increase in the number of high school students who are getting hot lunches."

Prior to the beginning of the Green Light program, only 75 high school students were coming to the lunchroom regularly, Mrs. Carpenter said. After the program got going, 90 high school students regularly got hot lunches. This is from an enrollment of 130 students, she said.

"Not only is the lunchroom and the kitchen kept cleaner, but because we have enough help, we can take more time to prepare the food and make it better and tastier," Mrs. Carpenter said.

Her helpers agree.

Mrs. Kathleene Hamner was the first to be employed under the Green Light program. She now is a regular cook's helper. Next was Mrs. Ruth Foshee. As evidence of the plan's success grew, so did the number of women who were employed. Third to be employed were Mrs. Florence Ogle and Mrs. Media Hamilton. Fouth were Mrs. Pearl Gaston and Mrs. Fannie Carter.

Basic requirements for employment are that the women must be at least 55 years old, they must need financial assistance, and they must be able-bodied. They have to pass rigid health examinations for instance, in order to work in the school kitchens and lunchrooms.

The ladies are paid at the rate of $1.60 an hour, and may not work more than 24 hours a week. Even so, they do not spend that much time in the school lunchroom, even when school is in regular session. They also work for others who need help.

"I split kindling for one old woman who couldn't get outside during last winter's cold weather," Mrs. Hamner said.

"I scrubbed the floor and washed dishes for one of my neighbors who was sick and couldn't afford to hire it done," said Ruth Foshee.

"I cleaned the cookstove and refrigerator for an old man who didn't know how to do these things," said Mrs. Hamilton.

The other ladies also told how they helped with cooking, sewing, cleaning and other household work when neighbors became in need of these services. They apparently can go wherever needed, and are not restricted to their own communities.

Maybe, because of their own need, they understand the need of others.

Mrs. Gaston and Mrs. Carter are prime examples. Both were widowed within recent years.

"I was too old to get a job, and I was lonely," said Mrs. Carter. "I needed something to do, and I also need the money. This makes me get out and see people, and besides, I like children."

Mrs. Gaston put it another way.

"It helps me meet people with confidence," she says. "I was too old and too inexperienced to find any kind of regular job. I have neighbors on either side who now call me when they need me. It helps me spiritually, as well.

Mrs. Ogle and Mrs. Hamilton have different problems. Their husbands are retired and disabled.

"It helps me keep up my spirits," Mrs. Ogle said. "We are paying our way."

Mrs. Hamilton told about her recent major surgery.

"Because I was working on the Green Light, the state paid my hospital bill," she said. This saved her from financial disaster, and prevented the necessity of welfare.

Mrs. Carpenter speaks glowingly of the ladies who have been selected to work with her.

"I've never worked with a nicer group of women, and they all get along well together and do their work well.

"I guess they know we all need each other," she said.

Superintendent Scott hopes the plan will continue. He applied for the program as soon as it became available, working with Glen McCalman, field representative, and Lewis Johnson Jr., McCalman's superior.

"Norman has seven of the 42 Green Light ladies in Arkansas," Scott said.

"I don't know if the program will continue, but its counterpart for men, the Green Thumb program, appears to be permanent.

"But if the Green Light has worked as well in other parts of Arkansas as it has in Norman, then it surely should continue," he said.

"We hope it does," Mrs. Carpenter says. "We need the Green Light here."

HOW BAD IS THAT LEAD IN YOUR GASOLINE?

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, getting the lead out may not be the admonition it once was—especially if you're talking about gasoline.

First, the Bureau of Mines and now Sloan-Kettering report that nonleaded gasoline is potentially more hazardous than the common variety of leaded gas in use today.

It is not hard to foresee the day when ecologists suddenly discover that the nonleaded gasoline being used in the new emission-control systems is polluting the atmosphere. This will be followed, of course, by feverish activity in the laboratory and billions of Federal funds to find a way to adapt leaded gasoline to the new systems.

I doubt if you could get the scaremongers on the scene today to admit as much. They have to make a living, too.

President Nixon said the effort to control pollution is not a search for villains, so I see no reason why the lead industry should be made a scapegoat just because we have to prove we are doing something about air pollution. How I wish someone could convince me we are doing the right thing.

John Chamberlain wrote about this in the October 17th issue of Human Events, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point:

HOW BAD IS THAT LEAD IN YOUR GASOLINE?

(By John Chamberlain)

Charles F. Kettering—the famous "Boss Ket" of General Motors—was the man to do things. He invented the self-starter on order. He wasn't a chemist, but when the "knock" from raw gasoline proved incompatible with the more sensitive motors he combined with another non-chemist, Thomas Midgley, in a "try anything" attempt to come up with an additive that would keep pistons and cylinders in smooth working order. By trial and error the Kettering-Midgley team finally hit upon tetraethyl lead—and millions of automobiles have gone millions of comfortable miles on leaded gasoline since the day of its commercial introduction some 45 years ago.

Now lead in gasoline has been named as one of the more nefarious pollutants. As a "toxic metal" it doesn't deteriorate. If a chromium-deficient rat swallows enough of it, it reduces its life span by 20 per cent, which makes one wonder what breathing it would do to a chromium-deficient human being. (Query: does anyone know the percentage of chromium-deficient men and women?)

The Nixon Administration, which is properly alive to the pollution issue, now wants to put a $4.25-per-pound tax on lead in gasoline, partly to encourage experiments on emission-control devices that will work with non-leaded fuel, and partly to raise money to wipe out an estimated federal budget deficit of $1.3 billion. Unfortunately "Boss Ket" is no longer around to invent an engine that will work without doing damage to itself if it uses nothing but lead-free gas.

If it were merely a matter of paying a little more for non-leaded fuel and suffering from the resulting increased wear-and-tear on the motor, most of us would gladly do so in order to improve the quality of the circumambient air.

But there is more to this business of legislating for emission-control standards than meets the eye. It seems that the methods used for producing a lead-free usable fuel results in adding mysterious elements to the gasoline that could make the exhaust from the tail pipe even more dangerous than it now is.

I am not a chemist, and I can only pass on what a U.S. Bureau of Mines research report says on the subject. When "aromatics" are increased in the gasoline in order to compensate for the lack of lead, some mysterious substances called "polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons," or "PAH," appear in the engine exhaust. According to the Bureau of Mines, this actually adds to the photochemical "smog" of the Los Angeles eye-irritating type by as much as 25 per cent.

Moreover, the PAH molecules have been found by Sloan-Kettering Institute researchers to cause cancer in mice. This doesn't necessarily mean that the molecules would remain in the atmosphere in sufficient quantity to cause cancer in humans. But the possibility remains.

So it could be a matter of jumping from the frying pan into the fire if Sen. Muskie succeeds in "legislating" the lead out of gasoline by 1975 or 1976. We live in a most mysterious world, and if one only increases the smog by trying to get rid of it, then where are we?

I don't own any lead stock, and, at the behest of my pollution-conscious 12-year-old son, I frequently buy the new Amoco nonleaded gasoline even though it is a bit more expensive. So I think I take off from a reasonably objective stance in trying to get to the bottom of the big lead versus no-lead controversy.

The lead interests will tell you that a federal tax on lead will backfire by cutting off experiments on devices designed to trap lead before it comes out of the exhaust. The DuPont Co., the Ethyl Corp. and Mobil Oil all claim to have developed satisfactory emission-control systems that operate on leaded fuels. The California Air Resources Board says the DuPont "manifold reactor system" on a car using leaded gasoline "meets nearly all of 1980 proposed federal emission standards."

The auto companies themselves, however, seem to have come down on the side of lead-free gas for the further future, assuming that their technologists and scientists will develop catalytic control systems that can work efficiently with non-leaded fuel. At least General Motors President Edward N. Cole has been quoted in a Detroit newspaper as saying that unleaded gasoline will ultimately extend the life of emission-control systems.

So, between the theories, you pays your money and you takes your choice. But you should be aware that no matter what you do you may still be polluting the air.

CONFUSION, CUBA, AND THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, there has been one slight problem connected with the treaty, signed by the United States and 16 Latin American nations, that creates a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. Cuba did not sign it. Nor does

Cuba have any intention of signing it. Nor, if they were to sign it, would they abide by it. Why should they? The Soviet Union is turning Cuba into the dagger with which it will strike at the heart of the United States.

It is indisputable that the Soviet Union is building a base in Cuba from which to deploy its nuclear ballistic missile submarines around the periphery of the United States. When the Department of Defense recently pointed this out, a storm of protest arose from certain sectors of media and the Senate. Incredible as it may seem, this criticism was not directed against the Soviet Union and Cuba, but against the Defense Department and the Nixon administration for calling attention to the fact.

How does one go about conditioning the American people to accept a Soviet naval base 90 miles off our coast? It is a real art which attempts to get the U.S. electorate to put up with something that is detrimental to their interests, to the point of perhaps being fatal to their existence. First the "voice of reason" speaks out. "Let us not jump to conclusions," we are told. "Let us not judge Stalin, Lenin, Mao, Ho, Castro—pick any one—too hastily. We must wait until all the evidence is in. We must wait and see what develops." The voice-of-reason tactics are sure fire—for the enemy. By the time we finally get around to making a judgment from which to act we are faced with a fait accompli. By the time all the evidence is in, so are the Communists—and well entrenched. Needless to say, if we use this method in determining whether the Soviets are going to attack the United States—that is, if only the attack itself can prove the point—it will be a bit late to do anything about it.

Along with the voice of reason comes the voice of the eunuch. We are told that what is good for the goose is good for the gander, and since we have a base in, say, Germany, it is perfectly fair for the Soviets to have a base in Cuba. We are told that we must look at these things objectively from a position of neuterism or neutrality. Americans who take a neutral stance in regard to the United States and the Soviet Union, besides being morally unprincipled, fail to understand that the Soviets are not going to look out for our interests and, if we do not judge affairs from the point of view of our security and well-being, we can hardly expect anyone else to do so.

Another argument assumes a substantial derangement of the American mind. We are told that it is actually to our advantage that the Soviets have a base in Cuba because now we can hold them hostage. Following this type of thinking to its logical conclusion, we would conclude that if the Soviets were to establish a naval base in San Diego we would be in an even more favorable position, since then they would be even easier to hold hostage.

The voices of reason and the eunuchs are soon joined by a host of amateur psychologists telling us about the Russian psyche. You see, the Russians feel insecure and therefore, since insecurity may trigger a nuclear war, paradoxically enough, it is to our advantage for them to have a base in Cuba, buffer states in Eastern Europe, orbiting nuclear weapons, a "friendly" Southeast Asia—pick one. Once these poor uncertain individuals, the Communists, do not feel threatened, all will be well. To follow this line of thought further, since freedom makes the Communists feel insecure in the extreme—the fact that they crush it everywhere they seize power is historical proof of this—we can conclude that they will only feel secure when we no longer exist as a free nation. Since this is exactly what we wish to prevent, this argument is less than compelling.

Whether these arguments, and a host of others equally ingenious, will tranquilize the American people into accepting this state of affairs, is still to be seen. The hard facts are these: the Cuban base doubles the threat from the present Soviet submarine force, since this fleet no longer has to make a 4,000-mile trek back to the homeland to undergo necessary repairs, and can therefore stay on target at all times. The building of this base is prima facie evidence that the Soviets are planning to knock out our B–52 bases and the radar on the Safeguard system in conjuction with a massive SS–9 ICBM strike on our Minuteman missiles. With this nuclear backing in Cuba for political and guerrilla warfare, the whole of South America, already crumbling, becomes many times more vulnerable to Communist takeover.

In these days of "realining priorities," it is time we put a top priority on commonsense—and self-preservation.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD today an open letter to the President written by C. F. Marley, Nokomis, Ill. I feel it will be of interest to my colleagues in the House. The letter follows:

MR. PRESIDENT: TELL US WHY

(By C. F. Marley)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a loyal American, please tell me why you condone supplying the enemies our sons must fight? And why do we have a policy which is eliminating private farms, businesses and local governments when these were the things we fought for in the past; the things which made us a proud and free people? Yet, under these circumstances we are being told we are bringing "freedom" to the Vietnamese.

It is not reasonable that freedom and independence should begin at home? How can we bring freedom to others when we have all but lost it at home? On what reasonable basis do you expect continued support?

I am no dissident who is for burning down the country. I am a subscriber to the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and all other institutions which have meant freedom and independence.

I come from a family which is proud of its country, and a family which has fought in every major struggle for more than 100 years: I have two great uncles buried at Vicksburg, Miss., where they died defending the Confederacy. Their father, my great grandfather, was for two years a Union prisoner of war. I had an uncle in World War I. I and my five brothers have served in the Army, Navy, and the Air Force. One fought the Japanese at Buna, in New Guinea; I saw action at Empress Augusta Bay at Bougainville in the Solomons, and at Green Islands in the Bismarks. Another brother landed against the Germans in Southern France, and against the Japanese at Okinawa. Another fought the Communists in Korea. Another was called for in the Lebanon crisis. Today, three of us have sons in the military, one with the Marines in Viet Namese seas.

I point this out because we know quite a lot about wars. And, while earlier wars made at least some sense, this one makes little, and it makes less and less all the time. But, to give assistance to the enemy while fighting him was and must still be, unthinkable. This is no call to pull out and abandon our prisoners of war. It is a call to stop aiding the enemy while we are at war.

Mr. President, just what is it that has changed? For a long time now our so-called friends have been openly supplying the enemy in open view at Haiphong. To add to the insult, in recent days the newspapers have carried the story that the State Department is dropping a long standing requirement that free world ships trading with China may not use fueling facilities owned by Americans unless a check shows the ships are not carrying strategic goods. The newspaper account says that this relaxation fits in with your Administration's effort to improve relations with the Communists and to loosen trade restrictions for American profits.

THINK OF IT: Every week we lose 70 to more than 100 men in Viet Nam, and now we are to give aid, comfort, and assistance to the enemy at the same time. This is selling American blood at a profit. It cannot be tolerated!

Some well-meaning friends to whom I have spoken about this outrage have tried to discourage me from saying anything because of the trouble you are having with the youth of this country. I say this situation is intolerable and a legitimate question is a legitimate question whether posed by a hippy or a member of the DAR. In fact, anyone who remains quiet under these circumstances contributes to the problem.

Then there were people who told me not to say anything because I do not have all the facts. If I do not have all the facts it is Washington's fault, not mine. In these nine years we have heard many stories and there is no reason we could not have had the facts. But I do have this many facts: You want to send my sons into combat along with the rest of the young men in this country and you have eased the flow of military hardware to the enemy, and I want an explanation.

Mr. President, I do understand some of your problems were not of your creation. But you have had two years. We see no end in sight, only more war brewing in the Mediterranean. My patience and that of others is growing mighty thin.

Your reply, when received, will be given equal exposure. Thank you.

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS OF KANSAS FOURTH DISTRICT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter

which contains an annual report on the work of the 91st Congress as well as the activities of my congressional office during the past year. It has been my practice since coming to Congress in 1961 to provide these periodical reports to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas. The newsletter follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN GARNER E. SHRIVER, REPRESENTING THE KANSAS FOURTH DISTRICT

DEAR FRIENDS: This final newsletter of the 91st Congress constitutes an Annual Report to you on some of the legislative accomplishments of this Congress, and to highlight the work of your Kansas 4th Congressional District office in Washington. As this report is written, the 91st Congress still is at work, and there is a strong possibility that we will recess about mid-October and return for a post-election session in November. Unfortunately, the Senate has fallen behind the House causing a prolonged congressional session, and the congressional leadership in the House has failed to face up early to many of the priority proposals recommended by President Nixon to meet the nation's major problems. Many of the Administration's proposals dealing with inflation, manpower training reform, crime control, draft reform, and revenue sharing probably will be left for the attention of the next Congress. Among the important measures passed by the Congress were the Postal Reorganization bill that contained a right-to-work amendment; a tax reform bill that phased out the surtax and increased Social Security benefits; and an unemployment compensation bill providing 13-weeks extended payments for unemployed workers. The House also passed the first congressional reform measure in 24 years which is pending in the Senate; and final action is hoped for soon by a House-Senate conference committee on a new farm bill.

Successful representative government rests upon continuing 2-way communication between the Congressman and the people he represents. I work for you, and I need your comments and suggestions. Thank you for this opportunity of serving you in Washington and for your interest and concern in good government.

Sincerely,

GARNER E. SHRIVER.

THE ANNUAL REPORT

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I share the responsibility for reviewing the entire $200 billion national budget. One way to attack inflation is to cut wasteful and unnecessary government spending. Although final appropriations actions have not yet been completed, the House appropriations committee has made net reductions of over $745 million in budget requests, but the Senate has made a net increase of over $1.3 billion. In serving on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I continued to seriously question the value and effectiveness of the U.S. foreign aid program. The House took action to cut it back by another half-billion dollars in 1971 resulting in the lowest foreign aid budget since World War II. The next Congress will have the responsibility of completely revamping the program.

ASIAN FACT FINDING MISSION

As a representative of the Appropriations Committee, your Congressman visited Vietnam and South Korea in 1969 on a fact-finding mission to evaluate the continuing American military and economic efforts in those countries. Like most Americans I want to see the war ended in Vietnam as soon as possible. On the basis of briefings and observations there I came away with the impression that President Nixon's policy of "Vietnamization" of the war would work. Since that time of course, U.S. troop withdrawals have been well underway and by next spring more than 265,000 Americans will have been withdrawn. When I returned from that mission, I stated that it was time that the U.S. military responsibility in Korea should be assumed by the forces of South Korea. In a recent statement, the Secretary of Defense announced that an official decision has been reached to finally begin the phased withdrawal of American troops from Korea.

ECONOMIC TRANSITION IN THE UNITED STATES

Today, we in the United States are experiencing a major economic transition. We are going through the difficult process of redirecting our economic base from wartime to peacetime productivity, and at the same time we are fighting inflation, caused largely by runaway deficit federal spending. In accomplishing these massive changes in Federal priorities, there has been an accompanying amount of temporary unemployment. I have been working closely with local officials, and business and industry to do what I can at the federal level to assist in stimulating the economy and creating more jobs. Following are a few of the actions taken by your 4th District Congressman this year:

1. Requested all civilian and military agencies to conduct federal procurement conference in Wichita on August 31 to assist in getting government contracts. Secured participation of 10 prime contractors to discuss subcontracting opportunities. More than 350 persons registered for one-day conference sponsored by Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce.

2. Upon request of City of Wichita and Sedgwick County Commissioners secured prompt designation of Wichita and Sedgwick County for economic development assistance, and requested early meeting by Economic Development Administration with local officials to provide technical assistance in developing economic plan.

3. Plans for an export financing conference by Export-Import Bank of U.S. Department of Commerce and Small Business Administration in Wichita on October 29, to help stimulate exports of 4th District-made products and services.

4. Sponsored legislation providing $450 million 3-year cooperative effort between government and industry to retrain and redirect small businesses, engineers, scientists and technicians who have been engaged in defense-oriented research and development programs.

5. Sponsored legislation to provide accelerated program of public works in areas of substantial unemployment.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN THE KANSAS FOURTH DISTRICT IN FISCAL 1970

Preliminary reports on federal spending in the Kansas 4th Congressional District during fiscal 1970, which ended June 30th, indicate that more than $450 million in expenditures occurred during the period. These reports were furnished me by the budget officers of each of the Federal departments and agencies. Following is a breakdown of federal spending by agency in the 4th District:

Department of Agriculture	$52,805,201
Department of Commerce	261,123
Department of Defense	189,100,000
Department of HEW	[1] 100,000,000
Department of HUD	16,799,000
Department of the Interior	1,722,446
Department of Justice	1,143,934
Department of Labor	1,304,069
Post Office Department	19,752,000
Department of Transportation	17,296,446
Department of Treasury	3,373,000
General Services Administration	3,689,594
Civil Service Commission	6,196,068
Railroad Retirement Board	4,810,000
Selective Service	116,034
Small Business Administration	5,273,562
Veterans' Administration	25,300,000
National Science Foundation	$82,168
National Foundation on Arts and Humanities	72,500
Agency for International Development	267,272
Office of Economy Opportunity	325,507
Interstate Commerce Commission	44,900
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	117,345
NASA	682,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliatory Service	52,400
American Battle Monuments Commission	3,794
Atomic Energy Commission	22,931
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,781
Total	450,622,075

[1] Estimated.

SERVING CONSTITUENTS

In addition to the important legislative and committee responsibilities of this congressional office, I have continued to assist and serve my constituents, to the best of my ability, in their individual relationships and problems with the Federal Government. The volume of my contacts with federal agencies in behalf of my constituents, including local governmental bodies, increased considerably during the past year and there was a heavier request for documents and information.

During the year my staff and I held over 975 conferences with 70 different government agencies in Washington in behalf of 4th District citizens. This compared with 890 conferences in 1969.

We received and replied to over 1,550 requests for Government publications, documents and information as compared to 1,200 in 1969.

As in the past mail from 4th District citizens continued to have high priority. From January 1, 1970 through October 2, 1970, I received approximately 15,500 first-class communications from constituents.

It was gratifying to have nearly 1,100 Kansans sign the guest book in my Washington office during the second session of the 91st Congress.

OPINION POLL

Approximately 115,000 questionnaires were mailed to 4th District citizens with the help of volunteers this year. More than 21,000 citizens returned their opinion polls to me for tabulation. Throughout my service in Congress, these polls have been helpful to me in determining the thinking of Kansans on domestic and international matters.

OTHER COMMUNICATION

In addition to the Opinion Poll and these periodical newsletters, I have attempted to maintain close communication with the people of my District by frequent trips home for personal visitations and speeches. Thus far, this year I have made 15 such trips. In addition, through the cooperation of 12 Kansas radio stations, I continued a series of weekly radio reports to the people. Occasional television reports also were carried by Kansas TV stations. Weekly and daily newspapers in the 4th District also continued their cooperation in publishing either regularly or as space permitted my Weekly News Report from Washington.

DISTRICT OFFICES

In order to better serve constituents in the 4th District and to facilitate communication on important matters, two congressional district offices are maintained year-around. One office is in the Hutchinson Post Office with Mrs. Hollis Gibson in charge and the other is at 830 North Main in Wichita with Mrs. Jeanne Guerrant in charge.

CONGRESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

Following are the young men from the 4th District nominated by me to compete for appointments to the nation's outstanding

service academies who were chosen in 1970: Donald Joseph Clement of Wichita, Air Force Academy; Glenn Donald Pyle of McPherson, Naval Academy; and Jeffrey W. Anderson of Newton, U.S. Military Academy.

Congressional interns who were selected, upon recommendation of the Faculty Screening and Recommendations Panel, were Alfred Berg (Tabor College), Wichita; Roger Seifert (Friends University), Wichita; Mary Kay Royse (Kansas State Teachers of Emporia), Langdon; and Michael James (Wichita State University), Wichita.

VICTORY: THE UNMENTIONABLE OPTION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to explain to my constituents why we should win the war in Vietnam and why we are not attempting to do so I have assumed that the administration was rejecting a strategy of victory because it felt constrained under certain implications of the containment policy—specifically, that the United States should not try to overthrow an entrenched Communist government for fear that the Soviet Union will retaliate with an attack on the continental United States.

Even though the Nixon administration has dropped the containment policy per se and moved to a containment by proxy policy, it still seemed that this was the basic criterion limiting our military action in Vietnam. However, now I find that this is not the case at all.

On June 26 of this year, in replying to a reporters question about the Middle-East during a background briefing for the press at the San Clemente white house, Dr. Henry Kissinger, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, made the following statement:

Incidentally, I would have to say that if there is the danger of a general war in this Administration, I do not believe, and we do not believe that it will come from Southeast Asia. It is very hard to see what we could do in Southeast Asia that would produce a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Victory means destroying the enemy's powers of resistance, material and moral, to the point where he can no longer wage organized warfare. The United States clearly could do this in Southeast Asia if it so decided. Dr. Kissinger is saying, and he indicates that he is not alone in this evaluation of the situation, that a U.S. victory would not result in a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.

This admission, to be truthful, startled me. Not that it is an incorrect statement. It is perfectly correct, in my opinion. A Soviet attack on the United States will not result from anything we do in Southeast Asia, but is rather predicated upon their capability to wage a successful "one act war on the American continent". When they achieve what they consider the necessary capability we are going to have a war, or perhaps better to say, be on the receiving end of a nuclear strike. The beginning of this conflict will depend on Soviet estimation of probability of success and not on our activities in Southeast Asia. What startled me was that the administration felt the same way about Soviet reaction to our victory, and still had not gone on to win.

If the administration felt that escalating our activity in Vietnam to the point of defeating the enemy would have placed the lives of all of us in jeopardy, it would have been possible to understand their not doing so, even though the reasoning involved in the decision was incorrect. Now the failure to seek victory becomes incomprehensible.

Always hopeful of finding some sensible reason for a particular policy, a search was made for an answer to the question of why we refuse to win. The only thing which the administration has to say on the subject is that we have ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised defeat. There is apparently no discussion allowed of an option known as victory. It is the unmentionable option.

Foreign policy may be complex but it is not complex to the point where it becomes possible to find some advantage in prolonging our stay in Vietnam when we could achieve our objective with surety and dispatch.

Speculation is growing as to why we refuse to win the war since what many felt to be the main reason for not winning has now been ruled out. The Armed Forces Journal of October 5, 1970, has an article which advances several reasons. Personally it is inconceivable to me that the administration would be so cowed by the radicals on the campus that they would allow loyal young Americans to die in Vietnam when we could win quickly or that this war is being run according to opinion polls—no matter what they reveal.

The article follows and it is my hope that the administration will set this matter straight. The only way this type of theorizing can be countered is by making it clear why we have decided not to win when we forsee no general confrontation arising from such a victory, when we have the capability to do so, and when it is obviously in line with our objective of maintaining a non-Communist Indochina.

[From the Armed Forces Journal, Oct. 5, 1970]

WHERE DO AMERICANS REALLY STAND ON ALTERNATIVES FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA?

(By Benjamin F. Schemmer)

The White House and *Playboy* magazine may be in for a jolt, if a forthcoming poll of 1-million college students bears out the findings of two young Vietnam veterans on America's real convictions about alternatives in Southeast Asia.

For eight months, the two veterans have been taking their own grass-roots survey, working mostly on their own funds and without backing from any group or individual. Responses so far to newspaper and TV/radio polls which they have stimulated show that 70–80% of the American people want to win in Vietnam.

Moreover, their polls show surprising public support for a two-day precision bombing raid against Haiphong Harbor and the Paul Doumer bridge in North Vietnam to choke off the flow of NVA/Viet Cong supplies into South Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos, and to force the release of American POWs. The bombing raids would be preceded by leaflet drops to let the North Vietnamese evacuate civilians and allow Allied ships to leave Haiphong Harbor, and would use conventional Paveway and Hobo glide bombs, said to be accurate within about 10 feet.

The veterans, retired Army Maj Jim Cawdrey and former USMC Cpl Dan Johnson, believe the Administration has grossly misjudged student feelings about Vietnam, and are about to poll 1-million college youngsters with the help of a nationaly recognized marketing company.

If results of the college poll bear out the expectations of Cawdrey and Johnson, the White House will find that of three Southeast alternatives spelled out in the forthcoming poll—Immediate Withdrawal, Vietnamization, and "Peace Through Victory" (involving the B–52 attacks against Haiphong)—American youngsters really want to see the U.S. try for victory. That's what Cawdrey and Johnson have found in the sampling they've taken to date.

If they are right, *Playboy* magazine will be as surprised as the White House. In its annual college poll, published in the September issue, *Playboy* claimed that 36% of 7,300 youngsters surveyed wanted to see the country "pull out now," while 29% wanted to "speed up withdrawal." Only 9% thought the U.S. should "fight for total victory, no matter what." *Playboy* told the Journal the poll was conducted last spring by its editorial staff, not by an independent polling group.

The White House, however, apparently thinks *Playboy's* barometer is pretty accurate. Some weeks ago, for instance, Dr. Henry Kissinger was asked by a reporter about the feasibility of drying up the North Vietnamese supply system and forcing a victory within 60 days through the very kind of bombing program which Cawdrey and Johnson have proposed, Kissinger reportedly said the plan was feasible. However, he then told the reporter, "But you get to handle the students." By various press reports, Kissinger was caught totally by surprise and is still shaken up over the college campus disorders which followed the President's decision in May to invade Cambodia.

$64 QUESTION

The real question at issue, therefore, is how accurately the Administration has judged Americans' true feelings about alternatives in Southeast Asia, since its perception of public opinion weighs so heavily in deciding future courses of action.

Cawdrey and Johnson have some impressive statistics to suggest that public opinion may *not* be what the Administration believes it to be. On a recent tour of seven western states, the two appeared on 47 radio and 24 TV stations and were written up in 12 major newspaper articles, totaling over 5,000 words. Polls taken by radio "talk" shows—where listeners called in to express their views on the three alternatives of Immediate Withdrawal, Vietnamization, or Peace Through Victory—typically came out in favor of victory. Station KGMC in Denver found 87% of its listeners wanted to win; KSXX and KSL in Salt Lake City found 73 and 80%, respectively, in favor of the Peace Through Victory alternative; in Seattle, KTW found 75% of its listeners for victory; and in Idaho Falls, 80% of KTEE's listeners opted for a win.

Cawdrey and Johnson say they find semilar results wherever they appear. Last March, for instance, they appeared on WINQ in Tampa, Florida. After their visit, a station official wrote them to say:

". . . another of our illustrious talkmasters took a running poll last week regarding solutions to the Vietnam problem. We received nearly 200 phone calls during that program. Each caller was permitted to place one vote for one of five possible solutions, which were categorized as follows: (1) Im-

mediate withdrawal; (2) Withdrawal within 18 months; (3) Gradual withdrawal as with Vietnamization; (4) Keep fighting; or (5) Bombing Hai Phong harbor.

"We were somewhat surprised to learn over 85% of our callers voted for the fifth solution."

Even *New Republic* magazine, which has been editorializing for voter support this fall of "peace" candidates running for Congress, ran a recent article which also suggests that the Cawdrey-Johnson estimate of real college student sentiment about Vietnam may be closer to the truth than *Playboy's* and the Administration's.

New Republic's 26 September issue quotes a May Gallup poll in which Americans were asked, "Do you think the U.S. made a mistake sending troops to fight in Vietnam?" Fifty-six percent of those polled said "Yes." But the most hawkish of four age groups surveyed was the group *under 30*. Young people were almost evenly divided: 49% said, "Yes, it was a mistake," while 48% thought not. Put another way, the poll showed that whereas people over 50 think our action in Vietnam was a mistake—by more than a two-to-one majority—*young* voters think so by barely one percentage point.

Last December, DBS took what it called a "random sampling" of 1,154 Americans over age 21, and found that only one in four favored immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. Three-fourths identified themselves as the "silent majority" to which President Nixon had referred in a 3 November speech. Asked by the network if they would favor an "all-out attack" if it would end the war at once, seven out of 10 people polled by CBS said they would advocate such an attack.

NO DOD POLL

A senior Department of Defense official told The JOURNAL DoD has not conducted any poll of its own on public opinion about Southeast Asia alternatives, and said he could not single out one poll over another as being more representative of likely American views on Vietnam policy. However, he cautioned that none of the polls discussed above could be considered "very scientific."

The DoD spokesman included in that remark a recent poll by the American Security Council, generally considered to be a fairly hawkish and "more defense whatever the cost" group. Nevertheless, the poll's statistics are impressive—especially in the absence of others from DoD.

From 1 July to 31 August of this year, the American Security Council ran ads in 203 newspapers covering 44 states, asking readers if they agreed, disagreed, or more were undecided on 10 separate "national security issues." In all, 27,197 readers responded. On the statement, "The United States should have a national objective of victory in Vietnam," more than 78% of those who responded to the poll agreed. Fourteen percent disagreed, and 8% were undecided.

As the *Playboy, New Republic* Cawdrey/Johnson, and American Security Council contrasts suggest, there is ample reason for the Administration to be confused and uncertain over where America really stands on the Vietnam war. White House officials reportedly have their own, more scientific polls of public opinion on Southeast Asia alternatives, but when asked for details about them would not provide any.

As "unscientific" as their poll may be, veterans Cawdrey and Johnson are two very impressive young men. They are not "right wing nuts" trying to obliterate North Vietnam. Their sincerity is disarming, and their quiet, articulate bearing commands respect.

Dan Johnson is a former Marine, wounded once in Vietnam. He last served there with the Fifth Marines. Jim Cawdrey was a senior district advisor and provincial psychological warfare advisor in Vietnam from mid-1965 to mid-1966. (He was retired after being shot in a freak accident at Schofield Barracks after his Vietnam tour.) Commissioned out of Infantry OCS in 1961, he speaks, reads, and writes Vietnamese and did graduate work in Asian studies at the University of Hawaii.

Both believe that a quick military victory in Vietnam is possible, and that bombing Haiphong Harbor and the Paul Doumer bridge (through which 97% of North Vietnam's supplies are transported) is the key. They feel strongly that such an attack—coupled with the threat of follow-up raids against North Vietnamese power stations and dikes in the North—is the only way to persuade North Vietnam to release over 1,500 Americans held as prisoners of war or listed as missing in action.

They point out that bombing didn't work before because key targets were not hit, and because accurate laser-guided weapons such as Paveway were not available. POW wives with whom they've talked reportedly favor their approach and point out that the lives of American POWs were not jeopardized by earlier bombing raids against North Vietnam.

The two veterans started their grassroots effect after Johnson early last year attended a dinner speech by Senator Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz), calling for a victory drive in Vietnam. Johnson says the audience's enthusiastic response—and comments like "That's the way I've always felt, but what can one man do?"—caused him to wonder if public opinion on the war was really understood. Cawdrey heard about Johnson's grass-roots effort, and decided to join him. Until recent months, when they've received about $6,000 in private small donations to expand their polling effort, both have been touring the country paying all expenses from their retirement and savings. They now have over 300 local committees in all 50 states, organized under the name National Committee for Lasting Peace, helping in the effort. They work out of San Diego (P.O. Box 4588, zip 92104, phone 714-234-2004).

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, just recently the Department of Labor released statistics showing yet another increase in the number of unemployed in our county. The problem is now more acute than ever and it is striking where it has seldom struck before—with highly educated and specially trained men and women.

One of these men, a chemist from my district, was moved to write the President of the United States about his own situation.

I think his message to the President is eloquent and is deserving of wider distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place this letter in the RECORD:

CONCORD, CALIF.,
September 4, 1970.

President RICHARD NIXON,
White House,
Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since I voted for you in the last Presidental election, I am in part responsible for the position I find myself facing. The way it was described to me was:

"Due to the depressed market, lack of sales and the tight money situation, we are forced to operate on a bare bones budget and therefore are forced to terminate your services. We have examined other positions on our company into which you might fit and are unable to offer you anything. Should business become better, there is a possibility that we may accept you back. You have done a fine job for us and should you require any help with your resume or legal advice regarding your house payment, please do not hesitate to call on us. Your hospitalization of which the Company pays $100 quarterly will be effective for one month after this date. You have three paychecks coming, one for $367 your regular paycheck one week early in lieu of notice, the second for $185 one weeks vacation pay and the third for $509 three weeks weeks severance pay. You also have $329 paid up to 1969 in your retirement fund plus the amount, unknown now, you have paid in 1970. This will be mailed to you in the near future. If you should require recommendations when seeking employment, you may be certain that we will furnish the highest. Once again, should you require any help with your resume or advice regarding your house payment, please let us know. I wish you luck."—Handshake.

I was not the only salaried employe to receive this news as there were three others with 28, 23, and 15 years service respectively. I only had 4 years.

The problem that concerns me now is that although my former employer Fibreboard Corporation is running scared, other companies are standing pat and not even considering applications for employment. A typical answer reads like this, "Unfortunately our job situation is extremely tight at the present time, and therefore, we cannot be encouraging regarding employment."

It seems to me that something is amiss with this Nation's economic policies when highly qualified people who have a proven record of accomplishment are unable to get to first base. You may be certain of one thing and this I promise you. I will take a good long, hard look at your record and at the Republican Party before voting in any election.

Very truly yours,
HERBERT L. SCHMALENBACH,
Unemployed Chemist.

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of October 12, I had the good fortune to be the guest speaker at the first meeting of the year of the PTA at Academy Park Elementary School in Portsmouth, Va. After I had made my remarks, I had the privilege of presenting awards to the four students who had written prizewinning essays on the topic "This Is My Country." I was so impressed by the patriotism shown by these fine youngsters that I want to share these essays today with my colleagues.

I want to congratulate again not only the four winners but all the boys and girls at Academy Park who took the time to express their love for this great country of ours. I am proud to count them and their parents among my constituents. The essays follow:

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

(Patricia Duke, Ungraded Intermediate Class; teacher: Mrs. Powers)

After George Washington and his soldiers won the war America was free. The thirteen

colonies that once belonged to England became the United States. The United States, our country, is now more than one hundred fifty years old.

Our country reaches all the way from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. There are millions of acres of rich farm lands and forests of oaks, maple, cedar, birch and pine trees. In the ground are rich stores of iron and coal, and oil.

We have free schools in which to learn and churches in which to pray and worship God. We have hospitals for sick people. Our country is great because we have every thing we need for a good life.

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

(Joey Honeycutt, grade 4; teacher: Mrs. Johnson)

One time I heard a record that the country belongs to you just as much as it belongs to me. My Country means a lot to me. It means that I'm free to play on it anywhere and anytime I can. When we go to Jamestown, it will mean more than anything.

I'm an American and I'm very proud of it. I would rather live in America than any other country. In America we have liberty and justice for all. We have the right to worship God as we please. We have the freedom of speech. I want to see more of my country and when I get older I hope to. I will be glad to serve my country. I will not try to dodge the draft. If and when I am called to serve the United States of America, I will always be an American and I also hope that God will be proud of America again.

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

William Miltier, grade 5; Teacher: Mrs. Robinson

I am proud of our countries history. In war and peace no country will ever equal its greatness. I love America because we have the freedom of religion, vote, and jobs. We have the privilege of public schools and fine colleges. I appreciate our great democracy and will continue in the coming years to do all that I can for my country. Many hard fought freedoms that I love were won in our War of Independence and saved in other conflicts. The freedoms which I love most are the freedom to express my thoughts and to worship as I please. When I visit the many historic places, I feel proud of my country and the heritage which those Americans left for me. I pray that during my lifetime. I might make my country just a little better as those who lived before me have done.

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

David Moore, Grade 6; Teacher: Mr. Gatling

This is my country. It started with Columbus searching for a new route to India and discovering America in 1492. America started with thirteen colonies, and grew more and more. But how did it all begin.

It begin with great men such as George Washington and Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson, men who fought for freedom and liberty.

We are free people who help each other. There are men in Viet Nam helping people and fighting for them.

Many men have died knowing that what they was fighting for was right, and what they were fighting for was there country.

Our country is proud of being the first to explore space and landing on the moon.

Yes our country has many thing to be proud of.

We have things that they did not have long ago, but they made out the best they could. They did not have freedom of speech or religion but they fought for it, so I am proud of my country.

PVT. MICHAEL SCHWARZ

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, Marine Pvt. Michael Schwarz has become the center of attention in the continuing controversy over the relevancy and the very existence of the military system of internal justice.

Schwarz, of R.F.D. 1, Weirton, W. Va., and three other soldiers who took part in a "search and destroy" mission February 19, 1970, in South Vietnam were tried for the murder of 16 South Vietnamese.

Schwarz and Pfc. Michael Green were convicted. Pfc. Thomas Boyd, Jr., and L. Cpl. Randall Herrod, the mission's commander, were acquitted. A fifth member of the patrol, Pvt. Michael Krichten, was granted immunity from prosecution to testify for the prosecution.

Since Private Schwarz began his appeal several vital facts have come into the open: Schwarz was not represented by a civilian attorney, the only defendant not so represented. His counsel was an inexperienced military counsel.

In addition, trial records show that Private Schwarz was convicted of following orders but Lance Corporal Herrod who issued the orders was acquitted. It was also noted that the defendants claimed they were firing at gun muzzle flashes. Schwarz later found that his gun had been hit twice by bullets but it was not introduced as evidence during the court-martial, only during the preliminary hearing.

These facts point out the mistakes in the court-martial and upon these I base my demand for a new trial for Private Schwarz.

Mr. John Duncan of the Associated Press, in researching the following story, quoted Schwarz' mother as saying her son "only wanted to be free to walk the land, return home to the farm, build it up and fix the fences." If the military will recognize its mistakes Michael Schwarz may soon be on his way home.

The story follows:

MICHAEL SCHWARZ WAS A KID SAID EASILY FORGOTTEN

(By John Duncan)

WEIRTON, W. VA.—If Michael Schwarz had not been accused in an alleged war massacre, his former school principal believes he would have been "the kind of a kid you would have forgotten."

Marine Pvt. Michael Schwarz grew up fast.

At 16 he was a husband, a father and a Marine. Before, he had been a car bug who loved to hunt and hated school so much he quit and altered his birth certificate in order to don a Marine uniform.

Now at 20, the boy who, according to his principal "is very patriotic," faces life in prison at hard labor on a conviction of killing 12 South Vietnamese civilians at the village of Son Thang.

Sentenced last June following Da Nang, Schwarz in custody at Camp Pendleton, Calif., awaiting military appeal.

Thousands of miles from the war zone, news of the trial and a subsequent "Free Michael Schwarz" drive shook the memories of those who knew Schwarz while he was growing up in a hilly and remote region just east of here on a 187-acre farm in Bulger, Pa.

Members of the immediate family and the few others who knew him well say Schwarz, more interested in cars than the classroom, skipped school a lot and had a few minor scrapes with the law.

At 16, he left, altered birth certificate in hand, for the Marines.

"It was something he always wanted to do since he was 12," his mother, Mrs. James Schwarz recalled at her home here. "I didn't want him to go, but he kept on pestering and changed his birth certificate, so I let him."

Schwarz will turn 21 October 8. But as far as the Marine Corps knows, he already is 21.

On his first furlough home six months after joining the Marines, Schwarz married 15-year-old Linda Kane, a neighbor he had known most of his life. They have a 4-year-old son, and have been together only two or three times, she said, since the wedding.

Linda, living with her parents, says she has not seen Schwarz since his return to Camp Pendleton and now, "I just live from day to day."

William Bohn, principal at Union Junior High School in Burgettstown, Pa., recalls Schwarz as "the kind of a kid you would have forgotten."

"He wasn't interested in school, wasn't a good student . . . he was just waiting until he could get out of school," Both recalled.

"He had his own group of friends which didn't circulate too much with the rest of the students, and when he wasn't with them he was usually alone. He was a friendly, polite boy but he didn't go out of his way to make friends.

"He was in the office frequently for skipping classes, playing hookey and smoking, nothing serious," said Bohn, "just the kind of thing that a boy would do who was just waiting to quit."

Bohn said Schwarz returned to visit the school after joining the Marines.

"He was wearing his uniform, he was very proud of it and he was very proud to be a Marine," Bohn said, noting that he had thought Schwartz in uniform was much better disciplined.

"He's a very patriotic boy and he talked to me about how he was happy that he was going to be sent to Vietnam shortly," added Bohn.

"It's kind of ironic that this should happen to such a boy, he loved the Marine Corps and he wanted to make it his career. I hope he gets a re-trial and is allowed to go free," said Bohn.

The Hancock Township Police Department reported that Schwarz had been in trouble a couple of times, but "nothing major, just a few teen-age pranks kind of thing."

Schwarz's best friend was Carl Pyle, now in the Marines also.

Mrs. Carl Pyle recalled that her son and Schwarz would go raccoon hunting together "and they had this thing they called a dune buggy, which was really an old car, which they drove to check their traps."

She said they would trap muskrats, work on old cars in the front lawn and were both "just happy-go-lucky kids."

"Mike just wouldn't let anything bother him," she said.

Mrs. James Schwarz said her son had two other interests besides the Marines—hunting and working on old cars.

"He wanted to go hunting, but I was afraid he would get hurt, so he wouldn't go. He also

wanted to race stock cars, but I wouldn't let him and he didn't," she said.

She said her son was a "very sensitive boy. If I was sick, he would sit up all night."

"Once when he came home on leave, he saw his dad sick and got frightened and jumped in his old Buick and drove 100 miles before we caught up with him," she said.

She said there was plenty of work for her son to do on the farm when he was young. And she said he is needed at home now, because her husband is sick and all but two of her seven other children have left the farm.

But the farm has gone downhill, said Mrs. Schwarz, and the family no longer farms the land.

She said her son's letters written after the trial first from a military prison in Da Nang and then another prison in Japan related that "he only wanted to be free to walk the land, return home to the farm, build it up and fix the fences."

"WE CAN HELP YOU IF YOU WILL LET US"

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, law and order ranks as one of the most critical problems facing America. Enough has been said and written about the subject to fill a library. Much of it represents an emotional and overgeneralized treatment of a complex subject. Looking for scapegoats and faultfinding rather than the search for solutions is a popular theme. Ironically, our law enforcement agencies are singled out all too often for the lion's share of the criticism and faultfinding. One is left with the impression that the police are on trial rather than the criminal elements running rampant in this country.

It is time to put teeth back into our laws. It is time to strengthen the court system of America so that the guilty are tried and punished quickly, fairly, and firmly.

It is a refreshing departure from the familiar rhetoric of our time when one reads a positive and thoughtful article offering suggestions to help our overworked and harried law enforcement agencies. This month's FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin contains such an article by Miss Mary Creese, news editor, Rock Springs Daily Rocket-Miner, Rock Springs, Wyo.

Entitled "We Can Help You, If You'll Let Us," Miss Creese offers some thoughtful suggestions on ways in which the police and news media can work together more effectively.

I hope this well-written article receives the careful attention of the law enforcement and news media communities.

In order that the large audience that reads the RECORD has an opportunity to read Miss Creese's article, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Rock Springs (Wyo.) Rocket-Miner]

WE CAN HELP YOU, IF YOU WILL LET US

(By Miss Mary Creese)

While some law enforcement officers shy away from news reporters, and some are reluctant, with good reason, to trust the news media, we in the newspaper business can be a help to you—*if* you'll let us.

It took many columns of type and a lot of extra hours to persuade one sheriff that those of us who were aware of the truth knew the search for a missing teenage boy was done thoroughly and professionally, even though it was unsuccessful.

We knew that, because of his fatigue and disappointment, the sheriff was reluctant to report his day's efforts. I joined in the search, garnered information from many other sources, and wrote sympathetically, but truthfully, of his activities to show that everything possible was being done.

BUILT ON CONFIDENCE

Good news stories, of course, are possible because of the confidence of law enforcement officers in the news reporter—a confidence that grows only after years of sustained accuracy, objectivity, and sound ethics.

Most law enforcement officers will agree that there is no deterrent to crime like a wide publicity campaign, that nothing helps prevent traffic accidents and slows the drivers, at least for a time, quite so much as the knowledge that "it can happen to you" or "it did happen to your neighbor."

Most officers will also agree that, if bogus currency is afloat or check artists are at work, newspaper publicity can serve notice to merchants to intensify their lookout for counterfeit bills and forged checks. As a result, the culprits may be more readily apprehended.

The professional, mature newspaper reporter and photograher wants, needs, and deserves your confidence. Between you and him can develop a mutual trust, respect, and understanding. He will guard your secrets and will appreciate your occasional need for silence.

LOSS OF CONFIDENCE

The police agency which withholds legitimate news from the press will soon gain a reputation of "managing the news." There will be a breach in relations, and confidence and respect will suffer. On the other hand, a reporter who violates the trust of a police official and reports on a case prematurely in order to scoop the opposition will soon find that a valuable source of information has dried up. It is a matter of dual responsibilities in which the rights of the public rest on the integrity of both the news media and law enforcement.

I, too, have no use for the movie-type reporter, who almost puts a "press" tag in his hatband, affects a trench coat, and runs everywhere, coattails flying and eyes wide, searching for a "story."

There are reporters who must be cautioned that they are not investigators—merely observers. They are employed to write about, not probe into, criminal activity.

AIR CRASH MAKES HEADLINES

While working as a reporter with the Longmont, Colo., Times-Call in November 1955, I had occasion to cover the crash of a United Airlines DC–6B which went down in flames east of Longmont killing 44 persons. The plane took off from Denver at 6:52 p.m., November 1, bound for Seattle, Wash. Eleven minutes later, when the plane had reached almost 6,000 feet, witnesses reported there was an explosion and a flash and the aircraft plunged to earth.

In a fast-breaking story of this magnitude, excellent liaison and cooperation with law enforcement officials pay off. My associates and I received tremendous assistance from willing law enforcement agencies from the very beginning. Since it was apparent from the information available at the outset that the crash resulted from a midair explosion, the big question was what caused the explosion and was it accidental or—was the aircraft sabotaged?

Six days after the crash, I learned from a reliable source outside law enforcement and official agencies concerned with the incident that a dynamite blast in the number 4 cargo pit caused the crash. Further, I was told that baggage in this particular pit had been loaded only in Denver.

You can imagine the temptation to break this shocking information in a big story nationwide under a Longmont dateline. But, we did not. The FBI had opened a criminal investigation of the case, and we did not want to jeopardize the possibility of a quick solution and arrest. Further, I really had no right to use the information as it had been given to me in confidence.

Soon thereafter an official release was made that a bomb had caused the crash. On November 14, the FBI arrested Jack Gilbert Graham, 23, whose mother had been killed in the crash, on a charge of sabotage. A few days later, the State of Colorado charged him with the murder of his mother. Graham was tried on the murder charge, convicted, and sentenced to death. He was executed on January 11, 1957.

SOUND JUDGMENT

I believe that we at the Longmont Times-Call did what any responsible professional news staff would have done in holding off on the tip about the dynamite blast. Even though the source was reliable, and later develpoments corroborated the fact, we had no official confirmation. Further, we had good reason to believe that public disclosure at the time might jeopardize the possible success of the intensive investigation by the FBI and other agencies assisting. The temptation was great, but, in looking back, I am convinced our judgment was sound and in keeping with the highest traditions of the profession.

I thought at one point several years ago I had the full confidence of a local law enforcement official. However, when I inquired of him one day about a report of vandalism in a nearby school, he said there was nothing to it.

Since my source seemed reliable, I took my camera and drove out to the school. I found there that the enforcement official had indeed investigated extensive damage inside the building. When members of the school board unlocked the building (closed until damage could be repaired), I prepared a good, interesting story, which included the fact that flour, sugar, eggs, and other foods in the school kitchen had been thrown about with abandon. Pictures told the sad story of complete, ruthless vandalism. We did not, however, print the picture of a shoe print with an identifiable heel mark. I held that one out.

It was a livid official who confronted me the next day with my story folded out on his paper, with which he pounded my desk, demanding to know where I got the story and why I chose to write it, and stating that if he had wanted it in the paper, he would have given it to me.

I told him if he did not want the story in the paper, all he would have had to do was tell me and give me a good reason for withholding it.

HELPFUL EVIDENCE

He calmed down and apologized, saying that the case was still under investigation. I asked if he had any prime suspects, to which he replied, "Two, but we can't prove anything." I offered him my picture of the

heelprint, with which he later confronted one of the suspects, matched the picture with the heel of his shoe, and obtained a confession.

It is true that the professional, mature news reporter wants to do his bit to help law enforcement officers. You can ask any responsible reporter or editor for cooperation in withholding a story pending certain developments and, if your request is valid, he will go along with you. He will, of course, expect you to advise him immediately when the story can be reported. Further, he will also depend on you to help protect his interest should the story become known to other news media which may not respect the agreement. However, a story with any significant news value cannot, as all officers and reporters know, be suppressed for long.

COOPERATION WITH NEWS MEDIA

I have found that the degree of cooperation between the press and law enforcement differs from area to area. The length of the acquaintance between a reporter and an enforcement official will, of course, have some bearing on cooperation. However, some police agencies are not news oriented. By nature or by habit, the officials and officers are closemouthed and offer little, if any, assistance to newsmen. Some departments apparently have no plans or procedures for making available to the press information from public records, such as police blotters. Consequently, a reporter does not like to deal with departments of this type, but he welcomes the chance to work with agencies whose personnel recognize the rights of the public as represented by a free press and who furnish what information and help they can without infringing on the rights of others and without making prejudicial statements.

REARDON REPORT

Many representatives of news media in this area, as do others in all parts of the country, believe that the highly publicized Reardon Report of the American Bar Association is a marked encroachment on freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, adopted December 15, 1791, 179 years ago, is a stipulation forbidding any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

But today many lawyers and law enforcement agencies claim the Reardon Report—only a report, mind you—is aimed only at lawyers and law enforcement agencies to restrict the release of prejudicial statements about accused persons, and that it does not affect the release of news about crime or criminal investigations.

Most newsmen see it differently. They feel it would black out arrest records and preliminary hearings. It would muzzle police officers and prosecutors and judges. It would forbid mentioning the existence of confessions, prior criminal records, and police laboratory tests.

It would allow a police officer to state that an accused individual denied charges against him, but if he *admitted* charges, that could not be printed. The lawyers would have a complete record of closed pretrial hearings transcribed, and then after the trial or disposition of the case without trial, the lawyers would have the court reporters write up all those notes and issue copies to the press.

By then, who wants them? No newspaper which has anything to do with news would touch them. Thus the public would be deprived of another bit of public information.

TRUTH WILL WIN

Even Justice Paul Reardon, author of the bar report which bears his name, has warned that the proposals should not be used by anyone "as a cover for what should be out in the open."

As pointed out in one newspaper editorial, "The press upholds the traditional democratic ideal that truth will win in a free and open market place.

"The bar tends to believe, on the other hand," the editorial continues, "that truth is best served when filtered through the various technicalities of the court room. . . .

"If statements by law enforcement and court officials are limited to a short list of specific formalities, the public clearly will have less opportunity to learn how law enforcement is carried out in their society."

Further, some members of the bar claim that the press uses crime news to sell papers—whereas more than 80 percent of the 61 million copies of daily newspapers are presold by subscription, and the press does not rely on so-called "sensational" stories to survive.

NO THREAT TO FAIR TRIALS

In this section of the country, to have the additional curtain, as proposed by the Reardon Report, dropped between us and news sources would constitute a definite threat to the freedom of the press.

To my knowledge, no one has come up with any positive support for charges that the press imperils the concepts of fair trials. The people have a definite right to know what their courts and law enforcement officers are doing. No one denies the dangers of excluding the press from proceedings in any type of trial, from the slightest misdemeanor to first degree murder. If such procedures were condoned, it would follow that the greater part of every criminal trial could be conducted in secrecy behind closed doors.

The public trial, in the words of a Los Angeles writer challenging the exclusion of the press, has a therapeutic function in reducing community tension, in supeseding private vengeance, in removing excuses for lynch and vigilante law, in protecting the rights of the public as well as those of the defendant, and in providing values which, perhaps, society has been inclined to take for granted in recent years.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Properly conducted public trials maintain the confidence of the community in the honesty of its institutions, in the competence of its public officers, in the impartiality of its judges, and in the capacity of its criminal law to do justice.

We have cooperated to the fullest with the judges who insist we withhold the names of juveniles involved in serious crimes—and we do cooperative, if the case goes into juvenile court. However, with the percentage of juvenile "repeaters" growing, even those judges are leaning toward the publication of names, ages, names of parents, and even street addresses of juvenile offenders.

Basically our role, with yours as officers, is protecting constitutional rights while making sure of a keener awareness of responsibility in publishing news—all the news.

That is good reason to say "no" when we are requested to withhold the name of an offender whose case goes through a court of public record. For if we comply with one request, where are we to stop?

A common complaint against newspapers is that we are unduly sensational in our handling of crime news—that such items may be an incentive to crime, that the pander to the cheap surface emotions of the herd mind.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

PRESS' DUTY

The truth is that a complete, factual, and mercilessly accurate account of a crime is the duty of responsible newspapers. In the first place, crime news is not solely the concern of low-grade morons. It is also the concern of responsible law-abiding citizens.

If the youth of this country, reading the facts on a race riot or massacre or murder, are tempted to purchase machineguns and start shooting, then there is little hope for American youth and the adults who bore and reared them.

Generally, crime news, complete and even blatant, is necessary before any serious move for reform is ever attempted.

Without publicity which brings out details of crimes, which the private citizen may recognize and therefrom offer his assistance, the tough solutions could be even tougher. With no news story, the person who stumbles over evidence of crime in remote places probably would never get his information to the law enforcement agencies.

We do not want to be told what to print; we will not surrender the right to public reports of events we consider newsworthy or of public interest; we will continue to publish any statement made in open court, whether or not it is stricken from the record, and we will defend our freedom to publicize wrongdoing wherever it exists, including the actions of law enforcement officers, lawyers, and judges. And we will print our own names in the news if we are the offenders.

Because the public ultimately is responsible for the administration of justice, the public is entitled to know how justice is being administered. No one has the right to keep the press and the public in darkness.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Freedom to gather news is at the heart of any concept of a free press. When you close out sources of news, you cripple the functioning of the press. It is a combination of the rights, to gather, print, and distribute which is the cornerstone of true freedom of the press.

If we have a fault, it is to underpublicize, rather than overpublicize, as staffs and space often are too small to give all areas the attention they demand and deserve.

IT IS UP TO YOU

We try to attract to our business persons with an insatiable curiosity and an ability to look and listen and report—without distortion—what they see and hear. True, some reporters follow devious methods in getting there first, regardless of the end result. We have contemptible persons in our business, but you will find them wherever the pressures of competition make it necessary to perform first and explain later.

However, we can be the agency which presents your story, accurately and sympathetically, as we understand that law enforcement is one of the most hard-pressed, underpaid, and senselessly abused groups in the Nation. We can help give you the status you deserve. But what good is the professional, knowledgeable reporter, if a curtain separates him from law enforcement news? That curtain ties our hands so that we are unable to help you. It's up to you.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS—AND CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE BUDGET AS A WHOLE

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am including a summarization of congressional actions to date on the budget for the current fiscal year 1971. Congress acts on the budget not only in the appropriation bills but also in its actions, or through in-

actions, on budgetary proposals in various bills out of legislative committees. Facts and figures are included for both as of this date, but it should be pointed out that much of the budget total on which Congress acts remains to be finalized.

Federal finances are a joint responsibility of the President and the Congress. Original Executive budget estimates and projections are always tentative; often wide of the mark; not infrequently amended upward by the President on the appropriation and spending side. I am including certain pertinent information in this respect.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

IN SUMMARY

Mr. Speaker, in briefest summary, the situation as to the annual appropriation bills with respect to fiscal 1971 amounts is as follows:

The House has now passed all the regular annual bills. In House actions we have made net reductions—and I am including the vetoed independent offices-HUD bill—of $2.5 billion below the related budget requests. If the vetoed bill is not considered, then the House is about $2.7 billion below the related budget requests.

In the Senate, 10 of the regular appropriation bills, including the vetoed independent offices-HUD bill, have been approved. In these 10 bills, the Senate has approved a net increase of about $2.5 billion above the President's budget requests. If the vetoed bill is excluded, the increase above the budget would be about $1.3 billion on the other nine bills.

Eight of the 14 regular appropriation bills have been approved by the Congress and sent to the President. Taking into account these bills, there is a net increase above the related budget requests of nearly $800 million. But excluding the vetoed independent offices-HUD bill, the net increase above the President's budget requests in the other seven bills $230 million.

Mr. Speaker, although the Senate still has pending before it major appropriation bills dealing with Defense, Labor-HEW, foreign assistance, and Transportation, and a new independent offices-HUD bill must be acted upon, I think it can safely be said that Congress, at this session in the appropriation bills, will in the aggregate be under the fiscal 1971 Presidential budget requests in the general area of about $1 billion, give or take a couple of hundred million or so.

In other words, Members can say that there is every indication that when this Congress adjourns following the post-election session Congress, in its actions on the fiscal 1971 appropriation bills, will be below the President's budget requests for 1971 considered in those bills.

Mr. Speaker, following is a capsule summary of the amounts of new budget obligational authority for fiscal year 1971 currently involved in the 14 bills:

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971—AT A GLANCE

[New budget obligational authority. Fiscal 1971 amounts only]

	Budget requests considered	Approved	Change (+) or (−)
1. In the House:			
(a) Subtotal, 14 bills	$137,138,661,822	$134,627,396,817	−$2,511,265,005
(b) Deduct independent offices-HUD bill, veto sustained	−17,216,823,500	−17,390,212,300	+173,388,800
Net total, 13 House bills	119,921,838,322	117,237,184,517	−2,684,653,805
2. In the Senate:			
(a) Subtotal, 10 bills	45,250,005,499	47,728,716,253	+2,478,710,754
(b) Deduct independent offices-HUD bill, veto sustained in House	−17,468,223,500	−18,655,019,500	+1,186,796,000
Net total, Senate bills (9 bills)	27,781,781,999	29,073,696,753	+1,291,914,754
3. Enacted:			
(a) Subtotal, 8 bills cleared Congress	35,366,850,999	36,138,439,720	+771,588,721
(b) Deduct independent offices-HUD bill, veto sustained	−17,468,223,500	−18,009,525,300	+541,301,800
Net total, 7 bills enacted	17,898,627,499	18,128,914,420	+230,286,921

Mr. Speaker, in elaboration of the foregoing summary of the totals to date, I will include a bill-by-bill breakdown and some additional detail.

APPROPRIATION BILLS IN THE HOUSE

In the House, 11 of the 14 bills were below the budget requests by about $3.1 billion. The Education, Independent Offices-HUD, and Labor-HEW bills were above the budget requests by a total of about $585 million.

The vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill was $173 million above the budget requests in the House, but in its enacted form was $541 million above. It will I assume be somewhat less than that in its reenacted form.

I am speaking of new budget authority—essentially, appropriation requests—for fiscal 1971, not budget estimates of expenditures, or outlays, which in addition to expenditures from new appropriations also involve expenditures from carryover balances of prior year appropriations.

Including the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill, the House totals for 1971 in the 14 bills are:

[In billions]

Budget requests considered	$137.1
Approved by House	134.6
Net reduction (14 bills)	−2.5

Excluding the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill, which must be replaced by a new bill, the House totals for 1971 on the other 13 bills are:

[In billions]

Budget requests considered	$119.9
Approved by House	117.2
Net reduction (13 bills)	−2.7

IN THE SENATE

In the Senate, 10 of the regular appropriation bills, including the vetoed Independent Offices-HUD bill, have been approved. In these 10 bills the Senate has made a net increase of about $2.5 billion above the President's budget requests. If the vetoed bill is excluded, the increase above the budget would be about $1.3 billion on the other nine bills.

Excluding the Independent Offices-HUD bill, the totals for 1971 on which the Senate has acted are as follows:

[In billions]

Budget requests considered	$27.8
Approved by Senate	29.1
Net increase (9 bills)	+1.3

The Labor-HEW bill, involving about $18.7 billion of budget requests, has been reported to the Senate $311 million above the budget; it will of course be subject to Senate floor action and later conference negotiation.

Pending in the Senate committee are bills for transportation, foreign assistance, and defense. As passed by the House, these three bills were below administration budget requests by a total of about $2.6 billion.

PENDING IN CONFERENCE

The agriculture bill, $727 million above the budget as passed by the Senate, is pending in conference. The military construction bill, $77 million under the budget, will also be ready for postrecess conference.

CLEARED CONGRESS—ENACTED

Mr. Speaker, eight of the fiscal year 1971 appropriation bills have been sent to the President. He returned two by way of veto—education, overridden by the House, and independent offices-HUD, sustained by the House.

As sent to the President, the eight bills, with respect to fiscal 1971, involved:

[In billions]

Budget requests considered	$35.3
Enacted	36.1
Net increase (8 bills)	+0.8

But excluding the vetoed independent offices-HUD bill which involved about $18 billion—$541 million above the budget—the totals with respect to fiscal 1971 for the seven bills enacted are as follows:

[In billions]

Budget requests considered	$17.9
Enacted	18.1
Net increase (7 bills)	+0.2

Mr. Speaker, the exact net increase on the seven bills is $230,286,921. Six of the seven bills were below the budget requests; the Education bill was $453 million above the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation showing the figures for each of the appropriation bills for fiscal 1971—both including and excluding the vetoed independent offices-HUD bill:

NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1971

[As to fiscal year 1971 amounts only]

Bill	Budget requests considered	Approved	Change (+) or (−)
IN THE HOUSE			
1. Legislative	$356,043,285	$346,649,230	−$9,394,055
2. Treasury-Post Office (net of estimated postal revenues appropriated)	3,044,755,000	2,971,702,000	−73,053,000
3. Education (veto overridden)	3,807,524,000	4,127,114,000	+319,590,000
4. Independent Offices-HUD (veto sustained)	17,216,823,500	17,390,212,300	+173,388,800
5. State—Justice—Commerce—Judiciary	3,243,905,000	3,106,956,500	−136,948,500
6. Interior	1,610,757,600	1,610,026,700	−730,900
7. Transportation	2,465,814,937	2,429,579,937	−36,235,000
8. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	109,088,000	108,938,000	−150,000
9. Foreign Assistance	2,876,539,000	2,220,961,000	−655,578,000
10. Agriculture	7,531,775,500	7,450,188,150	−81,587,350
11. Military Construction	2,134,800,000	1,997,037,000	−137,763,000
12. Public Works—AEC	5,263,433,000	5,236,808,000	−26,625,000
13. Labor—HEW	18,731,737,000	18,824,663,000	+92,926,000
14. Defense	68,745,666,000	66,806,561,000	−1,939,105,000
15. Supplemental	(496,720,000)		
Subtotal, House bills	137,138,661,822	134,627,396,817	−2,511,265,005
Deduct Independent Offices—HUD (veto sustained)	17,216,823,500	17,390,212,300	+173,388,800
Net total, House bills	119,921,838,322	117,237,184,517	−2,684,653,805
IN THE SENATE			
1. Legislative	421,414,899	413,889,653	−7,525,246
2. Education	3,966,824,000	4,782,871,000	+816,047,000
3. Independent Offices-HUD	17,468,223,500	18,655,019,500	+1,186,796,000
4. Interior	1,839,974,600	1,835,337,500	−4,637,100
5. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	109,088,000	108,938,000	−150,000
6. Agriculture	7,748,354,500	8,475,935,100	+727,580,600
7. Public Works-AEC	$5,263,433,000	$5,258,695,000	−$4,738,000
8. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	3,251,200,000	3,122,080,500	−129,119,500
9. Treasury-Post Office (net of estimated postal revenues appropriated)	3,046,693,000	3,018,079,000	−28,614,000
10. Military Construction	2,134,800,000	2,057,871,000	−76,929,000
11. Labor-HEW	(18,759,377,000) [1]	(19,070,964,078) [1]	[1] (+311,587,078)
Subtotal, bills cleared Senate	45,250,005,499	47,728,716,253	+2,478,710,754
Deduct Independent Offices-HUD bill (veto sustained by House)	17,468,223,500	18,655,019,500	+1,186,796,000
Net total, bills cleared Senate	27,781,781,999	29,073,696,753	+1,291,914,754
ENACTED			
1. Education (veto overridden by House)	3,966,824,000	4,420,145,000	+453,321,000
2. Interior	1,839,974,600	1,835,474,700	−4,499,900
3. District of Columbia (Federal funds)	109,088,000	108,938,000	−150,000
4. Independent Offices-HUD (veto sustained)	17,468,223,500	18,009,525,300	+541,301,800
5. Legislative	421,414,899	413,054,220	−8,360,679
6. Treasury-Post Office (net of estimated postal revenues appropriated)	3,046,693,000	3,004,711,000	−41,982,000
7. Public Works-AEC	5,263,433,000	5,238,517,000	−24,916,000
8. State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary	3,251,200,000	3,108,074,500	−143,125,500
Subtotal, bills cleared Congress	35,366,850,999	36,138,439,720	+771,588,721
Deduct Independent Offices-HUD (veto sustained)	17,468,223,500	18,009,525,300	+541,301,800
Net total, bills enacted (7 bills)	17,898,627,499	18,128,914,420	+230,286,921

[1] As reported.

Source: Prepared Oct. 14, 1970, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

THE STATUS OF THE 1971 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, in undertaking to make an interim report on congressional actions thus far on the budget recommendations of the President it is first necessary to establish, as best as can reasonably be done, the budget totals as revised and updated from time to time by the executive branch. Supplementary requests and recommendations not encompassed in the original budget and revisions of original budget estimates and projections because of miscalculations, underestimates, and revised or unforeseen requirements are not uncharacteristic of Federal budgets. Original budget projections are often highly fragile and precarious. This year's budget is no exception. Nor was last year's budget.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

For example, the administration's original budget review for fiscal 1970, in April of 1969, projected a unified budget surplus of $5.8 billion.

Last February, it was reestimated—down to $1.5 billion. For a variety of reasons, the original surplus had begun to wither away.

Then, in May, the executive branch again reestimated the fiscal year 1970 budget outlook. The surplus had vanished, replaced by a deficit estimate of $1.8 billion. Net expenditures were estimated moderately higher than the previous estimate; expected revenues in the fiscal year—ending last June 30—were considerably short of the previous estimate.

When the books closed, the fiscal year 1970 budget position had slipped further. The unified budget, which folds in the trust fund surpluses, was in deficit by $2.9 billion. Excluding the trust fund surpluses of $10.1 billion, the deficit for fiscal year 1970 in Federal funds was $13 billion. Trust fund surpluses are borrowed by the Treasury, at interest, and used for general purposes of Government.

This 1970 result was also a deterioration as compared to fiscal year 1969. In that year, the unified budget was in surplus by $3.2 billion because of the trust fund surpluses of $8.7 billion. Excluding them, the Federal funds deficit was $5.5 billion. The budget position on both bases of counting thus worsened in fiscal year 1970 as compared to fiscal year 1969. There were many contributing factors, but that was the result.

EXECUTIVE REVISIONS TO THE FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, the broad totals projected in the original fiscal 1971 budget, submitted by the President last February 2, are no longer valid—nor of course have they been valid for several months.

In May, the executive branch reestimated the February budget totals—which had projected a razor-thin unified surplus of $1.3 billion, counting in some $8.6 billion of trust fund surpluses—and came up with a projected unified deficit of $1.3 billion but a $10 billion deficit on the Federal funds basis. Expenditures were revised upward, to $205.6 billion—far above the original February figure of $200.8 billion. Revenues were also reestimated and new revenue proposals submitted which in the aggregate raised the previous revenue total, but not nearly equal to the upward expenditure revision.

There has been no official comprehensive updating of the totals by the executive branch since May, but there have been further supplementary amendments and requests and reports of miscalculations of previous expenditure estimates. According to the best estimates of the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, as reflected by the latest comprehensive "Budget scorekeeping" report of October 14, the executive branch, subsequent to the February 2 budget submission, has:

First, increased the original estimates for new budget obligational and lending authority for fiscal 1971 by some $4,225,691,000—to a new total of $222,256,691,000.

Second, increased the original estimated budget spending—outlays—for fiscal 1971 by some $6,082,871,000—to a new total of $206,854,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, these substantial changes spring from various supplementary budget amendments and requests; various legislative proposals beyond the boundaries of original budget totals, and reestimates of various items including miscalculations of requirements in certain so-called uncontrollable items such as interest, farm price supports, and social insurance trust funds.

The executive branch has already reported net overruns of $3,011,000,000 above the original budget spending projections for such so-called uncontrollable items as interest, $1.8 billion; social insurance trust funds, $508 million; and farm price support programs, $503 million.

The $6 billion plus upward Executive revision in the spending estimate includes about $987,121,000 related to supplementary budget amendments and requests for such items as the food stamp program, $216 million; various education programs, $162 million; the recently authorized subsidized advances program of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, $125 million; veterans medical care, $50 million; additional unemployment compensation payments, $67 million; and so on.

Another $1,300,000,000 of spending in 1971 beyond the original budget provi-

sion relates to the President's recommendation of April 6 on the 6 percent comparability pay for Government personnel, to be effective retroactively rather than delayed until January 1, 1971, as previously proposed in the budget.

Another $320,000,000 in spending not originally budgeted relates to the President's 8 percent postal pay proposal of April 16, which, in dollar impact for fiscal 1971, is estimated that much above the original budget provision.

THE DEEPENING BUDGET DEFICIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

Mr. Speaker, there has been no official updating by the executive branch of the fiscal 1971 budget deficit outlook since May 19 when the deficit projection was $1.3 billion on the unified budget basis and $10 billion on the Federal funds basis. But insofar as I am aware, all knowledgeable writers and authorities agree that the deficit this current fiscal year will be billions deeper than the May 19 outlook.

Expenditures are outstripping the original estimates.

Revenues are falling below the original estimates.

It is not difficult to visualize a unified budget deficit of at least $10 billion, a Federal funds deficit of at least $18 billion, and perhaps even higher.

For additional details about the 1971 budget deficit and some of the uncertainties surrounding it, I am inserting an excerpt from the October 14 issue of the "Budget scorekeeping" staff report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FACTS ON THE BUDGET DEFICIT

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

The budget for fiscal 1971 as revised by budget amendments, additional legislative proposals, and reestimates, exclusive of any separate direct Congressional actions on the budget, as announced by the President on May 19, 1970, reflected a unified budget deficit of about $1.2 billion. Including congressional actions, as announced by the President May 19, 1970, the unified budget deficit was estimated to be $1.3 billion, made up of an $8.7 billion surplus from the trust funds and a $10 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

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

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

1. Experience shows that actual outlays are likely to increase over earlier projections—thus increasing the deficit. (For example, as reported earlier, since submission of the fiscal 1971 budget in February the President has revised his official outlay estimates upward by about $6.1 billion.) Congressional enactments to October 14 have added approximately $2,064 million to the total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

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

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

4. The budget as revised to May 19, 1970 contained receipt estimates from various revenue producing proposals in the amount of $4,816,000,000 (including $503 million for trust funds of which $194 million was not requested by the President) which, if not enacted by Congress, will automatically reduce receipts of the Treasury by the amounts estimated—thus increasing the deficit. Congress has enacted, to date, $322 million of the President's new revenue requests plus a net of $169 million in new revenue not requested by the President and has rejected $152 million in items requested by the President. This leaves a balance of about $4,329,000,000 of the revenue requests of the President not yet enacted or, because of the enactment of $169 million not requested by the President, a balance of $4,160,000,000 yet to be enacted toward meeting the President's estimated revenue requirement.

Taking into account Congressional actions to date on the uncertain Budget estimates outlined above, and unless pending budget proposals for outlay reductions and additional revenues are enacted, the unified budget deficit for fiscal 1971 estimated by the President on May 19, 1970 to be about $1.3 billion would be increased to about $8.1 billion. Adding the $1.5 billion for increased outlays from updated estimates adjusting the outlay limitation, this unified budget deficit estimate would be increased to about $9.6 billion. Adding the loss of $3.2 billion revenue collections as estimated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation the total unified budget deficit could be as much as $12.8 billion, made up of a $7.6 billion surplus in trust funds and a $20.4 billion deficit in general Federal funds.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS IN NONAPPROPRIATION BILLS AFFECTING THE 1971 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons, the Executive Branch has not been able to hold to the original budget totals. Congress has also had its difficulties and differences of views in dealing with various budgetary and fiscal proposals.

As I indicated earlier, the best staff estimates available are that the President, through supplementary budget amendments and requests; through various new legislative proposals; and through reestimate on account of miscalculations and so on, has:

First. Increased his February budget spending and lending authority requests for 1971 by some $4,225,691,000; and has

Second. Increased his February budget spending—outlay—estimates for 1971 by some $6,082,871,000.

Congress, in acting on the spending side of the budget, has made many changes in the President's budgetary proposals. While most of the spending side on which Congress acts each year is processed in the annual appropriation bills, there are a number of actions, and inactions, taken in nonappropriation bills—"backdoor" bills; bills that mandate spending; and inaction or only partial action on proposals designed to reduce budget totals—so-called negative expenditures, such as postal rate increases.

As with some of the appropriation bills, some of these nonappropriation bills are above the related budget recommendations.

As with the appropriation bills, some of these nonappropriation bills have passed one House but not the other; some are in conference; some have been enacted.

But unlike the appropriation bills which generally make available budget authority that will ultimately result in actual spending from the Treasury either in fiscal 1971 or beyond, a few of the nonappropriation bills—enacted or now in the legislative mill—entail little or no ultimate spending from the Treasury. But for technical budgetary reasons, they are classed as new budget authority and are so scored by the executive branch and the joint committee staff. Two or three of them account for a very large share of the "excess" over the executive branch recommendations. Understanding their precise character is necessary for a good grasp of the general spending dimensions of the congressional add-ons in the nonappropriation bills.

For example, the joint committee staff scorekeeping report shows a congressional add-on of $3,050,000,000 for authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue revenue bonds to the public. This is classed as new budgetary authority, but in the long-range sense, would not be regarded as an ultimate charge on the Treasury.

Another significant congressional budget authority add-on is contained in the Emergency Home Financing Act. In the House, the add-on was $1,500,000,000. The enacted add-on is $750,000,000. This involves authority for secondary market mortgage financing. No information is immediately available as to expenditures in fiscal 1971 under this authority, but a salable asset is acquired when any expenditure is made. Thus the size of the budget authority add-on is by no means an indication of the ultimate net charge on the Treasury.

Two other add-ons reflected in the latest scorekeeping report involve standby insurance authority—one relating to credit unions for $100,000,000 which has cleared Congress; the other relates to standby insurance against stock market brokerage failures, involving $1,000,000,000 in the Senate.

Taking account of these items which can properly be regarded as essentially

nonexpenditure in the long-range sense, the congressional additions—House, Senate, or enacted, as the case may be—through nonappropriation bills, as reflected in the October 14 "budget scorekeeping" staff report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, can be much better evaluated from the following breakdown:

CONGRESSIONAL CHANGES TO THE 1971 BUDGET IN LEGISLATIVE BILLS—AS REFLECTED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE "BUDGET SCOREKEEPING" REPORT: THE SPENDING SIDE, OCT. 14, 1970
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget authority—changes from the budget			Budget spending (outlays)—changes from the budget		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
Total, legislative bills (p. 7, table 1, Oct. 14 "scorekeeping" report)	+7,528,335	+6,657,634	+5,718,162	+3,294,223	+1,821,088	+1,775,611
Deduct—						
TVA revenue bonds, H.R. 18104	−3,050,000	−3,050,000	−3,050,000			
Emergency home financing, Public Law 91-351	−1,500,000		−750,000			
Credit union insurance, S. 3822	−100,000	−100,000	−100,000			
Stock market insurance, S. 2348		−1,000,000				
Remainder	+2,878,335	+2,507,639	+1,818,162	+3,294,223	+1,821,088	+1,775,611

The details, bill by bill, are shown in supporting table No. 1 of the October 14 "Budget Scorekeeping" report. Figures on budget authority are for the most part precise figures, but figures on spending—outlays—are necessarily limited to the best reasonable approximations of the joint committee staff.

Some of the principal items reflected in supporting table No. 1, other than the essentially nonexpenditure bills noted, relate to social security benefits, the family assistance proposal, various veterans benefits, delay in postal rate increases proposed in the budget, the 8 percent postal reform pay, savings bond interest increase, and several civil service wage and benefit bills.

HOW TO CONTROL THE FLOOD CONTROLLERS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in California and in many other States, citizens are renouncing old concepts of ecology and conservation and are giving new consideration towards the preservation of the natural environment.

One of the areas where this new reconsideration is occurring is in the area of flood control and creekbed channelization.

In a recent issue of the outstanding publication Cry California, San Francisco landscape architect, Theodore Osmundson, related an excellent study on this issue as well as a report of how some citizens are becoming more active in the fight to save their environment.

The article follows:

HOW TO CONTROL THE FLOOD CONTROLLERS

(By Theodore Osmundson)

(Theodore Osmundson, a practicing San Francisco landscape architect, is the immediate past president and a fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects.)

Today, under present policies, virtually all free-flowing natural streams of urban California are doomed to be lined or covered with concrete. Gradually, and unnoticed, they have disappeared one by one with hardly a protest from the city dwellers who need them most for their beauty, fish and wildlife, and recreational resources. It's all being done in the name of flood control. And ironically, the public is paying a handsome price to foot the bill for this organized destruction.

DEATH OF A NATURAL DRAINAGE SYSTEM

It has not always been so. For example, when San Francisco was still a hamlet called Yerba Buena, and the bay was a formidable body of water separating the new city from the Contra Costa (opposite coast) to the east, the lands between the bay and the crests of the Oakland and Berkeley hills were inhabited only by Indians and the descendants of the first Spanish settlers who lived at peace with the land, sky and water. From the high ridges, covered with virgin redwood forests, the ground sloped westward through rolling hills dotted with live oaks, leveling off in grassy flatlands which extended to the tidal mud and grasses of the bay. From hills to bay flowed the clear waters through the natural drainage channels of the 21 creeks of the East Bay. Flowing toward the bay through forested, brush-covered and porous soil, their waters moved continuously all year, with nothing to disturb their ancient course. Deer, bear and foxes drank at their edges, and in the winter steelhead and salmon spawned in their upper reaches. And so it was in all the lands which were to become the nine Bay Area counties and indeed in all the ocean-draining watersheds of California. In the lightly populated areas of the state, some streams still run in their primal way, proudly pointed to by the local inhabitants as "great fishing streams," but most of those in urban areas have met the fate of the East Bay's 21 magnificent watercourses.

Struck by the land development booms following the Gold Rush and the opening of the area to commercial and industrial development, the streams of the East Bay were left largely untouched. As flat and easier-to-develop land fell to the builders, the creeks still rang to the sound of Sunday picnickers, flowers and trees grew along their banks, and for many years fishermen worked their waters for steelhead and salmon.

But the redwood forests were soon gone to the loggers who cut them down to build and rebuild San Francisco after her many early fires. The porous soil which once absorbed the rainfall and provided the constant flow along the streams throughout the year was slowly being covered with houses, pavement and the collection systems for storm water. In place of the moderate and constantly flowing streams, each storm brought torrents of rushing flood waters, eroding their banks and overflowing into developed areas in the flatlands.

Gradually, as surbanization moved closer to their edges, they were changed from natural woodland creeks into open storm sewers. No one thought of them as assets; rather, they were considered threats to progress. Only rarely did some far sighted individual step forth to declare them a great heritage, to be protected and used as permanent links with nature and as valuable resources for needed recreation in a country dedicated to hard work and "progress." Plans of Charles Mulford Robinson in 1905–06 and of the noted German city planner, Werner Hegemann, in 1913 to develop a number of the most prominent creeks of the East Bay as linear parks to connect the hills with the bay were never acted upon. The creeks finally became regarded primarily as "flood-control problems" and they were line with concrete, or buried. Many of the culverts were eventually filled over and residential and commercial buildings and streets were built above them. Today, the small remnants of the creeks that remain are in private gardens at the rear of houses or are barren, junk- and waste-laden storm-water ditches in industrial and business area. Only pitifully small fragments have been retained for public park use.

WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN

The story of the once beautiful tree-lined creeks of the East Bay is not unique. It is typical of all the urbanized areas of California. What caused this to happen? The answer is simple. The recognition of the human need for open space, recreation and simple natural amenity did not keep pace with commercial, industrial and financial "progress." Pressures to sell and use the creeks and the land along them for development were too great. The public attitude toward these great natural resources centered around one single concept—flood control; flood control to protect development.

The common belief today is that creeks naturally flood. But in many, before the ecological balance of plants, organisms and land was disturbed for man's uses, this was not so. In the upper reaches of the hilly areas, the drainage water flows through deep gullies and canyons, and falls much too rapidly to flood over the banks. In these areas, by simply prohibiting construction and purchasing the creek and adjacent lands for recreation, the natural stream could have been preserved for all time. For example, this was done in Diamond Canyon in Oakland, and in Chico, Big Chico Creek was given to the city for a park by pioneer James Bidwell. There are other such isolated instances but they were rare flashes of foresight and wisdom and were the great exceptions to general rule.

In limited areas such as the flatlands near the bay, tree-planted earth levees along with limited flood-plain zoning would have preserved the natural beauty of the creeks, provided open space and water-oriented linear parks for recreation and amenity, raised property values along miles of creek frontage rather than depressing them, and drastically cut the costs of later flood-control works. This was never done, and the developers made their profits and left the general public to bear the costs of flood control.

THE MENTALITY OF DESTRUCTION

Over the years, as the danger of floods has increased, governmental agencies have been established to deal with the very real problem of flood control, spending millions of dollars each year in the construction of

concrete channels and culverts, and the widening, lining and diversion of streams for this single purpose. With the characteristic zeal of engineering organizations, the flood controllers proceeded to destroy everything that stood in the way of fulfilling what they took as their single-purpose public charge. Gradually, and too late for most of the urban streams, water-oriented recreation and the protection of fish and wildlife have been added to the basic flood-control function of the agencies. But essentially, despite this added authority, the primary work along streams has been in controlling flooding. For the watercourses, as recreational and esthetic resources and as links between man and his natural environment, this single-purpose policy has been applied almost universally and has been nothing short of disastrous. When all other factors are omitted from the problem, flood control, or the regulation of the flow of water, is a hydraulic-engineering design problem and the solutions reflect this and little else. Peak water flow is computed and channels are cleared of "vegetative obstructions" (native trees, shrubs, and the cover necessary for wildlife habitat and amenity), widened, and finally lined with riprap or concrete to protect the banks from erosion.

The engineers are blamed for the rigid and austere final result. But no one mentions the simple fact that we, through our legislators, have never injected factors such as the protection and enhancement of environmental quality into their engineering equations. Unfortunately, the water engineers have developed through the years a mentality that flowing water should *only* be dealt with by engineers and solely as an engineering problem. The time has come to dispel this line of thinking as well as the myth upon which it is based. Changes in this traditional approach should be pushed with the greatest vigor if we are to save the last remaining natural streams in the state.

THE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR DESTRUCTION

The primary responsibility for the destruction of the natural environment associated with California's streams rests ultimately, of course, with the people and their elected representatives. They can demand more than basic, bare minimum flood-control solutions. But there is also a high degree of blame which can be placed squarely on the doorstep of the flood-control agencies which the public has created and heavily funded.

The three principal agencies dealing with free-flowing water are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, and the local county flood-control districts. All cooperate with each other and the State of California Water Resources Agency, but each is preeminent in its own major area of interest.

The authorizing federal law is broad enough to allow the corps and the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) to set criteria for the allocation of funds to assist local flood-control agencies. They are only limited in doing so (except, of course, by bureaucratic inertia and local, provincially minded resistance) by the Congress, which must vote appropriations for their projects, and the Bureau of the Budget, which must approve budget requests. Both Congress and the bureau may or may not, regardless of the corps' or SCS's desires, recognize the importance of environmental quality factors in a given project. Of the two governmental fiscal-control bodies, Congress is the most likely to look favorably on such factors, given the popular interest in environmental matters. However, the Bureau of the Budget as an arm of the executive branch should be responsible to both popular demands and the recent executive order directing all federal departments to clean up their own pollution and give high priority to environmental quality. What will come of this order remains to be seen.

Among the most destructive of all public agencies in California dealing with natural flowing water are the little-publicized and ubiquitous county flood-control districts. Although these districts clearly have the authority to provide recreation in their projects, they have failed almost universally to make use of it. By applying their authority rigidly to the "bare bones" of flood control, they have produced systems of the most incredibly ugly concrete trenches where once flowed the tree-lined natural streams of California's flatlands. Their efforts to protect the natural environment have been sharply limited to working with other agencies such as city and county park departments. While they have done isolated good works in cooperation with other agencies, their current plans are a clearcut blueprint for the final elimination of the streams of urban California for all time. This is true, almost without exception, for every flood-control district in the state.

The business of flood-control agencies, including the county flood-control districts, is very big business indeed. All of them now have huge annual budgets, with a large percentage of their funds currently allocated for controlling flooding of free-flowing streams with practically no concern for the natural environment of the streams. For example, the Alameda County Flood Control District's current construction program is budgeted at $2–3 million annually with authorized projects of $96 million, mostly for creek-water control, but with almost nothing for recreation or environmental quality. And this is only one of the flood-control districts of the nine Bay Area counties and almost every county in the state has such an agency. The corps' national budget for all works, including military construction, runs to $1.25 billion annually, with a major portion going to flood control. It takes little imagination to picture the enormous effect the corps, alone and in concert with local government, will have on the streams and rivers of the United States. The SCS spends more than $1 million annually in California for watershed protection and flood control, largely along free-flowing streams of the state. With such huge sums spent each year on largely single-purpose projects, the day is not far distant when every stream in, near, or affecting a populated place will be modified or rigidly controlled in concrete or riprap channels. To anyone who loves the beauty of a creek or who enjoys fishing a moving stream, this is a chilling prospect, a projection as shocking as the seemingly endless proliferation of highways. If single-purpose flood-control projects continue at the present rate, the obliteration of California's and indeed America's streams and their replacement with concrete-lined storm sewers is a certainty. What can be done to stop this legalized and heavily financed rape of the streams?

There are signs of change in the straight-line, slide-rule, single-purpose approach the flood-control agencies have taken in the past. But we simply cannot rely on the engineers to lead the way in protecting our remaining streams.

Some of the statements recently issued by the corps are encouraging, as witness these extracts from a memorandum dated March 9, 1970, to the district engineers of the corps in Los Angeles, Sacramento and San Francisco, by Brigadier General Frank A. Camm, division engineer for the South Pacific Division. He stated that the corps' activities "significantly influence the economic and physical development of cities and regions and therefore [the corps] must recognize and accept its full public responsibility in shaping the total environment," and "although legislation and corps policy sets limitations to which recreational and environmental quality efforts can be undertaken, the range of possibilities allowed should be used to its maximum." The memorandum further states that "the South Pacific Division shall take a leadership role by implementing the Comprehensive Program for Environmental Quality," and that the program "will not be considered as a separate entity, but rather shall be incorporated as a part of the overall effort and program of the corps."

But in Washington, Brigadier General Richard Groves, Deputy Director of the Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Division, said "It is a fact that our nation is engaged in a struggle to survive its technology and its habits. It is a fact, too, that we are defiling our waters, polluting our air, littering our land, and infecting our soil and ourselves with the wastes which our civilization produces. These are serious problems, but we cannot permit ourselves to yield to an emotional impulse that would make their cure the central purpose of our society. Nor is there any reason why we should feel guilty about the alterations which we have to make in the natural environment as we meet our water-related needs."

Clearly the engineers have a long way to go in understanding the total environmental crisis in which we have found ourselves.

ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEM

Because of the need for urgent action, a Joint Committee for Bay Area Watercourses was formed almost a year ago by People for Open Space and the Northern California Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects. The committee, led by Dorothy Erskine of People for Open Space, and this writer, in collaboration with Samuel E. Wood, consultant to California Tomorrow, studied the problem and came up with a proposed program which could lead to effective solutions. The committee came into being as an immediate result of the public outcry against the concreting of Tamalpais Creek in Marin County by the Corps of Engineers and the Marin County Board of Supervisors, sitting in their other role as the flood control district board. The action was protested by dozens of citizens who physically obstructed construction equipment as work began in the channel. The protesters were summarily arrested and jailed.

The joint committee's purposes were to study why such an obviously unpopular and narrowly conceived project could advance to the construction stage and be to all intents and purposes irreversible, and what could be done in the future to spare other free-flowing watercourses from the fate that streams such as Tamalpais Creek had suffered. The committee met with representatives of the flood-control agencies and discovered many things long known to the general public.

The committee found that the stream-wrecking policies of the local, state and federal flood-control agencies stemmed from the following key deficiencies:

They follow a single-purpose, least-cost-possible rule in constructing their projects.

They lack adequate power to acquire land for flood-plain control in conjunction with or as a substitute for engineered structures.

They follow hearing procedures which fail to alert the public early enough to show the impact of a given project on environmental and esthetic values.

They make the cost-benefit studies for their own projects, evaluate alternative designs for their own projects, and make final decisions regarding them. The public has neither the resources nor the technical know-how to challenge or evaluate the agencies' decisions.

The established way of allocating project costs among federal, state and local agencies places virtually the entire burden of paying for environmental protection on local interests, the least capable of paying.

Based on all that was learned in the study, the committee, in the language of the agencies involved, recommended the following:

The Congress should declare the policy that all remaining free-flowing streams are a national heritage to be maintained in a natural state for the enjoyment of the people of this country.

Full conservation and development plans covering entire basins for all the remaining streams whose ecology has been affected by water-development programs should be prepared before any additional projects are considered. These plans should identify areas needing restoration of esthetic quality as well as new water-project areas.

National water-development policy and process should be changed so that environmental values will be the controlling consideration in the location, planning and construction of flood-control and water-development projects and integrated into the planning, financing and construction to provide a total project cost. Where important esthetic values will be lost, these values must be calculated as part of the total project cost. Engineering and economic evaluation should identify, quantify and utilize these environmental values in determining size of reservoirs, in land purchase, design and construction, and in determining project engineering feasibility and economic justification. Costs of minimizing or replacing such environmental values should be a non-reimbursable cost. Such values should also be considered in establishing fish-and-wildlife and recreation benefits and costs.

Individual projects should not be considered in anything but the context of a full water-development plan for the entire basin or basins. These plans should include conservation standards adequate to protect environmental values of fish and wildlife, amenity, ecological factors and other natural factors affected by the development.

Water projects should not be authorized unless local, regional, and basinwide land-use plans, as part of a general plan of the project area, have been adopted and are enforced. Such plans must specify flood-plain zoning and other techniques that minimize the need for construction. All variations from such plans should be justified in the authorization document following full hearings in the project area.

Projects on which construction has not commenced during the first five years following authorization should be required to undergo full reappraisal and reauthorization.

Four sets of hearings, held in the project and service areas, should become standard procedure for all water-development projects before project construction funding:

First, to identify the problem and possible solution;

Second, following preliminary design, to present an array of alternative plans to the general public to show the effects and implications of the project;

Third, to review the recommendation of the responsible agency; and

Fourth, following the preparation of specifications containing detailed designs, to show the full effects of the project prior to calling for construction bids.

Total project costs, including federal, state and local, should be integrated and presented as part of the combined economic analysis with the capital costs for recreational and environmental features borne by the state and federal governments. Allocation of project cost should be without reference to project elements.

It should be the declared policy of the United States that all federal water-development projects include the necessary physical, legal, economic and contractual features to return the used water to the drainage basin in a quality equal to or better than the quality of the water when diverted.

Construction funds for each project should be specifically appropriated by Congress.

All hearings related to any project in a specific basin, regardless of the sponsoring agency, should be consolidated and scheduled together.

These recommendations would set the stage for a massive and orderly rearrangement of the processes and funding of the flood-control effort now so highly destructive to the natural environment of our remaining streams. Like so many of our institutions which have become locked in tradition, routine funding, bureaucracy, servitude to development - for - development's - sake and public apathy, these agencies need new thinking leadership and a new public directive from the highest level of government. Nothing less will save our last remaining streams from complete and irreversible destruction.

HORTON COMMENDS SCHOOL-TEACHER-TV PERSONALITY TONY DEFUSTO

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all aware that many jobholders are moonlighting these days. It appears that some of these good people take another job for added financial returns, and others take on a second occupation for just "something to do" or to be engaged in work that offers more excitement than their usual line of endeavor.

For whatever reason Francis Anthony DeFusto, of Henrietta, N.Y., has decided to blend television performing with schoolteaching, I would like to commend him, not only for his good work in both fields, but for the fact that each activity seems to enhance the other.

While I have not personally witnessed Tony's abilities in the classroom, I have indeed watched him on TV and I find him a highly skilled, knowledgeable performer.

Tony teaches English, full time, at Brighton's Brookside Middle School. On weekends he is busy as the master of ceremonies of WROC–TV's "Sh-h-h Show" program of presenting films to the younger set on Saturdays and Sundays at a somewhat early hour when many parents are catching an extra 40 winks.

This alone endears Tony to a large audience of my constituents in the greater Rochester area. His ability to make these film presentations more meaningful and educational, due to his background as a schoolteacher, gives his appeal to the parents an added thrust.

By the same token, Tony DeFusto believes his television work helps his English teaching because he maintains it makes him more aware of what is practical, and his students know he speaks from experience.

Tony works full time in the broadcast industry during the summer months, doing the usual announcing chores, which incidentally, include working with the news department.

I can think of no better way for a schoolteacher to keep himself constantly alerted to the problems of the changing world in which we live. It appears to me this would indeed tend to make Tony an even more qualified and inspired educator.

It brought me much pleasure recently to read a feature story in the Henrietta Post that brought out many things of interest about Tony DeFusto. Written by Ann Fox, it details his approach to life in both fields of endeavor, as well as giving us a good picture of his background and his thinking, as a teacher-broadcaster.

I would like to share that article with my colleagues in the House of Representatives, so that they, too, may know more about this fine young man who stays mighty busy.

The article follows:

TEACHER FROM HENRIETTA MOONLIGHTS AS TV STAR

(By Ann Fox)

A television performer who is proud that he's been asked for his autograph just once in four and a half years?

The mind boggles.

But after a talk with Henrietta resident Tony DeFusto, one's surprise vanishes, for DeFusto is an unusual TV man.

For one thing, he is a fulltime English teacher at Brighton's Brookside Middle School.

For another, he is an unassuming young man who translates old English or corrects student tests between appearances on camera.

DeFusto, 31, is the man who emcees WROC–TV's "Sh-h-h Show" Saturday and Sunday mornings, admonishing his young viewers to keep quiet so their parents can sleep as he shows them cartoons, comedies and re-runs of family-type shows.

The reason he's pleased about the lack of autograph seekers is that he wants his viewers to think of him "as a face talking back, not a personality."

"I'm very low key," he says, "No gimmicks, no fancy costumes."

Only occasionally, youngsters or parents stop him and say, "Aren't you the guy . . ."

DeFusto, whose formal name is Francis Anthony DeFusto, and his wife and two children live at 72 Community Manor Dr., Henrietta.

However, he's rarely there.

He works seven days a week.

Although he finds himself physically accustomed to the rigorous schedule, he wishes he had more time for his family.

"I had two days in a row off last week," he says, "It was the first time in I don't know when."

During the school year, DeFusto works at the station from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. He does the two "Sh-h-h" programs, an hour record show on Radio Station WROC, station breaks, and keeps track of breaking news.

He works there fulltime during the Summer.

Toughest on-camera work on "Sh-h-h" comes when film breaks and he is required to ad lib for several minutes. Otherwise, he chats quietly, introduces the next segment, and then is free for the length of time it runs.

The bits all are precisely marked so he knows exactly how much time they run. In between, he sits in a nearby announcer's booth—"You can only be about 15 seconds away because of the possibility of a break in the film"—and picks out film for the next week, reads, or corrects papers.

He's quick to point out, however, that he corrects "only objective things—nothing that requires great concentration."

He figures he's on camera only 25 minutes during the two shows. They last a total of four hours.

DeFusto says his students—seventh and eighth graders—seem unaffected by his TV

work, although occasionally one will offer criticism or advice.

"Sometimes they ask questions about the technical side," he says.

He thinks his TV work may help his English teaching because "I'm more aware of what's practical—and the kids know I speak from practical experience."

"For example," he says, "we might not spend much time learning about direct objects—which people insert automatically anyhow—but I'd tell them relative clauses are a functioning thing you need to know about."

It works vice versa, too. Because he's an English teacher, he thinks he is extra conscious of English usage when he writes news broadcasts.

In fact, DeFusto thinks his two careers combine very well.

However, he has no aspirations to go further in television.

"This suits my purposes," he says, "I enjoy it enough so it isn't work but I wouldn't like it full-time."

Besides, he thinks he hasn't the talent or the drive to go further.

"Many teachers moonlight," he says. "I'm just a little more public. I was public when I sold socks at J. C. Penney Co. (which he did as a part time job several years ago) but I'd rather be public this way now."

Is there a basic conflict between what he wants for youngsters as an English teacher and what he wants as a television man?

Not really, he says.

"I don't want them to watch TV all the time. But it's a way of life. It's there, if they have an hour or so to spare.

"But it shouldn't be an issue," he says.

Then he adds, "I believe strongly in parental control. When somebody asks me, 'Do you really think you should have shown that?,' I say to them, 'Do you really think you should have let your children watch that?' ".

"There's always that off switch," he says.

DeFusto's daughter, Daria, 5, watches his show, but not regularly "because she usually has other things to do." She has appeared twice on it, on her third and fifth birthdays.

"I was more nervous than she was," says her father.

The DeFusto's other child is Anthony, 16 months.

DeFusto has carried on his dual career here for four and a half years and has just finished his fifth year at Brookside. His interest in radio-TV dates back 20 years "when I'd pick up scripts the announcers threw away after wrestling matches and take them home and practice."

He took some radio courses in college, went to Schenectady to teach after graduation, and became involved in TV when he was asked to do educational news for educational station WMHT. Jobs on a commercial station there and later in Chapel Hill, N.C., followed.

Eventually, DeFusto sees himself teaching old English at a small college where he can relax and enjoy life.

AUTO SAFETY: BUMPERS—NO. 7

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, A recent issue of Traffic Safety featured an article, entitled "Cushioning the Crash." This article is important reading for anyone interested in reducing the consequences of low-speed crashes:

CUSHIONING THE CRASH

(By James W. Lahey)[1]

One of the major injury factors in any vehicle collision is the physical law of inertia.

That is, something that is moving tends to keep moving; something that is standing still tends to remain that way.

Safety belts and air bags protect the passengers by controlling their motion in a crash.

Another approach is to have objects absorb the impact: vehicle bumpers or crash cushions.

Two recent bumper approaches are the water bumper and the telescoping bumper. Two recent crash cushion approaches are the inertial barrier and the telescoping guardrail.

Bumpers—With the water bumper, the impact is absorbed by water stored in vinyl containers. The impact is dissipated when the water shoots up through plug holes located across the top of the bumper. The plugs pop out in an "explosion" of water.

The plugs are secured by tethers and can be replaced after the bumper is refilled with water.

The chambered reusable device can be attached to the standard chrome bumper.

A test report, written by a Brigham Young University (BYU) professor for the manufacturer, said: "The BYU study concluded that the bumper is of significant value in preventing vehicle damage in collisions up to 18 m.p.h., reducing it at higher speeds, and that it can significantly reduce the phyological hazards endured by a lap-belted occupant in such impacts."

The weight of the water adds about 100 pounds to the vehicle's weight, and this was a matter of concern during the bumper's development. But a Culver City, Calif., police officer tested the bumpers for effects on maneuverability of patrol cars and reported:

"There was some difference found in the maneuverability of the vehicles so equipped, compared with the vehicles when they were not so equipped. However, the difference was so minute that the collision safety factors of the vehicles with water bumpers outweighed the difference noted."

The manufacturer says that the bumpers reduce force and deceleration values by "30 to 50 per cent."

The bumpers can be adapted to commercial vehicles like school and municipal buses, pick-ups, and to 2½-ton trucks, fork lifts, signal lights and other poles, bridge abutments, parking lots, and warehouses, piers, boat docks and marinas, and pusher bars.

Although the tests were conducted at relatively low speeds, company spokesmen are quick to point out that more than half of motor vehicle collisions occur at speeds of 30 m.p.h. or less.

Another test, covering vehicle damage to passenger cars equipped with water bumpers and standard chrome bumpers revealed:

WITH WATER BUMPERS

Type of accident	Number of accidents	Average cost per accident
Rear-end	69	$35
All others	45	175
Total	114	91

WITHOUT WATER BUMPERS

Type of accident	Number of accidents	Average cost per accident
Rear-end	104	$314
All others	109	479
Total	213	374

[1] James W. Lahey is associate editor of the National Safety Council's *National Safety News*.

Spokesmen also say that two water bumpers for passenger autos would cost around $195 plus $30 installation costs. But, they add, replacement of damaged chrome bumpers costs $50 to $100 for each bumper plus $10 to $25 in labor costs.

Bumper costs for small trucks, buses, dock cushions, etc., vary, of course.

Another manufacturer is offering shock-mounted, telescoping bumpers.

The system consists basically of two or four telescoping shock isolators mounted between the car frame and a conventional bumper.

The design is based on those used in aircraft landing gear and missile shock isolating systems.

The piston-like isolators are filled with gooey, elastic plastic. When the bumper hits something, the isolators act like a powerful mechanical spring and a hydraulic damper. That is, the plastic absorbs the shock and then returns the pistons to absorb a second impact.

The company's test report puts it: "The principal function of the hydraulic damping effect of the isolator is to produce a reaction force that increases with an increase in the vehicle impact velocity. This characteristic will significantly reduce the impact shock experienced by the vehicle's passengers for most rear-end collisions up to 30 m.p.h."

The damping effect, the manufacturer says, will also allow the bumper-equipped vehicle to push another without the bumper telescoping.

Collision with objects like power poles will transmit the stress either directly to the pistons or indirectly through bending action of the bumper.

The manufacturer, deeply involved in aerospace, expresses test results in aerospace terms: "Forces experienced by the driver were in the range of 6 to 10 g's. Deceleration of 10 g's, therefore, would equal 10 times the person's weight. Aircraft fighter pilots regularly experience forces of this magnitude with no apparent injurious effects."

Water bumpers have been in use for some time on San Francisco buses. A spokesman for the telescoping bumper firm said:

"We are equipping seven U.S. vehicles for fleet installation: 1970 Ford sedan, 1970 Chevrolet sedan, 1970 Plymouth sedan, 1970 Chevrolet van, 1970 Chevrolet pick-up truck, 1970 Ford van, and 1970 Ford pick-up truck."

One of the purposes of the undertaking is to obtain actual operating results.

The devices can be installed on existing vehicles or at the factory. The company spokesman said, however, that "current bumper elements are exceedingly weak. We know, however, that the automobile companies are aware of the inherent weaknesses of their bumpers, so we expect the basic bumper element to be strengthened in early models."

He then hopefully predicted bumpers with a 4½-inch stroke capability on some 1972 models, on most '73 models, and all '74 and '75 models. From 1976 on, the spokesman feels, all models will be factory provided with bumpers given the ultimate deflection space—a 9-inch bumper stroke.

Crash Cushions—High speed expressway crashes also kill and maim, so highway engineers are experimenting with different types of crash cushions.

The water-filled cell (an off-shoot of the water bumper) is one of the approaches being tried.

For example, the city of New York is experimenting with buffers of 50 water-filled cylinders at exits from Van Wyck Expressway.

Each cylinder is about 3 feet tall and 6 inches thick. They are filled with water and some calcium chloride to prevent freezing. They are placed in front of concrete abutments at turn-offs.

A similar experiment in Pojoque, N.M., has saved one life. Installed on a bridge spanning the Nambe River, the cylinders helped pre-

vent a two-ton truck and its driver from plunging through the guard rail into the deep river gorge.

Another approach is what has been termed the inertial barrier—highly frangible polyethylene barrels filled with sand.

This system applies Newton's Law of Momentum Exchange. That is, the forward momentum of the vehicle is transferred to the mass of the sand. In practice, the vehicle is not stopped abruptly as it would be by an abutment, but gradually by displacing the sand. This diminishes the g forces applied to the vehicle and occupants.

The barrels are set up in a certain pattern in front of an abutment, toll booth, etc. The pattern is intended to reduce the speed of a vehicle gradually, no matter at what angle it hits the barrier. The pattern is also designed to prevent the vehicle from submarining or climbing over the barrier.

A series of tests last year, sponsored by the manufacturer, indicated the barriers could be successful.

One test slammed a remotely controlled 3,480-pound auto into an eight-barrel barrier at 40 m.p.h. The car stopped in 17½ feet with a g force of 3.1. Damage, beyond shattered barrels, was limited to "grill, radiator, fenders, and hood deformed and bumper slightly bent." The car was driven away.

Another test had a car of similar weight driven into a 21-barrel barrier at 50 m.p.h. The auto stopped in 27 feet, three inches with a g force of 3.1.

The grill, radiator, fenders, hood, and bumpers were damaged, but the driver was unhurt. The report stated: "Car struck barrier at left front wheel with negligible deflection. Car structurally undamaged. Driven away."

A 1,700-pound Volkswagen passed two similar tests, indicating that the barriers were adequate even for vehicles with an acutely sloped hood and most of its weight in the rear.

The system is also designed to minimize the force of the "second collision"—when occupants pitch forward after coming to a sudden stop. The reduction in forces is intended to reduce the effects of the second collision to well within human tolerances.

Another approach being tested is the Texas Crash Cushion system.

Developed by the Texas Highway Department and the Texas Transportation Institute, the system uses the lowely, hard-to-get-rid-of used oil drum.

The system consists of 38 to 44 interlocked steel drums placed in front of parapets. Four 5½-inch semi-circles are cut in each end of the barrels to make them more easily collapsible.

Here is how this system works: When a vehicle traveling at high speed hits the honeycomb of barrels, its momentum is gradually decreased by the successive crushing of the barrels.

Proponents of the Texas system make the following points.

Damage is usually limited to broken lights and bent radiators;

Because of the availability of empty oil drums, the cost is only about $200, compared to as much as $5,000 for some other devices.

The drawbacks of the Texas cushion are probably true of all impact attenuators:

Maintenance after they are hit could be a problem;

Installing them properly on existing highways will be more expensive, because, often, guardrails and abutments must be cut back to allow sufficient room for slowing the vehicle.

But as Dr. Ted Hirsch, research engineer at Northwestern Transportation Center points out, "If, however, the barrels are installed at the time of construction, much of the guardrail can be replaced at lower cost."

Another development out of Texas is crash barriers made of hollow-tube vermiculite concrete.

Also developed at the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), the system uses special, frangible concrete that can be cast in place or precast in modular form. Each module weighs about 250 pounds.

According to TTI's D. L. Ivey, the vermiculite cushions are so soft that an individual can dent them with his thumb. The cushions are designed, Ivey says, to collapse in a controlled pattern to stop a vehicle at deceleration levels tolerable for occupants wearing safety belts.

He estimates that a normal installation would cost from $600 to $1,000, compared to $4,000 to $7,000 for more sophisticated designs.

Another spin-off from the aerospace program is a barrier that telescopes much like the telescoping bumper.

The manufacturer says that the system is especially applicable at median bridge abutments, between twin bridges at overstructures, massive obstacles at gores of diverging roadways, obstacles in gores at wide-angle exit ramps, and at prows on elevated structures.

The inside of the barriers contain a large number of doughnut shaped stainless rings (called torii) that are forced between two tubes.

When a vehicle strikes the guardrail, most of the impact is transferred from the barrier to the shock absorbers.

The tubes can be made to compress or expand, permitting the guardrail to move distances of up to 8 feet.

The manufacturer says each stage can be reset after use within five to 10 minutes, with an electrical press unit. He also says the system is low cost, can be installed in 2½ to three hours and needs no special weather protection.

THE EXCESSIVE NUMBER OF CASUALTIES SUFFERED BY MINORITY GROUPS IN THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, while many Members of Congress point to the reduced weekly casualty figures in the Vietnam war as a sign that we are gaining the upper hand in that conflict, it is of little comfort to any of the families whose sons are part of a smaller statistic. Even more distressing is the awareness, that the "brown" people of this country are one of the minority groups which have been involved in a disproportionate amount of the fighting, resulting in a disproportionately high casualty rate for these citizens.

While living under an inequitable draft law and suffering financial and educational disadvantages, the minority group citizen is more likely to fall victim to the draft. In addition, many young Mexican and Puerto Rican-Americans enlist in the Armed Forces because they see the military as the only place in our society offering them a good chance for an equal opportunity for advancement and success in their lifetime. As a result, our casualties in Vietnam hit them the hardest.

Such a situation has occurred in my district in the Mexican-American community served by Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in south Chicago. Since 1966, 11 young men from this community of 900 poor and lower middle class families have been killed in combat in Vietnam and Cambodia. It is this excessively high number of 11 that will stand out in the minds of the people of this community when everyone else is talking about bringing the total level of casualties down to a "politically acceptable" level. I am inserting an article published by U.S. Catholic and Jubilee magazine in its October 1970 issue, describing the undue suffering of this Mexican-American community and urge my colleagues to consider how these bereaved families can be solaced by the reduced casualty figures of a war that is as ugly as ever.

The article referred to above follows:

THE EXCESSIVE NUMBER OF CASUALTIES SUFFERED BY MINORITY GROUPS IN THE VIETNAM WAR

"BUT, HE WASN'T IN OKINAWA. HE WAS IN VIETNAM."

Michael Miranda

The lettering on the window of the tavern reads "Club Pavoreal," which means pigeon in Spanish. And, appropriately, a bluish-gray pigeon enlivens an otherwise drab decor inside by strutting around the dirty wooden floor and nibbling at scraps of potato chips dropped by patrons.

The patrons are laboring men, mostly Negroes and Mexican-Americans who work in the nearby steel mills of south Chicago. They drink beer or straight shots of whisky, or sometimes both. They live in dingy, beat-up frame houses or two-flats stacked together in a neighborhood decaying with ugliness and grime and air pollution from the mills that ring the southern edge of Lake Michigan and stretch into Indiana.

There are nine leather-covered stools in the tavern and a couple of booths. The mirror behind the bar is covered with a smoky film and looks as though it hasn't been washed in a long time. A picture of President John F. Kennedy hangs above it. There are the usual tavern accouterments, including a television set and cigarette vending machine, and in the back room, a pool table.

The proprietor, Anastacio Salas, is a small man, with dark skin, gray hair and broken front teeth. He is sixty-nine. He speaks Spanish much better than he speaks English. He has been part of the neighborhood scene for years. And the light of his life was his grandson, Michael Miranda.

But Michael Miranda is dead; his remains lie in a government plot in St. Mary's Cemetery, about ten miles due west of "Club Pavoreal" in the suburb of Evergreen Park.

Michael was a United States Marine. A private first class. He was killed in Vietnam.

And something died in Anastacio when he received the news that he would never see his grandson alive again.

"I don't like to remember it," he said.

"He was a good kid—Miguel. Why should they take the good ones? They should take the bums."

Anastacio has more than the usual reasons for feeling bitter over the loss of a loved one in war. He thinks the fortunes of life were cruel to Michael, that the dice were loaded against him from the start.

"He had no mother or father," Anastacio said.

"His mother was killed in an auto accident in Freeport, Texas. His father died in Monterray, Mexico. I raised him since he was ten days old. He called me 'Pa.' "

Anastacio excused himself momentarily to wait on a customer. Before returning, he poured himself a shot from a bottle behind the bar and downed it quickly. It is not his custom to drink on the job, but what can a man do to ease the pain of talking about a cherished grandson who died in a war so far away, so senseless in its destruction, and so difficult to understand?

"Miguel," he said, "used to help around here. Clean up. Mop the floor. He went into the Marines after high school. He didn't smoke. He didn't drink. He didn't even go out with girls.

"He wrote me once, after he left, that he was in Okinawa and that he had a good job. A safe job. Be he wasn't in Okinawa. He was in Vietnam. He said that just so I wouldn't worry."

Anastacio went into a back room and returned carrying a purple and gold band uniform and trumpet.

"He was in the band when he was in high school," he said.

"I bought him this trumpet. He'd practice the trumpet in the back room, and he was taking lessons on the outside. He loved music.

"If he came back, maybe he would've. . . ." Tears welled in Anastacio's eyes. He left abruptly to tend to another customer.

When he returned again, he carried an open cigar box. It once held LaPalina cigars. Now, it holds Michael Miranda's medals: the Purple Heart, a Vietnam medal, a National Defense medal, a Vietnamese Service medal.

In the box, there was also a small packet of papers—a letter, a bill from the cemetery, a couple of telegrams, and some photographs, one of them showing Michael as a little boy with his arm around a neighborhood pal, and another, taken in San Diego in 1968, showing Michael standing proudly with members of his boot camp platoon.

Anastacio looked at the pathetic little collection of mementoes, and his face became wreathed in anguish.

"How was he killed?" Anastacio said as he wiped his eyes.

"I forget everything. I don't have the papers that tell how he was killed, or where he was killed.

He went into the Marines in July 1968."

The old man counted on his fingers.

"Ten months later," he said, "he was dead."

Michael Miranda served with the 1st Marine Division. He was twenty-two when he died of wounds suffered from fragments of a hostile hand grenade that struck him in the head. It happened at night while his company was in defensive position during a search and clear mission in Da Nang, Quang Nam Province.

He was wounded on April 28, 1969, and died two days later in a hospital.

Anastacio talked for a while longer about his grandson. The memories obviously distressed him, and he chewed vigorously on a piece of gum to keep back the tears.

He said Michael was a strong boy, that he weighed about 210 pounds, that he played basketball and football, as well as the trumpet, that his original name was Michael Jassa and that he had changed it to Miranda, that his high-school teachers would occasionally chide him for falling asleep in class. "I tell him he stay up too late watching television," the grandfather said.

When he stopped, Anastacio Salas was asked what he thought of American involvement in Vietnam.

"Don't ask me any more questions," he said. "I don't like to remember.

"If you want to know more about my grandson, maybe his best friend can tell you. His name is Armando Flores. He cried when they brought Miguel home."

"He was a nice kid, a good kid," Armando said later. "He was quiet. It sounds strange, but you know he never had a date. I think he was self-conscious. Before he went into the Marines, he wasn't sure of himself.

"But how he loved to play the trumpet. That was the main thing with him. I used to call him 'Jazzo,' because he liked jazz music.

"When he was in the Marines, he told me he wanted to finish and get out. He was worried about his grandparents. He wanted to come home and take care of them.

"When he lived in the back of the tavern, he kept an eye on his grandparents. If somebody started an argument, or there was trouble, he always looked out for them.

"I remember one time some guy said something about his grandparents that wasn't very nice. Mike was working in the tavern, and quietly said to the guy, 'Let's go outside.'

"This guy was pretty solid, maybe 180–190 pounds. When he comes out, Mike picks him up bodily and puts him over his head. Can you imagine that?

"The guy had been drinking a little bit, and his eyes grew as big as baseballs.

"Mike tells him not to say anything like that again, and makes him promise he wouldn't. The guy promises, and Mike puts him down.

"We were good friends, Mike and me. We went everywhere together. I miss him very much."

It is late afternoon, and the wind whips little eddies of dust around the entrance of "Club Pavoreal."

Inside, Anastacio Salas goes about his business of serving drinks and ringing up the cash register.

He does his job quietly, methodically.

He does it with a hurt deep down in him that won't go away.

"IT'S MY PLEASURE"

Eddie Cervantes

He was painting the side of the two-story frame building. He was a short stocky man with glasses and a trace of sadness etched into his face.

"Yes," he said, "I am Eddie Cervantes' father".

"You want to talk about Eddie? Come upstairs. In the kitchen. We can talk there."

The inside stairwell was dimly lit, and looked as though it had been painted many times. The building was old, but the shingles on the outside disguised its age as they do on many decrepit two-flats in south Chicago.

The lot next to the building was strewn with debris, and that street in front apparently hadn't been cleaned in months.

In the kitchen, tortillas were stacked on a plate over an old stove.

Herculano Cervantes pulled up a chair and folded his hands on the table.

"Eddie was in Vietnam not more than two months before he was killed," he said.

"He was killed on January 30, 1968. Right after his twenty-first birthday. They never told me how. It was in action."

Herculano ordered one of the many children who were circulating around the kitchen to "get the clippings about Eddie."

A girl returned with a few sheets of white paper. Pasted crudely on them were yellowed newspaper clippings that told something about the life and death of Edward Cervantes.

Eddie was born on December 19, 1946. He attended J. N. Thorp elementary school and St. Francis de Sales high school. He was the oldest boy in a family of nine girls and eight boys.

He was an achiever, and ambitious. In grammar school, he was captain of patrol boys. And he would arise at 3:30 in the morning to deliver 361 newspapers in the South Shore area, then head home and help his mother get the younger children ready for school.

In 1962, at the age of fifteen, he became a neighborhood celebrity. He won a city-wide contest to become official bat boy for the Chicago White Sox major-league baseball team. The job opened a whole new world for him, gave him a chance to earn good money and set his sights on a college education.

He never made it to college. After working with his father in a laboring job at Wisconsin Steel Works nearby, he enlisted in the Army in May, 1967.

"In one of his last letters," said Mrs. Rose Cerda, one of Eddie's sisters, "he told my parents he wanted to buy a house for them when he got home. He always wanted to be a major-league baseball player, but decided he would go to college when he returned home and become a lawyer."

Herculano was somewhat taciturn and vague about the details of Eddie's death. He wasn't even sure of which Army outfit his son was in when he was killed.

"Once he sent a map home," volunteered one of the Cervantes girls, "and he circled the area where he was. He had circled Cam Ranh Bay, Phu Rieng and Dak To.

"He was a quiet boy," she added, "but he knew a lot of people. And he was hard working."

After some rummaging around in the modest apartment, Herculano finally came up with an envelope with an address on it and an official document reporting Eddie's death in Vietnam.

Edward Cervantes was with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. According to the document, he died "from gun shot wounds during hostile ground action," and that he had been promoted, posthumously, to the rank of corporal.

Herculano was born in Laredo, Texas, and came to Chicago in 1942 to work in the big steel plants, taking time out during World War II to serve as an infantryman. What does he think of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam?

"I don't think what we do is right there," he said.

"It's not a declared war. A lot of people think the way I do."

The death of Eddie has brought heartache to him and his wife, Maria. But their sorrow is tempered with the daily concern of rearing a large family.

"What can I do?" Herculano said, shrugging his shoulders. "Eddie is gone. I have the other children I must look after."

The example of Eddie Cervantes, a boy who had much to give to the community, touched many people. One of the people is Mrs. Marion Skoronski, principal of Thorp school when Eddie was attending classes there.

"It took me a long time to get over Eddie's death," Mrs. Skoronski said.

"He was the gentlest, most honest boy I ever knew. He was a normal student, but he would have been better if he had a place to do his homework.

"The family lived in two rooms in the back of a store then. Two rooms, and fifteen children living in them.

"I'll tell you a typical story about Eddie. One rainy day after school, one of the teachers had a flat tire on her car.

"Eddie changed the flat for her, in the rain. When he was through, she offered him two dollars. And you know what he said?

"He said, 'Oh, no, ma'am, I can't take the money. It's my pleasure!'

"That's the phrase he always used when he helped out. 'It's my pleasure.'

"Eddie always wanted to do what was right. He was so kind to people.

"I remember meeting him one day in Goldblatt's Department Store. He told me he was getting his eyes tested. All the Cervantes kids have weak eyes.

"Eddie said he was getting his eyes tested because he was going to enlist in the Army. He said, 'I figured if I go in now and serve my time, I'll have a chance at the G.I. education bill and go on to college.'"

It is obvious Mrs. Skoronski had a deep liking for Eddie Cervantes.

"I had heard about the White Sox bat boy contest," she recalled. "So one day when the girls were in gym, I had the eighth-grade boys write an essay on why they wanted to be bat boy. That was part of the contest. The only essay we sent in to the White Sox was Eddie's.

"You should've seen what his bat boy position did to the morale of the kids in the school. It made the kids proud that one of their own had been chosen."

Today, the Eddie Cervantes Scholarship Fund gathers interest in one of the local banks. The fund was established as a com-

munity endeavor after Eddie's death to help pay for the college education of some deserving youngster in the area.

The influence for good Eddie Cervantes exercised in his short lifetime continues after his death.

"He was a sweet boy," said Mrs. Skoronski.

"I LIT ONE CANDLE, THE GLASS BROKE, AND THE CANDLE WENT OUT"

Joseph A. Quiroz

A little rectangular flag hangs in the front window of the frame cottage. On it are two gold stars.

From the outside, the size of the house is deceivingly small. Actually, it has eight rooms at ground level, and four rooms in the basement.

Once it was the home of Joseph A. Quiroz.

Joseph was killed in Vietnam on January 28, 1966. He was shot in the chest while trying to save his platoon from an ambush.

He was in the Army. A private first class. He was twenty-one.

"We moved here in 1951, when Joe was just a small boy," said Mrs. John Quiroz, the mother.

"When he was young, he used to play ball all the time. He played softball. He didn't finish high school because he wanted to go to work and help support the family. His father, he had a bad leg."

Joseph Quiroz was one of seventeen children. There were ten boys and seven girls in the family.

He spent three years at Bowen high school, and then went to work as a laborer. He was drafted into the Army.

"He came home once for ten days," his mother recalled. "That's all the furlough he got.

The last time we saw him, we were putting him on a train for Fort Ord.

"He used to write that it was kind of tough over there. He said he was glad he went over to Vietnam. He felt he was fighting for a cause. He said he wouldn't want the Communists to take over the United States. He wouldn't want to see any harm come to his brothers or sisters."

Joseph Quiroz was small in size, five feet, nine inches tall, maybe 150 pounds.

But brave men come in all sizes.

And Joseph Quiroz received the Bronze Star posthumously, for valor and heroism. He was a member of C Company, 2nd Battalion, 1st Cavalry Division.

He was killed during an assault on a Viet Cong machine gun nest, sustaining small arms and mortar fragment wounds in his chest.

Mrs. Quiroz had a premonition about her son's death.

"It was on a Sunday, January 30," she said.

"I went to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church to light a candle for Joseph.

"I lit one candle, the glass broke, and the candle went out. I tried another candle, and the same thing happened. The glass broke, and the light went out.

"Then, I knew something had happened to him."

That night, at 8:30, the telegram came.

"I couldn't look at it," Mrs. Quiroz said. "I couldn't even open the envelope. My hands were trembling."

She handed the envelope to a daughter, Cindy, who opened it and read the sorrowful news.

Mrs. Quiroz is opposed to the war in Vietnam.

"I hope the war is over with soon," she said. "It has taken so many lives."

"My boy was only in the service for five and a half months. He didn't have all the training he should have [had]. He was in the R. O. T. C. in high school. That's all. He was drafted into the Army in July, 1965, and was sent to Vietnam in November."

Mrs. Quiroz paused for a moment.

Time has healed some of her grief, but has not diminished her fears.

"I hope the war is over," she said, "before they take more of my boys."

Joseph Quiroz was a sociable young man.

"He belonged to a club called the Senior Saints," a brother revealed. "They'd throw big dances and parties. They were peaceful then.

"Joseph was a good organizer. He could get things going. He never looked for trouble unless they came looking for him."

In the small front room of the Quiroz home, there is a framed picture of Joseph; and on it hangs a rosary.

There is a second photograph of a young man in uniform.

"That's another son," said Mrs. Quiroz. "Joseph A. He was in the Army, too.

"He was killed in Korea in 1950.

"The other gold star is for him."

"MARINES DON'T CRY"

Dennis J. Rodriguez

The last time Eva Rodriguez saw her son, Marine Pfc. Dennis J. Rodriguez, alive was the Tuesday after Easter, 1969.

Dennis had finished his leave and was preparing to go to Camp Pendleton. On the following May 4, he would be going to Vietnam.

"I can still see him," said Mrs. Rodriguez.

"He told me he didn't want me to go to the airport with him.

"He said, 'I don't want anyone crying on my shoulder.'

"He was sitting in a car parked out in front. Some friends were driving him to O'Hare Field.

"He gave me a little wave, and then they drove off."

Dennis would not live out the year in Vietnam. He would never live to be twenty years old.

He was a rocket man with the 5th Marine Division. On the morning of October 4, 1969, he was with his platoon approximately four miles northeast of a combat base at Anh Hoa in Quang Nam Province.

At approximately 8:30 A.M., while on squad-size combat patrol, Dennis stepped on an enemy explosive box mine.

Fragments from the mine struck him in the head and body. He was evacuated to a Naval Support hospital in Da Nang, and died the following morning at seven o'clock.

It was a crushing blow for Eva Rodriguez, who is divorced from her husband, Angel, and who lost her only other son, Johnny, when he died at the age of nine of leukemia.

"Dennis," she said, "was my sole support.

"He didn't have to go. But he wanted to do it. He even wanted me to sign for him when he was seventeen. He enlisted when he was eighteen."

Eva Rodriguez lives in a small, neatly kept first floor apartment in one of the more pleasant blocks in south Chicago. The two-flats and bungalows on the block are set off with lawns and trees and shrubbery.

The silence and solitude of the apartment are noticeable. Loneliness is Eva's companion. The men in her life are gone.

The appointments in the apartment are modest. There is a TV set with inside antenna in the front room. A gas space heater in the kitchen. A drag-racing trophy that Dennis won sits nearby. A folded American flag which covered Dennis' casket lies on a shelf.

"When Dennis left," Eva said, "I told him, 'Dennis, don't try to be a hero. Just do your job.'

"He said, 'No, mom, I won't try to be a hero.'

"That was the only lie he ever told me."

Mrs. Rodriguez smiled sadly.

"I remember, he said to me, 'Mom, no matter what happens, don't cry. Marines don't cry.'

"And I told him, 'But, I'm not a Marine.'

"And he said, 'But I am.' "

Dennis Rodriguez was born June 8, 1950. He was baptized, received his first communion, and was confirmed at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church.

He attended J. N. Thorp elementary school and Chicago Vocational high school.

"He didn't want to go to college," his mother said.

"He wanted to become a professional drag racer. Drag racing . . . that was his baby. His father once gave him an old junk of a car, and he fixed it up. He raced it on Route 30 . . . that's where he won that trophy."

Before enlisting in the Marines, Dennis worked in a garage and later at U.S. Steel. He turned his money over to his mother.

"All his life that poor kid had to get up early in the morning," Eva said.

"When he was going to Chicago Vocational, he got up at 6:30. His first class was at eight.

"He was on the shy side, but he wasn't meek. He could take care of himself. He was a nice, quiet kid . . . you don't find many of those any more."

Dennis signed into the Marines on November 4, 1968. He used to kid his mother about changing his last name.

"He told me," said Mrs. Rodriguez, " 'I've got two strikes against me. I'm a half-breed.'

"And I told him, 'But you're an American citizen.' "

Eva once relented and suggested he change his name to Dennis James. He never followed up on the suggestion.

Dennis was tall, six feet, three inches.

"When he came home from boot camp," Eva recalled, "he weighed only 160 pounds. But the Marines straightened him up. He used to slump a little when he walked. It seemed he was an inch taller."

Correspondence from Dennis while he was in Vietnam indicated his life was frequently in peril.

"He'd write," said Mrs. Rodriguez, " 'Six of us went out on patrol, mom, and two came out. Six of us went out, and one came back . . . that was me.'

"I had a feeling . . ." Eva added. "Death was all around him. One of his friends had been hit and later died. And when Denny wrote me, he seemed unemotional about it. He was getting so death didn't bother him.

"At the end of his letters, he'd always say, 'Don't worry, mom. I'll be back.'

"I just thought: 'No, he won't.' "

Two weeks before Dennis Rodriguez was killed, he sent his mother a letter. "He told me he had busted his hand, that his fingers were smashed up, but he didn't tell me how," his mother said.

"He told me he was going out on another patrol.

"They ought to bring all our boys home from Vietnam. Sometimes, I think the President is doing all he can; then, I think he isn't."

It was deathly quite in the apartment. Mrs. Rodriguez looked at the blank TV screen.

"Sometimes," she said, "I see a baby on TV, and I think, 'I remember Dennis when he was that small.'

"Now, he's grown and gone."

Mrs. Rodriguez looked at her son's Bronze Star.

"In a way," she said softly, "I'm glad he passed away rather than come home not knowing he was alive. That would be worse."

On Memorial Day, Mrs. Rodriguez placed a poem in the classified section of The Daily Calumet.

In an unsophisticated way, it told of a mother's love for her son:

"On your country's hero roster
Your name is written fair.
But, I would give the world and all
If only it weren't there;
And you were safe at home with just
Your duty done today;
Instead I've only medals
For which your life did pay."

"THE LAST THING HE SAID TO ME WAS, 'I'LL BE BACK' "

Alfred Urdiales, Jr.

When Alfred Urdiales, Jr., was a little boy, he played a fascinating game with homemade miniature parachutes.

He would tear up old socks, form them into human figures, paint them, attach them with strings to handkerchiefs, and then drop them into space from a window or porch of the family apartment.

"We lived on the third floor of an apartment in south Chicago then," recalled Mrs. Alfred Urdiales, an attractive, middle-aged woman. "And he would have a great time, dropping ten or eleven of those little things into the air."

The fascination for parachutes carried over into Alfred Urdiales' young manhood.

In June, 1967, he became a member of the famed 101st Airborne Division, Co E, 1st Battalion, 502nd Regiment.

"When he went to Vietnam," Mrs. Urdiales recalled, "I found all that stuff he used to play with as a kid in the top drawer of his dresser. I cleaned them all out. I thought, 'When he comes back, he'll be a man, and think this is silly'."

Alfred Urdiales had a mischievous sense of humor. But he never had a chance to tease his mother about disposing of his juvenile keepsakes.

He was reported missing in action on February 7, 1968, during an attempt to help a Marine unit pinned down by enemy fire. He had been on duty in Vietnam for six weeks.

"It was during the Tet offensive," his mother said.

"A sergeant came to the house on a Tuesday night—it was February 13th—at 9:15 to tell us he was missing.

"Two days later, we were notified he was officially dead. Two officers from Fort Sheridan came to the house. They said his body had been found.

Mrs. Urdiales said she isn't certain how her son died.

"The death certificate said he had died of a gunshot wound, but it didn't say where. The officers said I could relax, that he had died instantly.

"When they brought him home, I knew he hadn't been shot in the head. I figured he was shot in the heart or stomach."

Seven years ago the Urdiales family moved away from the heart of the Mexican-American community in south Chicago. The family includes two other boys and three girls. They live in a bright new brick bungalow a mile or so south of the old apartment.

It is better than what they once had, but the neighborhood scenery still leaves something to be desired. A huge gas tank and the elevated concrete Calumet Expressway dominate the immediate view to the east.

Alfred Urdiales went to Marsh elementary school and Bowen high school. He was a member of the R.O.T.C. in high school. He held the green belt in Karate. He bought and paid for his own motorcycle, a blue Honda, but when he was in the paratroops, he wrote home that he wanted to sell the cycle and buy a new car.

"Every month, he'd send his money back home," his mother said. "In his last letter, he said he was sending $100 back. He had $751 in the bank. He wanted to buy a new Firebird. He said he wanted us to have it at the airport when he came home from Vietnam.

"He was a real good boy," Mrs. Urdiales continued. "He never got into trouble.

"I got a headache from him only once. He and his brother got into a coal yard, and broke the gauge on a tractor. The man said it would cost me $1,000. That was the only time he did anything destructive . . . but he admitted it.

"As far as gangs or leaving the house without telling us, he was no trouble. He worked at Gene's Steak House as a bus boy. Sometimes as late as three o'clock in the morning. He'd do that during the school year.

"When he was thirteen or fourteen he worked as a caddy at South Shore Country Club during the summer.

"He was about 5'8", on the thin side, but he ate like a horse. He was quickwitted, sometimes real silly. He was always smiling and he made friends easily. He'd never get angry, and when I'd holler at him, he'd kid me and call me, 'Mama San,' or his father, 'Papa San.' "

Alfred Urdiales came home on his last furlough two days after Thanksgiving in 1967. He left home for the final time on the following December 19.

"We took him to O'Hare Field," Mrs. Urdiales said.

"The last thing he said to me was, 'I'll be back.' "

Mrs. Urdiales wiped the tears from her eyes.

She has a dark opinion of the war in Vietnam.

"I think it's terrible," she said. "I really do.

"For a while, I hated Johnson.

"If we had a declared war, if we had to defend ourselves, I might feel differently.

"But this is sheer nonsense.

"We have gained nothing. Those people don't care."

Mrs. Urdiales said her son's personal belongings were never returned from Vietnam. She told how he wanted to join a sky-diving club after getting out of the paratroops, and how he used to keep the family informed when he was training at Fort Benning in Georgia.

"Each time he jumped, he'd call home to tell us about it," Mrs. Urdiales said.

"After his first jump, he said, 'I was in a world all my own . . . like being up in heaven.' He loved it. He really did.

"After his third jump, he said he got kind of scared.

"And, after his fourth jump, he said, 'What the hell am I doing up here when I know I've got a mother and father and brothers and sisters at home who love me?'

"We sat and cried after we heard that," Mrs. Urdiales said.

"We wondered what his future was going to be."

"I'LL BETCHA THE CUBS WIN"

Charles A. Urdiales, Jr.

Pfc. Charles A. Urdiales, Jr., was built just like his father. He was five feet nine inches tall and weighed 165–170 pounds. As he approached young manhood, he even took to appropriating his father's shoes and clothes because they fit him so well.

He was like his father in another respect.

"He was a foot soldier like myself," Charles Urdiales, Sr., said. "During World War II, I was in the Philippines."

Young Charlie was never in the Philippines, but he did get to Vietnam.

And he died there on May 13, 1968.

He was a member of Company B, 4th Battalion, 23rd Infantry, 25th Division. He was killed in action near Chu Lai.

He was riding in a jeep and was fatally wounded when a mortar shell hit the vehicle.

He was twenty-four years old.

Charlie Urdiales was a high-school dropout. He attended Chicago Vocational for two years and then went to work as a stock boy in a local grocery store.

Later, he got a job as a burner at Wisconsin Steel. He wasn't drafted into the Army until he was twenty-three—on April 14, 1967.

"I tried to keep him in school," his mother said. "But he hated it.

"He was a normal boy. He never gave us serious trouble. When he started working, he paid attention to his job. He never missed work.

"He liked to bowl and play softball."

"At home," his father said, "he was the more serious type.

"He liked to watch ball games on TV. He was a Cub fan.

"He'd be watching the game and say 'I'll betcha the Cubs win.' I'd tell him, 'Don't bet on them. Just root for them.' "

The Urdiales have one married daughter. Both parents work. They live in a neatly-kept brick bungalow.

"I remember how Charlie would stretch out on the floor," Mrs. Urdiales said, "and fall asleep watching television.

"His bedroom upstairs is just like he left it. You know how boys keep their rooms. His pipes, his dresser drawers; everything is the same upstairs. I just can't bring myself to clean it out.

"He was a good boy. He was so close to us."

"When he was working, he always saved his money," his father added. "He bought two cars for cash. When he was in the Army, he asked us to hold the last car—a '65 Pontiac Catalina—until he got out. I told him we'd sell our car, put the money in the bank for him, and drive his car. That way he'd have money collecting interest for him until he got home."

Mrs. Urdiales is outspoken in her opposition to the war in Vietnam.

"I'm against it," she said. "I would just as soon have seen our son run away to Canada. At least he'd be alive today.

"I don't think this war is doing us any good."

"It must be doing somebody some good," the father added.

"You're proud your son went in service.

"You're not proud that he died."

Charlie Urdiales took his basic training at Fort Knox. After his basic training, he came home for a two-week furlough in October and married a local girl, Paula Leski. He was then sent to Germany, but returned home for another month's furlough in March, 1968.

He tried to conceal from his parents the fact that he had orders for Vietnam. His ruse was unsuccessful, and they knew where he was headed when he left the following April.

"He said to me," his mother recalled, 'Don't worry, mom. I'll be all right.'

"He wasn't afraid to go. He wanted to get it over with. He wasn't there very long. He was there one month."

In the brief time he was in Vietnam, Charles Urdiales had time to write his parents once. He didn't tell them he was in combat.

"He got one letter from me when he was in Vietnam," his mother said.

"I sent five other letters.

"He never received them."

"WE USED TO CALL HIM JO JO"

Joseph A. Lozano

The gray shingled, two-story flat squats along a cindered alley and has no frontage on the street. Another flat blocks its view.

The stairs leading to the second-floor apartment are exposed and weather-beaten.

Mrs. Rumalda Lozano, a heavy-set, short woman, came to the door.

She had just come from work, but she had time to talk about her son, Joseph.

The apartment is small and incredibly crowded, and in the tiny living room there are a couch, a chair or two, gas heater, television set and, on the wall, a photograph of Marine Cpl. Joseph A. Lozano, with a rosary draped over the frame.

"We used to call him Jo Jo," said Mrs. Lozano. "There never could be a son like that again.

"All he did was think of others.

"He was one of three sons. Benjamin, he is the oldest. Then Joseph. And then Anthony. He is the youngest. He is thirteen.

"Joseph left part of his insurance to his younger brother. That's what I mean when I say he always thought of others."

Mrs. Lozano fought back tears. And, for a while, she could not talk.

Joseph Lozano was on a special mission in Quang Nam Province with the 1st Marine Division when he was killed on January 6,

1970. He sustained fatal missile wounds from explosive devices fired by enemy forces.

Twice before he had been wounded in Vietnam, on April 4 and October 4, 1968.

In the action on April 4, 1968, he was wounded in an enemy attack and subsequently awarded the Bronze Star.

According to the citation he received when awarded the Bronze Star, he was on a mission near the Ben Hai River in the DMZ.

"While assaulting an enemy hilltop position," the citation read, "Lozano and the men in his company came under intense hostile mortar fire.

"With complete disregard for his own safety, Lozano fearlessly maneuvered across the fire-swept terrain directing Marines to cover positions and assisting casualties."

With the help of Lozano's "bold initiative and unwavering devotion," the company pressed home its attack.

Joseph Lozano attend Our Lady of Guadalupe parochial school and Chicago Vocational high school.

"He didn't finish high school," his mother said. "He planned to make a career in the Marines.

"He used to say, 'Mom, if I stay in the Marines twenty years, I'll be able to retire with a full pension when I'm still young.'

"He was always thinking of the future.

"He started working when he was seven years old," said Mrs. Lozano who is separated from her husband.

"He was a religious boy. Often, he'd say, 'Don't you know that people who pray together stay together?'

"And he'd always send me a religious card for Mother's Day and for Christmas.

"He selected his friends. Those who knew him miss him. He was a true friend.

"I remember one time he came home and drew $60 out of the bank.

"I said, 'Why did you do that?'

"He said a good friend of his needed it. The man had three young children, and needed the $60 to pay the rent.

" 'I had to help him,' he said.

"He always brought home candy and pop for the kids. All the kids were crazy for him."

Joseph Lozano enlisted in the Marines on May 15, 1967; and, after seeing action in Vietnam, he returned home on a twenty-day leave in September, 1968.

"He didn't want to tell me he was going back," Mrs. Lozano said.

"I said, 'I bet you're going back,' but he just laughed.

"I told him to consider us.

"He said, 'I know it is hard for you, mom, but I don't want the same thing that's happening over there to happen to my brothers and sister.

" 'Those kids over there, sometimes they go without food and water. I want to do everything I can to help them.'

"Joseph hated all protesters. He said they should thank God for what they have—food and shelter.

"The people in Vietnam, he said, compared to us, have nothing. We have everything.

"I know they took my boy, but I feel no regrets. I just feel bad the way he told me those people over there have to live."

Mrs. Lozano wiped the tears from her eyes.

"Two Marines came and let me know he was dead. He died on a Tuesday and they let me know on Wednesday at 9:30. They didn't bring him back until the 15th.

"We buried him on January 19th."

"HE ASKED US TO SEND HIM MEXICAN FOOD"

Thomas R. Padilla

On March 25, 1970, Army Specialist 4 Thomas R. Padilla was killed in combat at An Khe, Vietnam while serving as a machinegunner with the 4th Infantry Division.

He was shot in the chest. He was picked up by a helicopter, but the medics were unable to save him before reaching the sanctuary of a support hospital. He died in the helicopter.

Eleven years ago, Mr. and Mrs. Cruz Padilla left their home in Morales, Mexico to settle in south Chicago where the father worked for Wisconsin Steel.

They moved north with their young family, including Thomas; another son, Alfonso, now twenty-six; and three daughters, Martha, Veronica and Bertha.

The Padillas are industrious people. Alfonso holds down two jobs; Martha is a secretary, and the younger girls are studying business skills at Bowen high school and Chicago Vocational.

Maria, the mother, cooks Mexican food for all of them, and keeps the family's second-story apartment spotless. She does not speak English.

Through her daughter, Veronica, who translated her Spanish, she expressed her disdain for the war in Vietnam.

"I am against the war," she said. "I don't think the deaths of the young men over there have done any good.

"If I had known I was going to lose a son in Vietnam, we never would have left Mexico."

When the mother finished, Veronica added her own thoughts.

"Of course, I don't like the war," she said. "Especially after losing my brother. I don't think he should have gone. He wasn't even born here.

"I don't think we're doing any good losing so many lives of men who could have done great things."

Thomas worked as a mechanic while attending high school.

"He dropped out of school during his senior year," Veronica said. "He was having trouble with his grades. He didn't think he'd graduate."

Thomas was drafted by the Army when he was twenty years old. He went to Vietnam in July 1969. He had only one furlough before he left.

"We took him out to O'Hare Field," Veronica recalled. "He didn't say much. He told my mother not to worry, that he would write as often as he could.

"In his letters, he always tried to be cheerful, and told us everything would be all right.

"He wrote about the poor people over there, and once he sent us a picture of a puppy he had found. He said it was always raining where he was; that's why he couldn't write very often.

"He asked us to send him Mexican food. He said it would make the other food taste better."

"He was very quiet, very serious," added Martha. "When Alfonso came home from the Army they used to talk about the war a lot, he and Thomas. Thomas didn't like it, but Alfonso said, 'If you are called to go, you must go. That is the law.' "

"He never complained," continued Veronica. "When he went to Vietnam, he didn't like it; but he said he was going to do it if he had to.

"Did Thomas die for any good reason?" Veronica asked.

"I'm beginning to wonder. People say he died for a good cause. But for what cause? No one has told me that.

"So many people dying, on both sides—women, children. Will somebody please tell me how this war is helping them, and why my brother had to die?"

On Sunday afternoons, the Padillas go to the grave of their son and brother in St. Mary's Cemetery.

They are accompanied by Julia Sanchez. She is the girl Thomas was going to marry.

"HEY, MOM, A MAN WANTS TO SEE YOU"

Leopoldo A. Lopez

The telegram was dated May 16, 1970. It was addressed to Mrs. Amalia Lopez, and the terse message had a familiar ring to it:

"The Secretary of the Army has asked me to express his deep regret that your son, Specialist 4 Leopoldo A. Lopez, was killed in action in Cambodia on 12 May 1970. He was in night defensive position when the area came under rocket and mortar attack by a hostile force. Please accept my deepest sympathy. This confirms personal notification made by representative of Secretary of Army."

The telegam was signed by Kenneth G. Wickham, Maj. Gen., U.S.A.

Mrs. Lopez held the telegram in her hands. She is a short, pleasant-looking woman, with dark eyes and hair. She wears glasses. She speaks articulately. She has known sorrow.

"My husband was in the Army in the second World War," she said. "He was killed five years ago when he fell off a scaffolding at work. He was a construction worker. He is buried in Alamo, Texas. That's where Leo is buried, too."

Mrs. Lopez nodded her head sadly. "These last five years have been . . ." She couldn't finish what she started to say. Tears filled her eyes.

Mrs. Lopez lives in an old, but well maintained two-story brick building. The first-floor apartment is modestly appointed but clean. In the front room, there is a bracket of framed pictures showing three men in military uniform.

"The three of them," Amalia said. "My two sons and husband."

Mrs. Lopez has a second son, Fernando, twenty-two, who spent a year in Vietnam and returned home safely. She also has a married daughter, Otila, and a younger daughter, Marguerita.

She has painful memories of May 14, 1970.

"That's when an Army officer came to tell me about Leo.

"It was 9:15 at night. I was in the back room, saying my rosary. My daughter called to me, and said, 'Hey mom, a man wants to see you.'

"I went out, and he said, 'I came to notify you Leo Lopez was killed on May 12th.'

"I said, 'Oh, my God!' I got sick, and I fainted. My son told the officer to go and come back later."

Mrs. Lopez is bitter over President Nixon's decision to send ground troops into Cambodia.

"When he put them in Cambodia, I felt there was no hope.

"The boys over there don't even know what they're fighting for. You see them on TV sometimes. They don't even know what they're there for.

"The medal my son got, I should send to Nixon. I don't care about the insurance. All I want is my son.

"The kids who run wild in the streets. Why don't they take them?"

Leo Lopez was born December 1, 1946. He dropped out of Hirsch high school when he was seventeen. He dropped out because of racial trouble in the school.

"He got a job right away," his mother said. "He ran a machine for the Laminet Cover Company. Then, when my husband died, he went to work for the National Video Corporation as an inspector. He quit there to make more money, and got a job as a construction worker.

"I never had any trouble with him. He always went to work. He was always very happy. He was the one who made things lively around the house. Everybody was his friend. He didn't care what their nationality was.

"He didn't cash his checks. He'd always bring them home to me. That's the way we bring them up."

Leo married a neighborhood girl, Delores Mariscal. They had a daughter, Monica, who is now three years old. Leo's draft classification changed when his marriage ended in divorce. He was taken into the Army on October 25, 1968.

"The marriage didn't work out," Mrs. Lopez said. "But Leo continued to give support to his daughter even when he was in the Army."

Mrs. Lopez went into another room and returned with a large package. It came from Vietnam and was addressed to Leo's daughter.

"I don't want to open this," Mrs. Lopez said. "I'm afraid I would cry. I'll let her (Delores) open it."

Leo Lopez spent ten months in Germany, and returned home on a thirty-day furlough before leaving for Vietnam. He was with a mechanized unit of the 5th Infantry Division.

"The last thing he said to me," said Mrs. Lopez, "was, 'Ma, don't cry. I'll be home safe. I *have* to come home.' "

Leo had big plans for the future.

"His father owned twenty acres of land in Texas," said Mrs. Lopez. "Its been rented out. Leo told me not to rent it any more; that when he got out of the Army, he wanted to take care of his father's land.

"He said he would go to Texas after he was discharged. He was to get out in late October or early November."

Mrs. Lopez paused for a moment. Her thoughts turned to war and to the terrible price war exacts on the ranks of young manhood.

"You work hard, you try to give them things, teach them the right thing to do," she said.

"And then someone comes along and takes them away."

"HE WANTED TO JOIN AN OUTFIT THAT TOOK CARE OF THE KIDS"

Peter Rodriquez

Pfc. Peter Rodriguez of the 1st Battalion, 7th Regiment, 1st Marine Division lies buried in Holy Cross Cemetery, some eight miles due south of south Chicago.

Late every afternoon, when they are returning from work, Joseph and Ruby Garnica visit Peter's grave.

The cemetery is not far from their home, where they moved after leaving the congestion and dreariness of their old neighborhood in south Chicago.

They are Peter's godparents and, in a happier time, he lived with them. They raised him as a son of their own.

Peter came from a broken home. His mother and father are divorced. The father, Pedro, has left the area, and lives in Laredo, Texas.

Mrs. Garnica is a sister of Peter's mother, and she was especially fond of her nephew. She called him "Pito."

"He was a good natured boy," she said. "He made friends easy. He wasn't prejudiced. He had colored friends as well as others.

"He was eighteen when he died."

Peter Rodriguez attended Our Lady of Guadalupe and other elementary schools, and then studied at Bowen high school.

"He quit in his last year to join the Marines," Mrs. Garnica said.

"He tried three times to get into the Navy. We didn't want him to go. The Navy never called him."

Peter enlisted in the Marines on July 17, 1967, went to Vietnam in February, 1968, and was killed on May 30, 1968.

He was a fire-team leader in the 1st Platoon. On May 30, his platoon was providing security for a truck convoy in Quang Nam Province when it came under heavy enemy small arms fire and grenades. During the ensuing battle, Peter was hit and killed instantly.

"He was hit in the head with machinegun fire, and in the right arm with shrapnel," Joseph Garnica explained.

A commanding officer of Peter's unit wrote, "Pedro was a fine man and an outstanding Marine."

"What did he die for?" asked Mrs. Garnica. "What did it prove?

"He said we shouldn't stop the bombing. That's when he was killed.

"He wrote that he felt sorry for the Vietnamese kids. He wanted to join an outfit that took care of the kids.

"I don't know what we're doing in Vietnam in the first place. I could see World War I and World War II, but this is a little ridiculous.

"I have four more nephews. That's why I'm bitter.

"They could be going into the same thing."

The month before he was killed, Peter was one of eight Marines who volunteered to raid a mountain held by the enemy in order to recover the body of a fellow Marine.

Recovering the body was difficult, although the eight Marines were under cover of air support. After recovering the body, they ran into trouble on the way back.

In an official Marine record of the exploit, Peter is quoted as saying, "Just as we passed the hilltop position, we began taking automatic weapons fire. One final strafing run by the jets made them stop firing just long enough for us to make it into the thick brush down the trail."

Mrs. Garnica said Peter mentioned the exploit briefly in a letter.

"He said if it was him, he'd like to have his body brought back.

"Otherwise, he wrote little about the war. He didn't want us to worry."

Peter's last letter was written on the inside of a brown C-ration box.

"He wrote it a couple of days before he was killed," Ruby Garnica said.

"It was to his sister, Yolanda. He said he was concerned about two friends of his who were mentioned in a letter he received from a girl friend.

"That was Peter. He was concerned about others."

In the comfortably furnished front room of the Garnica home, a double picture frame with photographs of Peter Rodriguez sits atop a stereo set.

Next to the picture frame is a long thin vase. It contains a single red rose.

"I TELL HER, 'SOME OF US MUST DIE, SO OTHERS CAN LIVE' "

Antonio G. Chavez, Jr.

Antonio G. Chavez, Jr., almost died when he was three years old.

"It was in a hospital—in Brownsville, Texas," his father recalled.

"My wife and I were in Mexico, visiting her parents. We had young Tony with us.

"We bought some milk, fresh from a cow. We put it in a bottle and gave it to Tony.

"He became terribly sick, and began running a high fever.

"We were rushing back to Chicago and decided we better get him to a hospital. When we got there, I thought, 'It's no use. He's just about gone.'

"But, my wife, she had hope, and soon, almost miraculously, Tony got well."

Tony Chavez made it to his fourth birthday.

He never reached his twentieth.

He was killed at the age of nineteen on Hill 881 at Tam Ky, Vietnam.

He was a private first class, with the 1st Battalion, 5th Regiment, 1st Marine Division.

When his body was returned for burial in St. Mary's Cemetery, the coffin wasn't opened. He had been shot in the head.

Tony was born on May 4, 1947. He died on May 1, 1967.

He was the oldest of eleven children, in a family that now includes five boys and five girls.

"It is terrible to lose the first one in the family," said Antonio Sr. "His mother took it very hard, and I have tried to comfort her. I tell her, 'Some of us must die, so others can live.' "

The father was an infantryman in World War II and spent time in the Philippines and Japan. He is not opposed to American intervention in Vietnam, but he qualifies his position.

"I'm not against it if it's a good thing for this country.

"We have to see this thing out, one way or another.

"Somebody has to be up in front to check them, so that some day they don't come to our homeland."

Mr. Chavez didn't identify the "them."

"If the war is right," he added, "I'm for it. If it's a waste of time, I feel we have no business over there.

"I think the President is trying his best to straighten it out."

Some of his father's patriotism rubbed off on young Tony. He quit Chicago Vocational high school in his senior year to enlist in the Marines.

"He was a brilliant boy, very studious," his sister Gloria said. "I don't know what possessed him to join.

"I think he figured he'd get in on an education program after service. They promised him a lot about schooling."

During the summer, before he went into the Marines, Tony worked at Wisconsin Steel, hooking long sheets of pressed steel; and he had a side job as a sander at Western Metals.

"He always turned his money over to his mother," Gloria said. "He'd keep a few dollars for his own, to buy books, things like that. He was good at drafting. He wanted to be an architect."

In June, 1966, when Tony returned from boot camp, he married a girl he had known at Chicago Vocational, Judith McCauley. They had a brief honeymoon. On July 1, he returned to Camp Pendleton and soon shipped out for Vietnam.

"All his letters back home were sad," his sister said. "He told us how the guys cried like babies over there, how terrible the explosions were, and how he missed the family and Mexican cooking, enchiladas and tortillas.

"At home, Tony was cheerful. If you were blue, he had a way of shaking you up. If you had a problem with money, he was there to give it to you. He was understanding."

The front of the Chavez two-story brick apartment building is adorned with a cutout of Snoopy, the celebrated cartoon puppy.

Tony would have gotten a laugh out of the replica.

"He had a good sense of humor," his sister said.

While the Chavez residence teems with kids and the usual turmoil that goes with a large family, the mother can't escape the grief she feels.

"Mother always tells us," said Gloria, "that Tony is alive.

"That he'll be back."

THE CANAL ZONE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal Zone has become a very remote part of the American scene since it last was in the headlines several years ago.

That absence from the public eye, though, does not mean that the Canal Zone matter is gone, nor that its importance has in the least bit been diminished.

A constituent of mine, who prefers that his name not be used, has compiled

a great deal of information on this issue and has sent me several letters which I think worthy of inclusion in the RECORD.

The letters and reports follow:

Hon. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress, 14th District of the State of California, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: This letter is in reply to your kind communication of 30 July 1970 and is concerned with circumstances and conditions surrounding the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, an exceedingly complex situation. My letter may well result in raising more questions in your mind than it answers, for I have no pat or easy solutions; I am not even certain that I know what all the proper questions should be. Still, as a concerned citizen who lived two years as a Professor at Canal Zone College, there are definite problems that we must face as a nation, and frankly, I am of the opinion that some partial "solutions" have already been reached by the Executive—which solutions have not even been related to the Congress, much less participated in by it.

We may well go back for a moment to the origins of this situation when President Theodore Roosevelt proudly announced to all who would listen: "I took Panama!" This declaration is well known to, and bitterly resented by, all educated Latins of whatever nation as evidence of our own imperialism—which was indeed our national policy at that time. It is still the source of rather deep bitterness toward the United States on he part of Colombia, of which Panama had been a province, however relucantly, up to 1903. (Some 80 or more revolutions by Panamanians had preceded this "independence.")

There can be no doubt as to the strategic importance of Panama and the Panama Canal to the United States, then or now. There is little doubt that the Panama Canal could easily become another Suez, were we so foolish as to abandon the Canal Zone to its fate as an integral part of the Republic of Panama. In my opinion, a situation would develop there in less than one year that would effectively close the Canal, for it is extremely vulnerable. That would be a tragedy, for the Canal is a vital waterway to us, which it is not to the Soviet Union, and its closing would be a major political triumph for them.

The "troubles" of 1964 between citizens of the Republic and citizens of the Canal Zone were not nearly as superficial as they might have appeared from the United States. The fact that they occurred at all, and that they were so severe, are indicative of the tenuous nature of our "friendship" with the Panamanians. They were also indicative of deep-seated distrust and not-always-carefully-hidden hatred of the United States and our sometimes heavyhanded policies toward smaller and weaker nations.

All Zonians are aware of this instability in international relations, I think, but that does not necessarily mean that they, either as individuals or as representatives of the United States abroad, are inclined to work harder to bring true understanding between the citizens of the two nations. In fact, the incidents of 1964 may well have worked to insulate and isolate most Zonians from Panamanian national life than they had been before—and some of them use the "danger of armed insurrection" as a generic rationale for never going into the Republic at all. (At some points, this is merely a matter of going across the street.) I have known educated individuals who have lived and worked in the Zone for more than twenty (20) years, but who have never even been into the interior of the Republic. I have known any number of long-term Zone residents who would never dream of making the trip back to the United States by auto through Central America and Mexico, as I did (safely!) in May and June of this year. Seemingly, the longer one lives in the Zone, the less one feels a part of Panama and the further removed from Central America and its citizens.

This, in all fairness, cannot be said of all Zonians. Many of them are intimately familiar with the Republic; many of them have travelled extensively throughout Panama and Central America. Many of them make an honest effort to relate to Latin citizens on a person-to-person basis—but they are few.

What is hard for the Panamanians to accept is the fact that so many Americans tend to treat them as second-class citizens in their own country, when *we* are the foreigners who are guests in a foreign land. There are a number of reasons for this, but most often the condition reflects relative levels of income—another cause of jealousy and bitterness. Here are three very generalized income strata (ignoring the "oligarchic" families in Panama who, as in other Latin American countries, are wealthy by any yardstick):

(1) At the top are the long-term American residents of the Canal Zone. Some of these people are third-generation Zonians; some of them have never even been to the United States; many others come for short visits only. All enjoy full American citizenship.

These and other Americans occupy almost all executive positions in the Canal Zone. Among them are many high-ranking Army officers who "retire"—on full pay—to the Canal Zone, where their military friends place them in key positions that are sometimes in the $25,000 per year range as head of one or another of the operating divisions of the Panama Canal Company.

(2) Panamanian nationals who work for the Panama Canal Company earn salaries or wages which are substantially below those of their American counterparts, although well above what they could earn in comparable positions in the Republic. These tend to be the most able of the Panamanians and they are excellent by any standards.

These differentials are "justified" by the Panama Canal Company on the grounds that the Panamanians are not required to pay U.S. income taxes. That is true, as far as it goes, but the differentials still exceed any implied taxes.

(3) Panamanian nationals who work in the Republic earn salaries or wages which are more-or-less comparable to those earnable in other Latin countries. In comparison to their average standard of living, however, *every* Zone resident is "rich" beyond their wildest dreams.

Their unsophisticated belief, naturally enough, is that if they could only get rid of the Americans and keep the Canal revenues for themselves, they would all be as rich as the Americans appear to be now. This belief is sparked and fanned by extremists of all sorts and I shall not be surprised to hear in the fairly near future of an organized movement aimed at the "national liberation" of Panama. To the poor and uneducated natives, we *do* appear to be exploiting the country for, if we were not, "How could you all be so poor, while they (meaning us) are all so rich?" It is a powerful and a dangerous argument.

The Panama Canal is, essentially, the only "natural resource" that the Republic has. This little country has a total GNP that is not much, if any, larger than the income of Panama Canal Company itself. Panamanians cannot even grow enough food for their own needs. The point is that Panama does not benefit as much as they believe they should from their only significant resource; this appears to be true.

For example, I have before me recent financial statements of the Panama Canal Company which were given to me by a Panamanian national who is in the employ of the Company:

Interest payable on net direct invest of U.S. Government	$7,783,811.92
Annuity payments to the Republic of Panama	286,800.00
Net income, current fiscal year to date (Feb. 28, 1970)	9,924,284.95
Total retained income	190,970,124.70

The Panama Canal Company, then, pays to the Republic less than 4% of what is remitted to the U.S. Treasury Department each year just in interest on investment in the Canal—most of which took place more than 60 years! This is in addition to all the costs of running the Canal, depreciating capital investment, and all other cost recoveries, funds, and allowances.

Now we come to the State Department's pious declarations of unwillingness to deal with the present Panamanian government. True, it *is* "unconstitutional" in nature. True, it is a military dictatorship. (I, personally, despise military dictatorships of all kinds, on principle.) True, no one knows whether any subsequent government would recognize any treaties negotiated by it. *But:*

The "constitutionally elected" government of Dr. Arnulfo Arias was certainly not one that any thinking American would want to support. The State Department made no protest when the constitutionally-elected representatives from Panama City and Colon were not allowed by Dr. Arias to be seated in the National Assembly, because their political views were opposed to his. These are the only two large cities in the Republic and their "deputados" were among the best-educated and most knowledgeable men in the country; if their representatives could not take their Assembly seats, then a large portion of the citizens of the Republic were without a voice in the national government.

I am well aware of the convenient platitude about "interfering in the internal affairs of other nations." In principle, I agree completely with this. But which is more important: the *form* of democracy or the *content* of democracy. Had Dr. Arias continued as El Presidente, he would have been the "constitutionally-elected Head of State"—while the National Assembly would have been a rubber-stamp farce composed entirely of hand-picked appointees.

We cannot tell the Panamanians how to run their country and I do not believe that we should even try, but why should the State Department be so pious in supporting a man who is a known assassin, as well as a known admirer of Adolph Hitler? Dr. Arias has been thrown out as head of the Panamanian national government on three different occasions during his long political career. The proximate cause of his latest ouster in 1968 was his attempt to purge the Guardia Nacional.

Dr. Arias, who is in exile somewhere in the United States (Florida, I think), shouts every now and then that Col. Pinella has "set Panama back by twenty years." This, too, is simply not true. It is the shout of a highly educated man (M. D., Harvard University) who knows the general American repugnance of military dictatorships and who is attempting by his shouting to gain sympathy here for his cause.

I was in the Canal Zone and the Republic during this entire episode. The picture is quite different than Dr. Arias claims. The current government has built many important new highways and other public facilities; garbage in Panama City is now collected regularly "for the first time in living memory;" large new office buildings and apartment houses are going up all over the city (which is about the size of Oakland, Ca.); new banks are being established—all concrete evidences of the faith of somebody with money to invest in the present govern-

ment and in the long-term prospects for the country. More importantly, they are also some evidence that local tax collections are being made and that they are being used for the public good.

Panama is obviously a poor country, although it has one of the highest per capita incomes in all of Latin America. We can hardly expect a U.S.-style democracy to prosper there, for there is neither the educational, economic, historic, social, religious, or political base for it. I do not recommend dictatorships, but I do believe that we would do well to face the realities of the situation and not use "non-constitutionality" as our excuse for doing nothing at all. *We* are quite satisfied with the present status of the Panama Canal; it is to *our* benefit, not theirs, to keep the whole matter in limbo as long as possible. The Panamanians also know this, which is why the pressure to do *something* about the Canal continues to build.

Presumably, no one outside of the Executive Department knows what direct and immediate agreements were made to bring the 1964 "troubles" to an end. Some of these are obvious:

(1) Both Panamanian and U.S. flags now fly over the Canal Zone;

(2) More Panamanian nationals are employed in the Zone that before. How many? I don't know. About three or four people who work as civilians in the Zone are now Panamanians, I believe.

The Canal Zone also operates something like a little country all its own, although I do not know to what extent this pre-dates 1964. For example, neither U.S. nor Republic postage can be used for outgoing mail from the Canal Zone (or within the Zone). The Canal Zone has its own legal code, although there is an articulation here with the Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans for appeals by U.S. citizens. Only Panamanian nationals inhabit the Canal Zone penitentiary; U.S. convicts are apparently sent to Leavenworth or to Lewisburg, et al.

Some rehabilitation is being done to existing civilian housing in the Canal Zone, so there is evidently a plan to continue employing some thousands of U.S. citizens in key positions for the foreseeable future. However, on the military reservations (e.g., Howard Air Force Base) there are large (200–300 unit) subdivisions of good, new, permanent housing that has jus been built for both enlisted and commissioned personnel.

From all this, I can only conclude that we are waging some sort of delaying action as regards civilian employees in the Canal Zone, but that we plan to continue to occupy military bases there for a long time to come.

But what of the Canal itself? Are we to turn it over to the Republic for operation, leaving only symbolic U.S. "security forces" on the military bases? What a political football and source of revolution *that* would become!

There is a great deal more to all this, but I do believe that the time has come when the Congress, and not just the Executive, should become involved. Crucial decisions must be made and I have a deep-seated suspicion that some of them have already been made, *sub-rosa* though they might have been.

If I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please call upon me.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

———

RECOMMENDATIONS HAVING TO DO WITH THE CANAL ZONE

(1) Most fundamentally, the Canal Zone Government should be headed by a civilian Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

Neither reason nor logic dictates that a two-star general officer of the Corps of Engineers should be Governor of what is essentially a civilian activity. Since its creation, the Canal Zone has been a sort of private fiefdom of the Corps of Engineers, perhaps the largest that they have.

Since each of the military services has a four-star general or flag officer assigned to the Southern Command (headquartered in the Canal Zone and another interesting situation, when the question of need for all of them is raised), there is no military or defensive reason for the Governor to be a military type at all. Civilian engineers certainly know how to build and operate canals.

COMMENTS

The existence of the present type of government in the Canal Zone is an example, for all the world to see, of a U.S.-style "military dictatorship" in Latin America. It is strictly that, for U.S. citizens there have nothing whatever to say about their own government, or the way that it is run. Anyone who protests, or even seriously questions, an action by the Canal Zone Government is immediately shipped back to the United States at his or her own expense. (I have personally seen this done and I can name names, dates and places.)

If we are such great believers in democracy, and if we are an educated, sophisticated citizenry capable of choosing our own leaders, why do we not allow our own Canal Zone citizens to have any say in their own government? We tell the Panamanians and the rest of the world that *they* should have a democratically-elected, representative and responsive government—then deny those very rights and recommendations to our own citizens, as a condition of their employment in the Zone!

Hundreds of military and government leaders from all over Latin America come to the Canal Zone every year for training in all sorts of military, para-military and governmental administration. While there, these Latin leaders can clearly see for themselves the dichotomy between what we preach to them and others and what we do to our own people.

From my own observation, the Canal Zone is as much a police state as the most highly-regimented nation in all of Latin America. *The first step in correcting this situation is to remove the military dictator!*

(2) Panamanian nationals who work for the Panama Canal Company should have the same right to live in the Zone as U.S. citizens. When a man is told, in effect, that he is good enough to work in a place, but that he must "go back across the tracks" when the sun goes down, he is also being told that he is not good enough to be "one of us." He is obviously considered to be a menial, a "doer of work," but either is not quite human, or at least not as good a human as "we" are.

The present practice is an example of national arrogance on our part; it is unjust, bigoted and destructive. Let the Panama Canal Company (and/or the Canal Zone Government) assume the responsibility of providing good housing for all its employees—or provide no housing for anyone. (U.S. citizens *could* live in the Republic of Panama.)

This would accomplish several things:

(a) It would bring about an end to what is now a U.S. Government-approved and carefully protected "American enclave" in a foreign land.

(b) It would provide to all Latins proof positive that, at least in our official eyes, Panamanian nationals are the equals of Americans in all respects.

(c) It would force Zone residents to recognize and accept Panamanian nationals as their equals.

(d) It would provide an incentive to able Panamanians to obtain the education and skills required for employment in the Zone, with stable employment and a good standard of living as guaranteed rewards.

(3) Panamanian nationals should receive identical pay for work that is identical to that performed by U.S. citizens. I have mentioned in previous-correspondence the rationale that the Canal Zone Government uses to justify the present differentials: Panamanian employees of the Panama Canal Company do not pay U.S. income taxes.

PROPOSAL

Pay all Panama Canal Company (and Canal Zone Government) employees at the same rate for comparable work, then withhold income taxes from all at the current U.S. rates. *Remit those withheld income taxes paid by Panamanian nationals to the Panamanian government.*

This would:

(a) Eliminate the bitterness and resentment over pay scale differentials that currently exist.

(b) Provide a highly important source of revenue to the Republic of Panama.

(c) Recognize the contributions now being made by the Panamanian nationals to the Canal Zone prosperity, now being hidden through payroll differentials as an indirect (but substantial) benefit to the United States. (That is the way that Panamanians see it, and I agree.)

COMMENTS

There are now about 15,000 U. S. civilian nationals working in the Canal Zone. I have no way of knowing what their average income tax contribution to the U. S. government is, but we can get a reasonable range of probability. (My own income taxes, for example, exceeded $4,300 in 1969.)

If we assume a low average of $1,000 per employee, Canal Zone employees contribute $15,000,000 per year to the United States Government. If the average taxes were $2,000 per employee, Canal Zone employees' contribution to the U. S. would be $30,000,000. If they all paid income taxes at the same rate I paid, which is certainly far from being the highest, their contributions would total $60,000,000.

This is money earned in the Canal Zone, which, as Panamanians see it, should largely belong to them.

On the other hand, there are something like 35,000 Panamanian nationals who work in the Canal Zone. They, of course, are subject to income taxes in the Republic, but this rate is much lower than ours and their average taxable income from Zone employment is likewise much lower. If these people were paid rates comparable to their U.S. counterparts, and if income taxes were withheld from them at rates comparable to ours, and if these withheld income taxes were remitted to the government of the Republic of Panama, their contribution to their own government would be at least 35,000 × $1,000 = $35,000,000 per year.

(4) Panamanian nationals should be employed in the highest positions in the Canal Zone that they are capable of holding. There should be a much more active, concerted program designed to employ and promote Panamanians into key positions as rapidly as possible.

What could be done, among other things, is to provide many, many more scholarships for young Panamanians; these should include scholarships providing for higher technical and administrative education in U.S. colleges and universities.

(5) Racial segregation must be eliminated in the Canal Zone. Black people, particularly the descendants of Jamaicans who were brought in during construction days, are strictly segregated in their housing into Black enclaves such as Paraiso and Rainbow City. Why? Are our highly publicized desegregation programs only a State-side phenomenon, responsive only to terror? Such policies as exist in the Canal Zone are the very reasons why the U.S. is having the racial problems it has today.

Even more important than simple justice and equity is the hypocritical example we set,

on an international scale, in the Canal Zone. Segregation policies there are as rigid as anything that Selma, Alabama, ever saw! They are official, government policies. They must be changed, while there is still time.

The attitudes and policies of the "power structure" in the Zone toward the Black people there is a national and international disgrace for us. Every Panamanian knows it! This situation can only be perpetuated by approval and implementation of policies at the highest level. In my opinion, the military government of the U.S. in the Canal Zone does everything in its power to maintain the "mess boy syndrome" that I, personally, observed during my years in the Navy during World War II.

(6) U.S. nationals should be permitted only one tour of duty in the Canal Zone for a period not in excess of five years. Entrenched privilege over a period of several generations leads to all sorts of abuses. In a sense, within the military dictatorship of the Zone, long-term residents there are a sort of supra-national group—they are "Zonians" first and U.S. citizens rather incidentally.

Zone employees should have iron-clad, non-renewable contracts; they should be *required* to assume the full responsibility for their U.S. citizenship. As it is now, they have essentially no responsibilities at all to the U.S. or anyone else, except for the privilege of paying U.S. income taxes.

(7) High-ranking officers in the military services who wish to live and work in the Canal Zone after their retirement should be given this choice: "Give up your military pension or forego Canal Zone employment." They should not be permitted to have both.

Among other things which are unfortunate, the present practices establish and maintain the rigid military thinking that pervades the Canal Zone Government. The present Government has few problems, for all its top people are military or ex-military types who maintain "order" through fear, not leadership. Is *this* the American way? Most Latins think so!

U.N. SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, each year the Secretary General of the United Nations submits a voluminous annual report on the work of the organization. The introduction to this year's report by U Thant was released on September 14 but unfortunately attracted very little attention in the press.

I commend to Members and other readers of the RECORD the opening section of this introduction, set forth below. It touches on many of the constructive activities of the United Nations which are carried on month in and month out, but which are little known to the general public. An example is the role played by the Secretary General in the settlement of a longstanding and potentially dangerous difference between Iran and the United Kingdom over the future status of Bahrain—paragraphs 12 to 14.

The first section of the introduction to the Secretary General's annual report follows:

I. GENERAL

1. The year 1970 is a historic year in the life of the United Nations. The need for an effective world organization which can serve as a harmonizing agent for peace has never been so urgently required by mankind. As we evaluate the past and look towards the future on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization, some very basic questions are uppermost in our minds and are being given thoughtful consideration by Governments, groups and individuals all around the globe. What are the means by which the United Nations can play an increasingly vital role in the world of tomorrow? How can the United Nations make more effective use of its possibilities for reconciling differences between its sovereign Member States? What changes can be evolved in its methods of operation so that its capacity for improving the human condition will be utilized to the full? It is my fervent hope that we shall find the answers to questions such as these and continue to make progress—no matter how slow and painstaking it may at times appear—towards realizing the noble goals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

2. In the last two or three years, I have been constrained to report only a general deterioration of the international situation. This year, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly, I am happy to be able to express some cautious optimism in this regard, which derives from several factors. Of these, perhaps the most important is the fact that the mission of my Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, has been reactivated. I can only hope that the parties concerned will show at last that will to peace which I have observed elsewhere to be indispensable to any hope of progress.

3. Last year I referred at some length to the tragic situation in Nigeria. Towards the very end of 1969 and early in 1970, I was able to undertake at long last my visit to several African countries, a trip which, to my great disappointment, had been deferred more than once. I learnt much from this trip: not only of the magnitude of the problems facing Africa, but also of the enormous resources, both human and material, available in that continent. I was deeply impressed by the progress already made under the leadership of the distinguished African statesmen I was privileged to meet. I was equally gratified by the devotion that they all expressed to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. It was also a particularly happy coincidence for me that the tragic civil war in Nigeria was brought to a conclusion while I was nearing the end of my African trip and I was thus able to visit Lagos and exchange views with General Gowon and other Nigerian leaders before returning to New York.

4. A treaty has recently been concluded between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Federal Republic of Germany. I believe that this treaty has a positive significance. It is expected to contribute greatly to the improvement of relations between the two parties, to remove many factors of suspicion and promote confidence in their mutual relations, and to create a good framework for their future co-operation. In the same context, I may mention other important developments in Europe, especially the bilateral and multilateral negotiations now under way, the objective of which is the solution of major problems of political, economic and cultural co-operation. Consideration is being given to the convening of a European security conference and agreement on the agenda and on possible follow-up action seems to be emerging. It is particularly important to note that economic and cultural co-operation is considered not only as an instrument which could pave the way towards greater confidence among nations, but also as an effort which could greatly benefit from a new security arrangement. The United Nations, and more particularly the Economic Commission for Europe, have acquired considerable experience in this respect. I believe therefore that the United Nations machinery, particularly in the economic field, could perform a very useful function in any comprehensive and expanded programme of co-operation which may be established for Europe. I also believe that such use of the existing machinery of the Organization would best link the efforts aimed at regional security in Europe with the global framework of greater security for all.

5. In the field of disarmament I reported only limited progress this time last year. Since then, the two super-Powers have been engaged in strategic arms limitation talks and I am hopeful that these talks will lead to concrete results when they are resumed in November. I am also glad to see the progress that was made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament during its recent meetings in Geneva in regard to the formulation of a treaty on the sea-bed. I hope that the draft treaty which has been submitted by the Conference for the approval by the General Assembly will receive wide support from the Members of the United Nations. I have commented elsewhere with gratification on the progress made by the International Atomic Energy Agency in adjusting its safeguard system to the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

6. This twenty-fifth anniversary year will also usher in the Second United Nations Development Decade. I hope that the important discussions now under way will enable all concerned to agree upon a global strategy for the Decade which will involve not only the co-operation of the rich and the poor countries, but also a considerable degree of co-operation between the countries of Western Europe, North America and the Socialist countries of Eastern Europe. I very much hope that the required level of co-operation will be forthcoming on the part of all concerned and will help to get the Second United Nations Development Decade off to a good start.

7. In the same context, I am glad to see the increasing interest being taken in some of the basic problems of the human environment not only in various United Nations bodies and other intergovernmental organs, but also by the public at large and especially by young people. I have referred at length to this subject in some of my recent public pronouncements, which reflect my deep concern about this problem. I hope that the United Nations will be able to play a very useful role in this regard as a result of the important conference to be held in Stockholm in the summer of 1972 and the follow-up steps that may be taken in the wake of that conference. I am also glad to see the preoccupation of more and more countries and international bodies with the rapid growth of population and the many problems that it presents not only in respect of the living standards of the poor countries, but also in aggravating the problem of pollution, particularly in the advanced countries. In this context, I would like to make an appeal for more support for the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, which is being administered on my behalf by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme.

8. The elements to which I have referred so far are the hopeful features of the world scene which have led me to sound the note of cautious optimism with which I began. On the other hand, I must frankly acknowledge that there are many discouraging elements. I referred last year to the signs of improvement that could be seen in regard to devastated Viet-Nam. These signs have not led to any concrete results and we have actually witnessed not only a continuation of this war with all its tragic concomitants—the loss of life, especially of innocent civilians, and property. We have also seen how easy it is for the conflict to spread to the

neighbouring countries. I have purposely refrained from public comment so as to avoid prejudicing in any way the Paris talks, but I believe that some bold initiatives need to be taken urgently if the talks are to move forward from the present impasse.

9. Earlier I referred to some progress in the field of disarmament. On the other hand, I must mention the lack of any achievement with respect to a comprehensive test ban treaty. I should also like to see more progress towards complete ban on chemical and bacteriological weapons, the importance of which has been rightly stressed during recent months.

10. In the economic and social field I must again take note of the widening gap between the rich and the poor countries and also the risk, to which I have referred elsewhere, of a virtual global trade war which statesmanship should be able to avert.

11. Elsewhere I have also noted in detail some of our chronic problems, especially in Africa. The abhorrent practice of *apartheid* has continued in South Africa and it has been extended to Namibia, where the Republice of South Africa continues to defy the will of the international community and has proceeded to extend its authority over that Territory. In the case of Southern Rhodesia, I have also mentioned the failure of the policy of economic sanctions to bring down the racist minority régime in that country. The pace of decolonization has been agonizingly slow and there is no progress whatever to report so far with respect to the Portuguese Territories in Africa. Even more disconcerting is the fact that Portugal and South Africa have been giving assistance to the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia. In fact it is clear to me that, if it were not for this support, the mandatory economic sanctions imposed by the Security Council would have had a much greater impact on Southern Rhodesia's trade. I am somewhat encouraged by the fact that during recent months the Security Council has taken greater interest in the problems of South Africa. I refer here to the resolutions on Namibia adopted by the Council this year and the resolution redefining the embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa was recently adopted by the Council.

12. One of the most satisfactory developments in the work of the United Nations during the year under review is undoubtedly the settlement, in May 1970, of a long-standing and potentially dangerous difference between Iran and the United Kingdom over the future status of Bahrain.

13. For some years past, the two Governments had been seeking a means for peaceful settlement of their differences which would also reflect the wishes of the people of Bahrain itself. In March 1970, following informal approaches, they asked me to exercise my good offices in this matter, and specifically to appoint a Personal Representative to ascertain the wishes of the people of Bahrain concerning its status. In so doing, both Governments took the unusual step of agreeing in advance to accept the results of my findings, subject to their endorsement by the Security Council. In pursuance of their request, I appointed a Personal Representative, Mr. Vittorio Winspeare Guicciardi, Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, who, after consulting the people of Bahrain, reached the conclusion that the overwhelming majority of Bahrainis "wished to gain recognition of their identity in a fully independent and sovereign State free to decide for itself its relations with other States." Following the unanimous endorsement of this report by the Security Council on 11 May 1970, Iran formally renounced its claim to Bahrain.

14. The Bahrain settlement is a striking example of how the good offices of the Secretary-General can be used for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It also shows that such disputes, difficult and complex as they may be, can be settled peacefully and amicably if the parties concerned are willing to make the necessary concessions to that end. Many differences of this kind between Governments might be solved if the parties concerned were prepared to make use of the means available.

15. The Working Group of the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations, continuing to hold discussions and consultations with a view to reaching agreement on a model of peace-keeping operations, seems to have gone as far as it can in resolving difficulties by judicious drafting procedures. What now seems necessary is a political consensus at a higher level, among the major Powers, on the very difficult outstanding questions relating to the roles of the Military Staff Committee, the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the management and financing of United Nations military observer groups. It would be unfortunate indeed if the wealth of experience gained by the Secretariat in the management of peace-keeping operations were not fully taken into consideration in the resolution of these remaining problems.

16. While attempts are being made to reach final agreement on a model of peace-keeping operations, I feel that a crucial aspect of the Special Committee's mandate should not be overlooked, namely, the desirability of "overcoming the present financial difficulties of the Organization". The consensus on voluntary contribution reached by the General Assembly in 1965 has not yet been fully implemented. Under the terms of Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX), the President of the General Assembly and I were invited to undertake consultations that finally led to this consensus. Because of my special responsibility, I appeal once again to the members of the Special Committee, as well as to all Member States, to focus their attention on this important aspect of peace-keeping operations. It remains my fervent hope that, in spite of the remaining difficulties, progress will be evident on the vitally important question of peace-keeping during this twenty-fifth anniversary year.

"SPEAK TO THE EARTH, AND IT SHALL TEACH THEE"—SOME COMMONSENSE ON POLLUTION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the eminent historian Will Durant who said:

Some of those people who proclaim themselves out to clean up the world ought to start by taking a bath!

This injunction—which is probably only half-facetious, at best—is a good one to begin with when considering the problem of pollution and the environment.

I want to quote from the introduction to "The Environment: A National Mission for the Seventies," prepared by the staff of Fortune magazine:

RECONCILING PROGRESS WITH THE QUALITY OF LIFE

Within the recent past an immense transformation has occurred in public concern about the environment. One scientist describes the shift with a metaphor drawn from geology: "First, islands of anxiety about specific environmental ills—like the redwoods, the rivers, or the slums—rose from a sea of apathy; when they rose further, land appeared between them; we became aware that all these separate environmental issues were connected, all part of a single challenge to our civilization." Now that environmental anxieties have coalesced, they will be a permanent part of the American awareness, part of the set of beliefs, values, and goals within which U.S. business operates.

The new awareness brings a danger of its own, stepping up the urgency of our situation. Unless we demonstrate, quite soon, that we can improve our environmental record, U.S. society will become paralyzed with shame and self-doubt.

Already we hear voices—and not merely from noisy rebels among the young—exploiting our environmental anxieties as part of an indictment against the basic characteristics and trends of Western civilization. The idea of material progress is especially deplored. "What this country needs," says a professor, "is Buddhist economics." He explains that we ought to welcome a yearly decline in the gross national product, leading us back toward the economy of the Asiatic village, say in Tibet, without factories or much transport.

Nobody really thinks that Minnesota will swap Mustangs for yaks. Nevertheless, the sentimental rhetoric of the simple-lifers takes on, as our environmental anxiety rises, a dangerous capacity to distract us from the challenge that we actually face.

We know that isolated societies with very low levels of technology do not greatly damage their natural environments. We also know that our high-technology society is handling our environment in a way that will be lethal for us. What we don't know—and had better make haste to test—is whether a high-technology society can achieve a safe, durable, and improving relationship with its environment. This—and not a return to the pre-technological womb—is the only possibility worth investigating.

And to quote further, from a chapter farther on in the book:

Slowly as a poisoned snail, public concern over the physical environment crept forward during the first half of this century. In the Fifties anxiety began to quicken. In the Sixties the environment became one of the major topics of American discussion. In the last few months it has been almost impossible to look at a newspaper or a TV set or to talk to a stranger on a plane without encountering some example of dismay over what we are doing to the world around us.

Yet snails, along with all the other species—notably including man—that live on or near this once fair land, continue to be poisoned or choked or pushed around or otherwise imperiled. If, as seems quite likely, public anxiety mounts to ten times its present level, we will not necessarily succeed in correcting our present lethal course. Alarm about the environment, fully justified by the facts and long overdue, is a required precondition of reform. But alarm, by itself, puts out no fires.

It is not hard to imagine how disgust with our mishandling of the environment could become, as in some quarters it already has, just one more taunt against "the sick society," one more whip in the orgy of self-flagellation that has seduced so many professional observers of this pseudo-penitential time. Unless guilt over what we have been doing is accompanied by a stronger sense of what to do instead, U.S. morale may sink to the point where we will be unable to cope properly with the environment—or anything else.

THE DANCE MADNESS

The "black death" of the 14th century—bubonic or pulmonary plague—was apparently born of the fertility and filth of Asiatic populations, impoverished by

war and weakened by famine. It crossed Arabia into Egypt and the Black Sea into Russia and Byzantium. From Mediterranean ports of the Near East, the merchants and ships of Venice, Syracuse, Pisa, Genoa and Marseille—with the help of fleas and rats on these ships—brought it to Italy and France.

It found fertile ground. There had been a succession of famine years in Europe already, and the plague swept all over Europe from 1348 onward. From a third to one-half of Europe's population died—generally horribly, in shrieking agony; as a chronicler in Sienna, Italy, wrote in 1354: "And people said and believed, 'This is the end of the world.'" The total deaths were estimated at 25 million in Europe, and Chinese chronicles say 13 million died in that land. It came closer to wiping out mankind than any other evil, before or since.

There are certain distinctive parallels between the reaction of the people of that age to the Black Death, and the reaction in some quarters—some, by no means all—to the pollution problem today. The nameless, unspeakable fear of the Black Death caused one of the oldest examples of mass psychosis known to history, what is called by some historians the "Dance Madness." Great masses of people, fleeing from they knew not really what, except that it would kill, and fleeing to they knew not where, except feeling that anyplace would be better than where they were, literally danced their way across the roads of Europe. Totally, completely, senseless—chanting and shrieking oaths or prayers, as the mood moved them—great wriggling snakes of crowds of humanity—goaded by terror to near-madness—until they, too, were struck down.

Nothing can be handled properly if there are elements of hysteria connected with attempts to solve the problem. As far as pollution and the environment are concerned, it is sad to note, there has been a great deal of demagoguery, senseless name-calling, distorting of facts, oversimplification of the issue, fright tactics and a general collection of idiocies in some quarters that skate perilously close to the witless dancing of the Dark Ages when the plague struck.

Some of the antics involved in Earth Day earlier this year come to mind. Collecting trash, then dumping it on the steps of city hall; burying new cars; these things smack of some long-dead pagan ritual, planned to appease heathen gods. They are not only witless and thoughtless but detract from the real good others tried to do. On the other hand, during Earth Day, there was what the Indianapolis Star of April 24, 1970, called "down-to-earth things. There were young people picking up litter. There was the schoolmaster telling his boys that the problem is a serious and complicated one which will go on day after day, and which must be understood and met and conquered."

Precisely. Understand the problem; meet it; conquer it. But understand it, first.

ECOLOGY: NEW WORD, BUT OLD SCIENCE

The German biologist Ernest Haeckel coined the term itself about 100 years ago, from the Greek "oikos"—house. Ecology, according to an old definition, was "the economy of plants and animals." Today, the standard definition is the science of relation between organisms and their environment. As a science, it slumbered for almost a century. In 1937 literary critic Kenneth Burke did write:

> Among the sciences there is one little fellow named Ecology, and in time we shall pay him more attention.

As recently as 1962, the naturalist Marston Bates wrote:

> Ecology may well be the most important of the sciences from the viewpoint of long-term human survival, but it is among those least understood by the general public.

Until one or 2 years ago, only biology students had any conception at all about the term, or what it embraced. For our purposes, I believe biologist Barry Commoner has not only given it a "law" but also defined it:

> The first law of ecology is that everything is related to everything else.

For further elaboration on that, let us turn to one of the greatest naturalists of all time, Charles Darwin. His example was the first truly ecological classic, and quite probably will never be surpassed.

Darwin attempted in "The Origin of Species" to show "how plants and animals remote in the scale of nature are bound together by a web of complex relations." From his scrutiny of red clover and its relation to the bumblebees that pollinated it, he came up with the following from "The Origin of Species":

> The number of humble-bees (note: they were known as 'humble-bees' in Darwin's day) in any district depends in a great measure upon the number of field mice which destroy their combs and nests; and Col. Newman who has long attended to the habits of humble-bees, believes that 'more than two-thirds of them are thus destroyed all over England.' Now the number of mice is largely dependent, as everyone knows, on the number of cats; and Col. Newman says, 'Near villages and small towns I have found the nests of humble-bees more numerous than elsewhere, which I attribute to the number of cats that destroy the mice.' Hence it is quite credible that the presence of a feline animal in large numbers in a district might determine, through the intervention first of mice and then of bees, the frequency of certain flowers in that district!

This was carried a bit further, but not by Darwin. A German scientist noted that Darwin was correct, so it logically followed that cats were responsible for heavy crops of red clover in England. Since red clover was a staple food for British beef, and for horses of the British cavalry, and since beef was the prime item in the diet of the British Navy, if it were not for cats there would be no British Navy, no British cavalry, and Britain would not be dominant as a world power.

Thomas Huxley added even to this. Tongue in cheek, Huxley observed that the responsibility went even beyond cats—to English old maids. The old maids, you see, kept cats; they were most fond of cats of all the English and therefore it was one mammoth chain: old maids, cats, mice, bees, clover, horses, cattle, Navy, cavalry, world power.

A bit exaggerated, perhaps, but still quite illustrative of ecology's first law. Let us look at just one more chain of events by way of example, something closer to our own day.

Today's classic example is the Aswan Dam in Egypt. We all remember the Aswan Dam, of course. This great water-conserving project that would tame the Nile, and how castigated Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was when he withdrew American support for its construction. So, the Russians moved in and helped Nasser build it; a great victory for Egypt, was it not?

Indeed not. The dam controlled irrigation and deprived the Egyptian flood plains of the annual fertilization the Nile floods had given them for 5,000 years. The fertile silt now piles behind the dam, which will eventually have to be abandoned. And, artificial fertilizers now have to be imported into the Nile Valley.

Second. There is no longer any periodic flushing of the soil, such as the floods provided. This means the soil is being salinated, bit by bit. Methods for correcting this cost money and they have not yet been faced by Egypt.

Curious footnote to history: I have traveled in the great Mesopotamian Valley, in the area around Babylon, the city whose name is synonymous with dead civilizations. The soil is—and has been for years—heavily salinated to the point where it is worthless for anything.

Third. The eastern Mediterranean is deprived of flood-borne nutrients; the sardine catch in that area is down from 18,000 tons a year to 500 tons, a staggering 97-percent loss. No one has reimbursed the fishermen.

Fourth. There has been a great increase in the terribly debilitating disease known as schistosomiasis among the Egyptians. The disease organism depends on snails, which depend on a steady supply of water—the present constant irrigation furnishes this, but flooding did not.

So the first effect of the Aswan Dam has been to mean a larger population for Egypt, of whom a greater proportion than before are chronically ill.

This is, then, what it is all about. We need, now most of all, honest concern; we need panic not at all; and political demagoguery, for sure, will pollute the atmosphere far more than anything else.

And in a more mystic sense, Francis Thompson's famous lines:

> Thou canst not stir a flower without
> troubling of a star.
> All things by immortal power
> Near or far
> Hiddenly
> To each other linked are,
> That thou canst not a stir a flower
> Without troubling of a star.

THERE IS NOTHING NEW UNDER THE SUN

This is a cliche but certainly applies to ecological problems. The "good old days" may have been quite good in many respects but not as far as pollution was concerned. The first example ever recorded in human history of a pollution problem is strikingly modern in aspect: an established governmental authority faced with a problem it could not solve, so the task was contracted out to a private firm.

That to which I refer is so far back in human history it exists only in mythol-

ogy: The Sixth Labor of Hercules, when, by diverting the flow of the River Alpheus, the great hero in one day cleansed the incredibly filthy stables belonging to Augeas, King of Elis.

Bothered by traffic noise? So was Julius Caesar. He did manage an edict banning chariots from Roman streets during the nighttime but was almost overthrown by the Roman Senate when he tried to keep them out during daylight hours, as well.

Neighbors keeping animals too close to your back lot? An ordinance of the City of London, in effect during the 13th and 14th centuries, stated:

He who will nourish a pig, let him keep it in his own house.

Sewage problems? So far back that the exact date of its construction is unknown, Roman or possibly Etruscan engineers built the Cloaca Maxima, the Great Sewer, with massive stone arches so wide a wagon loaded with hay could pass under them. The city's refuse and rain water passed through openings in the street into the Cloaca Maxima and drains—all of which emptied into the Tiber. But, to quote one authority, "whole pollution was a lasting problem to Roman life."

Dirty water? Dagobert I, 7th Century King of France, decreed that anyone who "corrupted by filth" the waters of a fountain should pay a fine of six golden sols—256 grams of gold—and be forced to clean up the mess.

Tobacco smoke bother you? It bothered Charles I of England, too. While in captivity, during his trial, which led to his execution, he angrily upbraided the captain of the guard for smoking in his presence.

Coal smoke? An English King of the Middle Ages proclaimed a ban on burning coal while Parliament was in session, in London, and meant what he said. Some of his subjects did not take him seriously, and they were summarily hanged.

There were attempts to make things better. Leonardo da Vinci aimed, in his proposal for Ten New Towns, to: "distribute the masses of humanity, who live crowded together like herds of goats, filling their air with stench and spreading the seeds of plague and death."

The Black Death, mentioned earlier, was attributed to just about everything except the fleas and rats that caused it. However, there were, immediately after its scourge had passed, attempts to keep the towns clean. Royal ordinances were proclaimed in Paris in 1372 and again in 1395 against throwing garbage and human waste out of windows, to land in the streets. But an attempt by the King of Spain to introduce sewers and privies and to apply the same prohibition in Madrid, in 1769, almost caused a revolution.

Ecology, strictly speaking, is certainly not a new science as such. In halting, groping ways, all through recorded human history, man has had some feeble glimpses of what is going on around him, and of that great chain by which all things are bound together. He is paying more attention to it now than formerly; that is the main difference. And this is what we must keep in mind.

D-DAY FOR DOOM-SHOUTERS

Thomas Beddoes, an English poet of the 19th century, wrote:

Nature's polluted,
There's man in every secret corner of her
Doing damned wicked deeds. Thou art, old world
A hoary, atheistic, murdering star.

The point has been correctly made that the environment is a topic for glib and superficial treatment. Quite true; it is unfortunate but probably inevitable that social questions and problems almost always become politicized, in varying degrees. What is properly the concern of all has in many respects become the vehicle of some. Vehicle, in this sense, means their own private car careening madly across the landscape while they shriek from the windows something approaching Beddoes' gloomy verse. They happen to be quite wrong.

A visit to the offices of Environmental Action in Washington, D.C., the organization that supposedly coordinated Earth Day last spring was described in the New York Times as a place that "bustles with young people in Woodstock-approved costumes and is papered with posters such as 'earth—love it or leave it' and 'war is not healthy for children and other living things.' Someone has drawn Mickey Mouse ears on a photograph of David and Julie Eisenhower and stuck it on the reception room wall. A girl is telling a young visitor asking for posters and bumper stickers: 'No, we don't have any bumper stickers. You want to know why? They go on automobiles.' "

Environmental Action was last in the news when it selected a congressional "dirty dozen" accused of consistently voting against environmental and social legislation. Two long-standing environmental groups, Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth, promptly disassociated themselves from the "dirty dozen" listing and also suggested their own organizations were greatly embarrassed by the charge. A detailed analysis of the records of the 12 Congressmen singled out showed the voting records of each and every one had been distorted and twisted out of all perspective, on a trumped-up charge that had no merit at all.

Everyone wants to get in the act, often as not for some highly questionable motives, purposes and with equally questionable tactics. A series of bombings in New York City on November 11, 1969, in headquarters of three business giants, were, according to a note left at the scene, because "vast machines pollute our air, water, and food."

A writer for the far-out Maois Progressive Labor Party recently published a booklet called "Ecology and the Revolution." I quote:

The ecological movement . . . is potentially a form of opposition to the institutions of capitalism . . . ecological problems cannot be solved within the context of capitalism . . . Socialist revolution must be a goal of the ecological movement.

To this I can only observe that there was a socialist revolution in Russia in 1917. Today, Lake Baikal is close to becoming an industrial cesspool; "mass raids" on pollution in the Volga were announced last September; Soviet ecologist A. G. Kasymov wrote that "The growing problem of pollution of the Caspian Sea has recently aroused much concern in the Soviet Union for it seems to be leading to a catastrophe;" a Moscow housewife applauded a law to clean up the River Moscow because "every few days I have to wash out my teapot because of the sand that comes in with the tap water;" Moscow conservationist Vladimir Peskov wrote careless chemical pesticides used in southern Russia meant "Almost all the partridges are gone. Our woods, gardens and fields are becoming quieter and quieter;" and, in the northern Dvina River basin, 500 miles northwest of Leningrad, river beds are choked with debris from trees and paper industry discharges have robbed the water of vital oxygen. To top it all off, one top Soviet ecologist glumly admitted water pollution alone was costing the Soviet economy around $6 billion a year.

So much for the far-out fringe on the ecology bandwagon, as far as their logic is concerned. They would not for a moment shrink, however, from tossing a bomb at a factory chimney to get rid of the smoke. If this seems hard to believe, then consider this: A recent magazine much beloved by the radical fringe, young and old, led off with a sour editorial whose tenor can be determined from its comment on the students burying a new car as a symbol. The magazine said it was "an indication of dangerous political naivete that must be overcome. To buy the car in the first place was to pay the criminal and strengthen him.

And for a clincher, the last paragraph referred to the recent burning of a branch of the Bank of America, in Santa Barbara, Calif., by a youthful mob:

Burning a bank is not the same as putting the banks and their system out of business. To do that, millions of people in this country will first have to wake up to the real source of their misery. The action in Santa Barbara, a community which has seen its environment destroyed by corporate greed, might spark that awakening. If it does, the students who burned the Bank of America in Santa Barbara will have done more to save the environment than all the Survival Fairies and "Earth Day Teach-Ins" put together.

This was condensed to appear on the front page of the magazine as this chiller:

The students who burned the Bank of America in Santa Barbara may have done more toward saving the environment than all the teach-ins put together.

One final word about Environmental Action, Inc. This outfit claims to have inspired last spring's Earth Day; the New York Times gave them credit for it. However, one Member of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLOSKEY) and one Senator, the gentleman from Wisconsin (GAYLORD NELSON), both active in Earth Day, wrote concerning Environmental Action, Inc.:

This organization has no relationship whatsoever to the organization which sponsored Earth Day last Spring, and for which Senator GAYLORD NELSON and I were co-chairmen. The Earth Day effort was operated by a nonprofit corporation, Environmental Teach-In, Inc., specifically formed for the Earth Day activities and subsequently inactivated.

Earth Day itself had its share of doom-shouting from the irresponsible fringe, but Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, former chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley and Nobel laureate, put the zealots in their place. He specifically took aim at "the philosophy that all additional growth in our newly recognized limited environment is essentially destructive—suicidal—and that the release of any additional energy in support of that growth can only hasten the demise of man and the biosphere . . . Instead of looking forward to a trillion-dollar GNP, there are those who see it only as a forecast of ecological disaster. Not only do they demand that the Nation reverse its economic trends and establish a zero population growth rate, but a zero economic growth rate as well. What is most disturbing to me is that this trend of thinking is filled with enough logic and truth to suggest that many of the nightmares projected by today's doom-sayers could come true—if we were to continue unresponsively and irresponsibily on our current course."

Dr. Seaborg also noted that a best-selling item for Earth Day, The Environmental Handbook, said in its section on energy that since "all power pollutes the environmental movement should aim at reducing total energy use in the country by 25 percent."

Dr. Seaborg:

What such talk ignores is that energy is the source of all life and that man's use of energy throughout the ages has done far more to advance the human race, to uplift man in body and spirit, than it has to harm either man or his environment.

In May 1970, a group of theologians met in California to assert, incredible as it may sound, according to the New York Times of May 1, 1970:

Christianity had played its part in provoking the current environmental crisis and that any solution to it would require major modification of current social and religious values. Among the values to come under attack were the right of couples to have large families, the need for a constantly expanding economy and the sacredness of human life over against the rest of nature.

Virtually all of the scholars agreed that the traditional Christian attitude toward nature had given sanction to exploitation of the environment by science and technology and thus contributed to air and water pollution, overpopulation and other ecological threats.

Basic to this assertion is the commandment in Genesis 1:28 for man to be 'fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth'.

To this I can only respond that they stopped too soon in the Bible. Psalm XXIV, 1 reads:

The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.

Stewardship and care over that which God has granted dominion to man is intrinsic and basic in the writings of every single major world religion. It serves theology and ecology both very badly indeed to come up with such tortured nonsense and only makes matters more confused.

And, for the last word on those who screech and run in circles, the following remark by Prof. Norman F. Ramsey of Harvard:

College students, while throwing empty beer cans along the side of the road from their maladjusted and fume-producing automobiles, indignantly blame the military-industrial complex for its indifference to human environment because the establishment pollutes the atmosphere with its factories and power plants and permits the manufacture of automobiles with internal combustion engines.

"MY OWN, MY NATIVE LAND"

A citizen of the American Republic, today, quite properly concerned with garbage-strewn fields and highways, gaseous air hardly fit to breathe, and rivers too thin to plow but too thick to swim in, due to pollution, might well ask "How did it get that way?"

When the country was first settled everything looked inexhaustible. Sir Walter Raleigh's representatives wrote back to him that everything on the continent was "even in the middest of summer in incredible abundance." By 1800 we had 4 million people; less than one century later, there were 60 million. We moved across our land, and, as Walt Whitman sang:

"We primeval forest felling,
We the rivers stemming, vexing we, and piercing deep the mines within;
We the surface broad surveying, we the virgin soil upheaving. Pioneers! O Pioneers?"

In the history of almost every country and culture there has been pride in one's land, and its natural beauties and glories. It is no accident, for example, that the loveliest, most lilting American sea chantey of them all was the hauntingly beautiful "O Shanadore!" Its strains soared about the royals and top-gallants of Yankee clipper ships in ports all over the world as American seamen sang nostalgically of the Shenandoah River, which to them was symbolic of the beauty of their homeland.

But then, swiftly, the balance of nature was altered. The prairie dweller literally did not miss the buffalo until they were gone. "Virgin soil" was virgin no longer; it blew away in great whirling clouds of dust. Rain and melting snow poured unchecked floods over land unable to hold water, as the topsoil was no longer there.

To be sure, there had been blots on the landscape. John Oglethorpe's original 18th century Georgia colony was almost wiped out by epidemics caused, according to the colony's doctor, by foul streams that were polluted with the carcasses of dead animals and plants.

American manners have not always been of the best. I am sure it was duplicated in other American cities as well but the following, from Mrs. Frances Trollope's "Domestic Manners of the Americans," written after a visit to the United States beginning in 1827 and lasted 3 years and 9 months, is worthy of mention here. Mark Twain defended the sharp-eyed and sharp-tongued Englishwoman in his "Life On the Mississippi"; after reading the following passage it is clear why she was not exactly popular in the United States when her book came out in 1832:

We were soon settled in our new dwelling, which looked neat and comfortable enough, but we speedily found that it was devoid of nearly all the accomodation that Europeans conceive necessary to decency and comfort. No pump, no cistern, no drain of any kind, no dustman's cart, or any other visible means of getting rid of the rubbish, which vanishes with such celerity in London, that one has no time to think of its existence; but which accumulated so rapidly at Cincinnati, that I sent for my landlord to know in what manner refuse of all kinds was to be disposed of.

"Your help will just have to fix them all into the middle of the street, but you must mind, old woman, that it is the middle. I expect you don't know as we have got a law what forbids throwing such things at the sides of the streets; they must just all be cast right into the middle and the pigs soon takes them off."

In truth the pigs are constantly seen doing Herculean service in this way through every quarter of the city; and though it is not very agreeable to live surrounded by herds of these unsavoury animals, it is well they are so numerous, and so active in their capacity of scavengers, for without them the streets would soon be choked up with all sorts of substances in every stage of decomposition.

Walden Pond, immortalized by Thoreau, was not immune. A biting, satirical account of a modern-day visit to the spot noted that as one approached the pond:

From beneath the flattened popcorn wrapper . . . peeped the frail violet. The pond lay clear and blue in the morning light . . . In the shallows a man's water-logged shirt undulated gently.

But even with all of this, we are still fortunate. We Americans are blessed beyond all other people on earth. We still retain much. Daniel Boone and his party saw the "ample plains, the beauteous tracts below" before them as they stood on a mountain ridge in Kentucky; these are still there. The Ohio River still pulses majestically on in what one early writer called "silent dignity."

But not all of the changes made by man in the New World were bad. When Lewis and Clark went up the Missouri, there were no trout; it was too muddy. When Coronado gave the Colorado River its name, it had no game fish; it was too full of red silt. The situation was unchanged until development and reclamation projects of the first few decades of the 20th century.

It has been half a thousand years since the first mail-clad Spanish Don came to Florida, but deep in the mangrove keys life goes on even as it did centuries before the Spaniards. In the words of one naturalist:

A million years have done little to change the aspect of a hidden pool inside the mangrove. If you don't believe it, crawl with crocodile and terrapin through the slime and watch the lowly gastropod leave his smooth track beside yours. . . . Best of all, stay out there at night. You will listen to the silence of centuries and you will hear, as I have, the noiseless murmur of the Pleistocene.

It is these things that lie within the soul of a nation and its people, and give its life the quality without which no culture nor nation can survive. Nor would it care to survive, I think, if these were gone. It is these things that make us aware of what we had, what we have lost, and of the necessity to regain, and re-

store, and help a basically benevolent Mother Nature to fight back.

"BUT NATURE CANNOT MISS"

That all depends on what Nature is aiming at. I just mentioned a "basically benevolent Mother Nature" and this is true. She can also be quite mean, and unpredictable. It is well to consider how she reacts to what man does, and, equally important, to consider what she can do all on her own. Just getting along with Nature is not enough in ecology. We may not be able to control all of her forces—a truly Herculean job, as will be shown—but we might possibly be able to predict them.

The Peruvian earthquake of May 31, 1970, took about 50,000 lives and should serve as a grim reminder that our existence on the crust of the earth is precarious indeed. There are forces in Nature, constantly at work, that make ours incredibly puny in comparison. The town of Yungay, Peru, was totally wiped out with its 15,000 people by nothing less than a glacier run wild.

About 9 miles away, and 10,000 feet high, loomed Mount Huascaran, in the Huaylas Valley of the Andes. The earthquake shook loose 1 million cubic yards of ice from a 2,600-foot cliff. This crashed onto a glacier and released a wall of mud—30 million cubic yards of water and ice, and 65 million cubic yards of earth—roaring down the Rio Santa Valley.

At 250 miles per hour this conglomeration covered 9 miles in 2½ minutes. It crested a ridge and bore down on the city, covering it to an average depth of 10 feet. About 100 people escaped; only the branches of four palm trees remained visible.

This was a local event, restricted to Peru. Krakatoa, the volcano in the Sunda Strait between Sumatra and Java that quite literally blew its top on August 27, 1883, also, quite literally, shook the entire world.

Thirty-six thousand people died. Atmospheric waves created ocean waves that broke mooring chains on ships in Chilean ports—halfway around the globe. It would have taken 150 1-megaton bombs to create an equivalent pressure pulse.

Window panes shattered and walls cracked 100 miles away. The sound of the explosion was heard in Australia—2,200 miles southeast—and in the Indian Ocean—3,000 miles west. One cubic mile of sea water plus an estimated 10 cubic miles of volcanic ash and other material were hurled into the atmosphere. Volcanic ash darkened the sky for a radius of 275 miles and 3 days later, ash was still pouring down like heavy snow on the decks of ships 1,600 miles distant. Deep channels were choked with it and made impassable; parts of it fell in Japan, Africa, and Europe.

Sun glows of weird colors appeared in the sky for over 3 years afterward, as sunlight reflected from the ash. At one point, fire alarms were sounded in Poughkeepsie, N.Y. and New Haven, Conn.; the glow looked like a nearby forest fire. Ash particles in the atmosphere, blocking solar heat, lowered world temperatures noticeably for about 5 years following and some meteorologists believe the terrible blizzard of '88 was Krakatoa's last kick at the earth.

Most astounding of all: total energy of the eruption is calculated at 200 million million—that is right, 2 billion—kilowatt hours. This is nearly 70 times the total of all electric energy generated in the entire world for 1966.

After Krakatoa blew, nothing survived on the island—what was left of it. Not a plant, animal, seed or spore. When the dust had cleared and the lava cooled, the rock was as barren and sterile as when it was first formed aeons ago. This was for science an unparalleled chance to see just what would happen. How long before Krakatoa had life again, and in what forms would it be?

"Recolonization" took place by sea and air, with most of the "colonists" arriving from Java and Sumatra, 25 miles away. Nine months after the blast, a spider was busily spinning his web, airborne from his home on another island. Airborne algae spread blue-green growth; this formed a base for microscopic spores of mosses and ferns; lightweight seeds—all airborne—germinated on this. Seaborne seeds floated ashore and took root. By 1896, wild sugarcane seeds had been dropped by the wind and even delicate orchids appeared. Coconuts soon followed.

Scavenging birds and insects were early visitors. Birds brought seeds of figs in their digestive tracts. Other seeds and minute animals arrived on birds' feathers and feet. Some strong swimmers such as the python and monitor emigrated on their own; others, such as geckos and skinks, came there either alive or as eggs on floating debris.

Within 50 years, Krakatoa had a thick young forest and over 1,200 species of animals.

Take the delicately balanced scales of nature, in which are weighed the elements of the earth upon which our very existence depends. Put in one scale the earth's load of ice, 6 million cubic miles, covering 10 percent of the surface of the globe. Put in the other scale the earth's atmosphere, 5.1×10^{15} tons of dry air, composed of nitrogen, oxygen, argon and carbon dioxide, plus water vapor and nongaseous matter such as domestic and industrial smoke, natural dust picked up from the earth by wind, salt spray from the Seven Seas, and, within recent years, fission products of atomic tests and nuclear reactors.

I said "delicately balanced scales of nature." Yes, far beyond the point where an imbalance would require, as one person has suggested, gas masks on carburetors of automobiles, over the air intakes. Nature is not always too helpful, here, and has some tricks of her own with the atmosphere. Inversion layer is probably the most common, and has, for the longest period of time, been the most troublesome.

Before the white men came to southern California, the Indians of the region noted smoke from their campfires hung in the air and did not disperse. Los Angeles, on a coastal plain and bordered on three sides by mountains, is in a box, where sea breezes, westerly winds and the mountains—forming an inversion layer—trap smoke and everything else that rises from the ground. Los Angeles' smog problem is a subject for bad jokes and also great concern. In early December 1930, in the Meuse Valley, in Belgium, smoke from the industrial city of Liege concentrated so heavily—inversion layers again—that hundreds had acute respiratory attacks and 63 died. Twenty died and hundreds were sickened by the same thing at Donora, Pa., in October 1948; Donora is in the deep and narrow Monongahela River Valley, near Pittsburgh.

What does this have to do with the polar ice cap? Quite a lot; truly catastrophic and geologically revolutionary changes can come from an imbalance between these two elements and the scope is much wider than regional inversion layers. Now, to repeat, I am not in the "fright merchant" business, but the stench created when your neighbor burns rubber tires has implications far beyond the smell that drifts into your yard. The atmosphere is a giant insulator: by day, from the heat and lethal rays of the sun; by night, preventing earth's heat from escaping into outer space. Meddle with the qualities of an insulator and its insulating properties change drastically.

This has happened in the past. Geologists know there have been catastrophes on truly immense and grand scales. And the probable cause was changes of sea level, relative to the surface of the continents. This, in turn, is directly attributable to a change in the temperature of the earth; a drop in the annual average temperature of only 3½° centigrade—about 38° F.—would bring on a new Ice Age. And a rise of the same amount would melt Antarctica and Greenland down to bare rock in a time period estimated to be a few centuries, by some, and a few decades, by others.

The end of the major geologic periods—Cambrian, Ordovician, Devonian, Permian, Triassic and Cretaceous, in particular—saw these mammoth changes on earth. The Cambrian seas, for instance, swarmed with trilobites, primitive creatures related to the shrimp, lobster and crab. There were about 60 families of trilobites, but at the end of the Cambrian, two-thirds of them disappeared. The greatest mass extinction of all came at the end of the Permian, when nearly half of all the known animal families in the world were wiped out. The end of the Cretaceous saw dinosaurs, marine reptiles, flying reptiles and many forms of land and sea life go without leaving a trace. Why? Probably change in temperature due to, yes, air pollution.

True, there were no factory chimneys nor autos; not much for smoke except volcanoes and forest fires. Volcanoes? Few things discharge so much carbon dioxide into the air. A young earth, heaving, buckling, trembling—volcanic activity almost constant—carbon dioxide content of the air increases. It does not take much. Present content is 0.03 percent of the air; doubling this to 0.06 percent would raise the temperature the required amount to melt the ice caps, as escape of heat from the earth at night is blocked. Again, if carbon dioxide content dropped to half of what it is today,

glaciers would level the towers of Manhattan.

So what does this have to do with burning rubber tires? Simply to point out that while nature holds the scales, nature also sometimes tips the balance. The extinction of prehistoric life, mentioned above, quite probably came about from this imbalance of nature herself. Even here there is still a balance to be struck. The same thundering volcanoes pouring carbon dioxide into the air exposed new, unweathered rock, which absorbs the same gas. So, gradually, the balance was restored and the temperature fell again as this prehistoric "pollution" was taken from the skies.

The Washington Star for April 28, 1970, noted the Smithsonian Institution on that day reported a 16-percent reduction in direct sunlight from that measured no more than two generations ago. Where was it measured? Right on the Mall, within 1 mile of the U.S. Capitol. Why? Air pollution, 20th century style. What will it add up to?

So we go back to the other factor in the Scales of Nature: the ice caps, and the "greenhouse effect" as heavier concentrations of carbon dioxide hold heat and modify the temperature.

During the first half of the 20th century average temperature for the earth has risen about 0.55° C. It has been calculated that an increase of 3½° C. would melt the Antarctic and the Greenland ice cap down to bare rock. The International Geophysical Year—July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1958—did show, among other things, that glaciers are receding. One of these in the Himalayas had receded 700 feet between 1935 and 1959; others as much as 1,000 or 2,000 feet. Fish adapted to cold waters were migrating northwards; warm-climate trees were found sprouting farther north than ever before. In Scandinavia, arrowheads over 1,000 years old have been found where for centuries the land was under snow and ice—for the snow and ice are melting. The North Polar ice cap is thinning and shrinking.

Some estimate the critical increase in temperature—3½° C.—will come about in 40 years, as 6 billion tons a year of carbon dioxide enter the atmosphere. Already, violent storms at high tide do not miss by much flooding the New York subway system. Total melting of the ice caps would mean a rise in sea level of between 200 and 400 feet—more than enough to drown most of the world's major cities, which after all are located on sea coasts.

Another flood? Not necessarily; there is another thesis that this increased carbon dioxide content in the air will reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the earth. Then, of course, we head back down the scale—that drop of 3½° C. that means return of the glaciers.

There is yet another intriguing idea. Intriguing, yes, even though if it happened it would be probably more catastrophic than a nuclear war, and intriguing as anything about the earth around us is intriguing. It is this: the warming trend, melting the polar ice caps, will deprive Earth of these two mammoth counterweights that keep it in its present position. Enough ice melted from the Antarctic, for example, and the loss of weight at the end of the globe would cause it to tilt.

I cite these things as examples of how very small changes can produce thunderingly major upheavals in the pattern of existence. And, for another reason, too: in the process of cleaning up and preserving our planet, it does not hurt any of us, one bit, to look a little deeper into its natural history. The more you know about something, the more you take care of it, and cherish it.

One final reminder of how truly puny man is in the face of nature: the next time you are out in a shower that is later estimated at about one-tenth of an inch—little more than a sprinkle, really—remember this: that "sprinkle" falling over an area 100 miles square represents an energy release on Nature's part of 36 times the annual U.S. electric output for 1 year.

THE DARKER SIDE OF THE COIN

There are a lot of pretty grim facts about the situation that are distressingly true, and they will not go away by themselves.

About 190 million tons of refuse are collected each year in the United States. But count uncollected trash, such as mine tailings, or agricultural debris, and the total is 3.5 billion tons. The rate is increasing; it is expected to go to 5.25 billion tons annually by 1980 and to 12.3 billion tons by 2000.

Where is it all from? From each person, each year, according to estimates: 188 pounds of paper, 250 metal cans, 135 bottles and jars, 338 caps and crowns, and $2.30 worth of miscellaneous packaging. Add to this a total of 7 million autos, 110 million tons of industrial waste, 550 million tons of agricultural residue, 1.5 billion tons of animal manure, 1.1 billion tons of mineral waste and mounds of building and demolition rubble for which there are no estimates.

In New York State it costs 30 cents to pick up a bottle that cost 4 cents to make. Disposing of the Sunday New York Times costs more than it cost the company to print it. New York pays more to handle a ton of trash—$30—than it does to mine and ship in a ton of Kentucky coal—$23.

About 200 million tons of contaminants go into the atmosphere every year. They range from black soot of industrial smokestacks to colorless, odorless—but potentially lethal—carbon monoxide produced by cars.

Every second, day and night, 2 million gallons of sewage and other fluid wastes gush into our waterways. Noise—from all sources—is estimated to cost the country $4 billion a year in accidents, absenteeism, inefficiency and compensation payments. Total loss due to health cost of environment misuse is estimated at $35 billion annually in the U.S. alone.

The sea is affected; it is too early to say "threatened." The wreck of the *Torrey Canyon*, the tanker, spilled oil over the beaches of England and France. Thor Heyerdahl, in his latest reed-raft trip across the Atlantic, noticed floating, oily patches of trash and garbage hundreds of miles out to sea, probably dumped from ships. And, lately, there have been mysterious phantom oil slicks sighted in the Atlantic where no ships have sunk or have passed; that have not sunk recently, that is. These slicks are believed to be from holds of tankers sunk during World War II. The life of these tanks is approximately 25 years; just about that much time has passed. No one knows how many million gallons of oil lie beneath the waves, nor what will happen when it is released.

In 70 years of life the average American uses up 26 million gallons of water; 21,000 gallons of gasoline; 10,000 pounds of meat, 28,000 pounds of milk and cream, as well as $8,000 worth of school buildings, $6,000 worth of clothing, and $7,000 in furniture. Our 83 million cars cause 60 percent of the cities' air pollution—pollution that can no longer be escaped by moving to the suburbs.

Athens, Greece will have to be abandoned within 10 years unless radical measures are taken at once to combat air pollution. Already, the ideal climate of Athens with its clear bright sky is a thing of the past, and within a very few years the famed Acropolis will be invisible from the rest of the city.

Sulfur dioxide decomposition, caused when the chemical is discharged from autos, planes and industry and combines with water to form an acid, is endangering the Lincoln Memorial to the point where it could become "a giant Alka-Seltzer tablet," in the words of one expert. This has also hit the Capitol itself.

The four great bronze horses above the entrance to St. Mark's Basilica, in Venice, have been badly damaged by chemical smoke from nearby industrial plants, combined with salt sea air.

Air pollution and vibration from supersonic planes have corroded the stonework of Strasbourg Cathedral in France.

Now, this can appear pretty grim. And it is; but let us make sure we know what it is not.

It is not the product, alone of a modern, highly industrialized society. As sketched out earlier, the problem has been around for a long time. And, at any rate, a visitor to India who see swarms of sacred cows roaming the streets—unmolested—will think bales of newspapers look pretty good after all. Junked cars abandoned along streets are certainly eyesores. But, when Theodore Roosevelt was police commissioner of New York City, he noted one summer when the heat was so intense horses were dying in the streets and there were not enough facilities to remove the carcasses immediately. As I say, cars look bad; but I will take a car to a 3-day-dead horse in July heat any time.

Charges that the Federal Government is not involved are totally misleading. The Federal Government is in it—up to the eybrows. Thirteen congressional committees—some of which are quarreling with others and hauling and tugging over who should do what—90 separate Federal governmental programs; 26 quasi-governmental bodies; 14 interagency committees. The first 15 months of President Nixon's administration saw submission of 23 major legislative proposals to Capitol Hill, and, by Executive order, 14 new measures dealing with the environment. Of course, this is not enough for the doom-shouters; the President's proposed $3 billion was de-

nounced as "hilarious" and a demand made for $100 billion. This gets us into the "anything-you-can-spend-I-can-spend-more" game. So let us stay out of it.

Now, let us look at some main worries. First, water: there are about 2½ billion gallons of fresh water available in the world, per person, today. Water is not consumed; it is used; we are a long way from running out of water.

Oxygen: The Department of Commerce has just completed a 3-year study of oxygen content of the atmosphere. Results were compared against tests made in 1910. Despite the heavy burning of coal and oil, there has been no discernible change. Air at sea level contains 20.946 percent of oxygen by volume. Measurements since 1910 range between 20.945 to 20.952. Projecting the results, all recoverable fossil fuels could still be burned and concentration of atmospheric oxygen would still be around 20.8 percent by volume.

Trash disposal: true, the figures I have cited are large. However, all the household trash in the United States for 1 year could be buried in a pit 1 mile square and 500 feet deep. This is by no means out of reach, not with modern earth-moving techniques. For that matter, some very sizable pits are already available, in areas where strip mining once was carried on.

Man is automatically earth's major polluter: very wrong, indeed. The following article from the Washington Daily News of June 30, 1970, sets this charge straight:

NATURAL POLLUTION

William T. Pecora, the professorial-looking chief of the U.S. Geological Survey, warns that Americans are swallowing an environmental myth if they believe that man is earth's major polluter.

"Environmental degradation is a natural process on earth that has gone on for billions of years," he recently told an interviewer.

"There is good reason to believe it will continue for billions of years more," he adds, challenging some of his scientist colleagues who believe that earth's dooms day is just around the corner.

"We frequently hear that Lake Erie is dead," he said. "This is pure rubbish."

The lake is the shallowest of the Great Lakes which was created some 10,000 to 20,000 years ago and, barring another ice age, has several thousands of years yet to go before senility.

"The western part of the lake is an extremely shallow shelf and receives a large amount of natural organic material carried from the surrounding area," he said. "It is in this shallow shelf where the algae growth flourishes."

Recent study shows that Lake Erie produces about 50 percent of the fish catch of the entire Great Lakes system, a mark that it is not a dead lake, he says.

"The oxygen supply, unfortunately diminishes as algae growth increases as this portion of the lake becomes more shallow and organic material is swept into the water.

"Every lake or pond faces a similar life history," he said. "This is the natural law."

Mr. Pecora also shrugs off statements by some environmentalists who say the nation's rivers are dirty because of the works of man.

"Rivers are the natural transport system for sediment and organic matter washed downhill by the rains that fall upon the land," he said.

Mr. Pecora says his bureau does not have enough data on the Ohio River, but a survey of the Mississippi River shows that it carries a load of more than two million tons of sediment each day, the equivalent to a daily load of 40,000 freight cars.

The Paria River in Arizona is probably the dirtiest river in the world, he said. It carried 500 times as much sediment as the Mississippi River for each unit volume of water.

Chemicals washed from the land also are transported by streams in phenomenal amounts.

The Brazos River in Texas carries 25,000 tons of dissolved salt each day. Peace Creek in Florida carries twice the concentration of fluoride that is harmful to teeth, Mr. Pecora noted.

"With the intellectual development now achieved by man, it is inexcusable that we should fail to predict responses of nature," Mr. Pecora warns. "Better housekeeping of the earth must be practiced as man continues to take from the earth the things he needs and uses."

And the following from the Washington Post, September 24, 1970:

EXPERT DECRIES EMOTION OVER WATER POLLUTION

Pollution fighters are continually stressing how dirty America's rivers and streams are. Dr. Abel Wolman thinks it's time to stress how clean they are—from the standpoint of public health.

Dr. Wolman is an international authority on water resource management and a consultant for the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. He thinks the campaign for cleaner water is invested with too much emotion and not enough fact.

At a recent symposium in Washington, Wolman said, "Despite the fact the evidence is slim that the vast array of chemicals now reaching raw water sources is a menace to health, people have been unable to resist the temptation to alarm the public. More research is warranted, but there is absolutely no threat of impending disaster."

He also said, "Those who seek to recapture water of pristine purity are unrealistic, particularly when they hope to accomplish it by passing laws. Rivers aren't dirty because of man. They were dirty long before man arrived on the scene."

Wolman, who is preparing a master plan for sewage treatment for the WSSC, said the Mississippi River carries more than 2 million tons of sediment a day to the Gulf of Mexico, the equivalent of a load for 40,000 boxcars. And the Mississippi, he added, "is by no means the dirtiest river."

"In all the excitement about manmade pollution," he continued, "the fact that fewer people are dying in the United States from water-borne diseases than ever before is frequently overlooked. Half a century ago, our life expectancy was 40 years. Today, it is approximately 70 years. In the U.S., with 23,000 water systems serving 170 million people, water-borne and water-associated diseases are at a low ebb and have been near the vanishing point for some years."

Wolman said recent efforts to find out if there are more subtle and long-deferred illnesses in this country that originate with water have not been too productive.

By contrast, he compared water quality in the United States with that of the undeveloped countries of the world. "Some 10 million people, half of them infants, die annually because of contaminated water. In many countries, the feeding of the intestinal parasites in man requires nearly half of each day's food supply. Contaminated water is one of the routes of too many of man's parasitic invaders."

In a telephone interview, Wolman said "we have a problem of pollution in this country, and we should and must do things to correct it."

The problem must be attacked, he stressed, by first gathering evidence, not raising an emotional outcry. He said there has been a "mercury uprising," with no evidence that residues of the metal in rivers or lakes are a serious health hazard.

The President's Council on Environmental Quality, in its first report to Congress, last August, said "mercury pollution has become a serious national problem."

The 79-year-old Wolman, a professor emeritus in sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins University, said he is glad that people are beginning to get concerned about sewage-disposal problems. "I've been working in this area for 50 years. I'm glad the public has caught up with me."

The SST, flying high in the stratosphere, will dump pollutants in that region that will affect earth's climate. A sensational charge; it does not quite stand up to the facts.

First. It would take 400 SST's in the stratosphere for an entire year to put as much material there as is thrown out—and up—by just one major volcanic eruption.

Second. Navy balloon flights into the stratosphere have shown that humidity in that extremely dry region has risen 50 percent in the last 6 years. Now, there has been virtually no traffic there; what caused the humidity to rise? This is something the SST was supposed to do. However, we have discovered a large natural fluctuation in stratospheric moisture, caused by Nature, that has not harmed Earth's climate a bit.

All pesticides are bad; they must be banned. Should they? Poor countries do not think so. In fact, a delegate from an African nation snapped angrily at the U.N. to a member of the U.S. Mission:

If pollution is a by-product of industrialization and advancement of the standard of living, then Africa can certainly stand some pollution!

Spokesmen for less-developed nations are fearful that if DDT production stops, they will be left without essential chemicals to protect their crops against insects, and killer diseases carried by insects. In India, 15 to 30 percent of the crop total is eaten by insects each year; if that happened in this country it would be a disaster unparalleled. India is stepping up use of DDT from only 10 percent of the cropland to be covered, to 20 percent. This will mean, for India, an extra 1.4 million tons of rice, 100,000 tons of peanuts, 65,000 tons of sorghum, 250,000 tons of sugar, 46,000 tons of corn, and 200,000 tons of potatoes every year.

There has to be, in all the hue and cry over the environment, a sense of balance. We are in danger of losing our heads and being stampeded. Some of these fright tales should not have the validity of scaring little children to bed, let alone pushing public and private officials into paroxysms of terror and causing needless concern to our citizens.

An editorial in the Indianapolis Star from which I quoted earlier summed it up pretty well:

MIRTH DAY

Some of the antics of Earth Day, if kept up, could set America's fight against pollution back to primitive times.

Marching, fighting and shouting will not clear the water, land or air.

There was a belching forth of silliness, pomposity and vanity from coast to coast. Every show-off had his hour. Demagogues mixed pollution with every problem known and demanded, between name-calling and appeals for mass contrition, that all be solved at once.

But there were also down-to-earth things. There were young people picking up litter. There was the schoolmaster telling his boys that the problem is a serious and complicated one which will go on day after day, and which must be understood and met and conquered.

Silliness about pollution could get to be habit. It could become what has been called the "cause du jour," the crisis of the day, to be waved about, gibbered about, screamed about and shoved into everyone's face until the public recoils with nausea, half-convinced that with such opposition there must even be something good about pollution.

Or it could become the sane, calm, realistic concern of the young people picking up trash, and which the schoolmaster advised for his boys.

We pray it follows the second course—the down-to-earth course—for that is the only way anything useful ever is, or can be, done about pollution.

And, in conclusion, let us all reflect on what Blaise Pascal, the great French philosopher/scientist wrote in 1670:

Man is but a reed, the most feeble thing in nature, but he is a thinking reed. The entire universe need not arm itself to crush him. A vapor, a drop of water suffices to kill him . . . All our dignity, then, consists of thought. By it we must elevate ourselves, and not by space and time which we cannot fill. Let us endeavor them to think well: this is the principle of morality. By space the universe encompasses and swallows me up like an atom; by thought I comprehend the world.

HORTON SALUTES EDITOR DESMOND STONE FOR INDEPENDENCE DAY EDITORIAL ON INTERDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Independence Day 1970 there were, no doubt, thousands of words spoken and written in observance of our Nation's biggest and most important national holiday. Songs were sung, prayers were uttered, sermons were preached and speeches made, all extolling the great and wonderful merits of the United States. In most all cases, too, some of America's shortcomings were enumerated and recommendations for corrections were made.

This is good and as it should be. There is merit in every suggestion that could make this an even greater nation.

Of all the things I read and heard this year, commemorating July Fourth, one statement especially stands out in my opinion. It was terse but ever so powerful in its sincerity and intent.

I would like to share with my fellow members of Congress that statement. It was in the form of an editorial appearing on page one of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. It was appropriately bordered in red, white and blue and stood out not only in appearance but in impact.

Authored by Desmond Stone, editor of the editorial page of the newspaper it was entitled "Pledge of Allegiance Among All Americans." I recommend it as serious food for thought for every American. I commend Desmond Stone for once again giving all of his readers an outstanding example of inspired editorializing:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AMONG ALL AMERICANS

Just as America needs a Bill of Responsibilities to set alongside the Bill of Rights, so today, on this Fourth of July, 1970, we need a Declaration of Interdependence to go along with our famous Declaration of Independence.

For we have, so many of us, lived so long in the same room with freedom that we treat it like another piece of furniture. Some of us are even reluctant to give it house room. We have become that insensitive to its meaning.

We should not be shame-faced about our patriotism. It is right to stand up and salute the flag. It is good to say the pledge and feel the spine tingle. It is far better to have national pride flowing in our veins than dull hatred. It is important to have that love of country which sees our imperfections but which seeks to take out the knots in the system rather than to unravel it all.

But we do not see the dream as clearly today as we should. We have forgotten how to break bread together. We take when we should give. We love ourselves too much and our community too little. We confuse liberty with license. We ask the doubters in and leave the disciples standing on the stoop. We do more demanding than dedicating.

Somehow, we have not understood that much of the independence we extol has become interdependence. As fathers and sons, as neighbors on the street and as citizens of the same community, we need each other more than we appear willing to recognize.

But it is as members of the family of man that a sense of interdependence can benefit us most. For the truth of the matter is that this tired old globe of ours has become too populated, too polluted, too shrunken and too stocked with the weapons of destruction to permit any nation to do business as usual.

When Rochester's Mrs. James H. Hamm was honored with the 1970 Ira Sapozink Memorial Award, she said of our race relations: "If we live apart, we may not be enemies, but we can never be friends."

The late Adlai E. Stevenson warned us in 1963 that we cannot continue to live on the earth as strangers. "I want to put it to you," he said, "that today for a man to love his country truly, he must also know how to love mankind."

The "Glorious Fourth" is still a time for pony rides and bands, for barbecued chicken and fireworks, for celebration and thanksgiving. We have more to be proud of than we know, and more guarantees of freedom than any other nation.

But as well as our independence, it's our interdependence that we need to proclaim. When we ring out the bells, we need to ring them out loudly enough so that people everywhere will hear them peal, abroad and at home.

DESMOND STONE,
Editor, Editorial Page.

WWDC COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recent legislative activities have all indicated the tremendous concern displayed by Members of Congress regarding the serious drug abuse problems being faced in our schools and throughout our entire society. Many times we have all heard the question, "What can I do?"

Washington radio station WWDC has provided an answer for those concerned individuals who choose to be a part of the drug solution, instead of being a part of the problem.

For the past several weeks, Newsman Peter Gamble has been presenting a documentary on the drug problem called, appropriately enough. "In Your Own Backyard." But his and WWDC's interest did not stop with the presentation of this outstanding series. Actually, the documentary was used primarily to call attention to the problem and create an awareness on the part of Washington area citizens of the seriousness of the drug problem and to encourage area residents to take part in finding the vitally needed solutions to the problem.

WWDC's answer to the menace of illicit drugs is what they have called a community action program package, which is a workable, practical handbook for use by any person who wants to assist in drug abuse programs, from those who wish to open their houses to addicts, or potential addicts, to those people who wish to assist in the rehabilitation of a user.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly an outstanding public service, since the funds were provided by the station and, for a change, Federal funds were not sought to get the program off the ground.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate WWDC and AVCO Broadcasting Corp. for recognizing a need and taking the leadership in providing a response to that need. I strongly urge my colleagues to read the following information about this dynamic and viable program, with the thought in mind of what this type of volunteer effort could do to assist communities in the Members' congressional district.

Following is some background information and details on how the community action program package operates, which is only a small part of the some 70 pages in the total package:

INTRODUCTION

CAPP—The Community Action Program Package—as conceived and instituted by WWDC Radio is designed specifically for the Washington metropolitan area comprised of the District of Columbia; the Virginia jurisdictions of Fairfax and Arlington Counties and the city of Alexandria; and the Maryland jurisdiction of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

In concept, CAPP can serve any political or geographical area. The framework would remain the same, as would source and instructional sections. Referral sections, however, are strictly local, and would have to be compiled for the area to be served.

CAPP is designed to service and bolster existing drug agencies and efforts. It is written by a company, Avco Broadcasting, whose business is communications. It follows that CAPP itself is communication: communication between existing drug oriented programs, government bodies, police organizations, service and fraternal groups, and most importantly concerned citizens at the neighborhood level. As its title suggests, CAPP is a package of community actions programs. At its simplest level, CAPP will be a directory, an information source for above. At its most sophisticated level, CAPP will be a system of neighborhood houses which will fully utilize

a combination of programs to bring together the people needing help at the street and neighborhood level with the agencies and groups offering that help. In between are ways that interested people can assist this effort. From education and prevention to fund raising and job placement, there is something to do for everyone, from the concerned parent to the largest service organization.

CAPP HOUSE

What is it? A community action center, run completely by volunteers, to combat the drug problem on a neighborhood level. CAPP Houses will serve three main functions:

I. Education of the community

II. Referral center for those in need of treatment, advice, help.

III. A job placement service for rehabilitating addicts.

Where is it? Practically any place you can hang the CAPP sign. Perhaps office space in a place of business, a local hospital, church, a club room, in existing community centers. But our focal point will be the home . . . in a den, the basement, an extra bedroom, a garage. A true neighbor house, displaying the CAPP sign on the front door or in the window.

How to set up your CAPP house

Schedule a neighborhood "rap" or discussion session at your home. Invite your neighbors over the phone, fence, or with written notes. The best way to get a drug discussion underway is to invite a speaker from our list of volunteers (see "Speakers Bureau" under "Education" section), or borrow a movie.

You may also wish to hand out some preliminary educational material on drug abuse. The booklets "Answers to the Most Frequently Asked Questions About Drug Abuse" and "Drugs of Abuse" are excellent for your purposes. Obtain them free of charge by calling Dick Sackett, National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information, 496–7731.

I. Education of the community

First on your "to do" list: have volunteers contact the various sources of educational material, i.e., literature, slides, films, plays, etc. and select your CAPP House stock. (See "Education" section)

When you receive your material, you're ready to officially begin. Hang your CAPP sign on the front door. Contact WWDC Creative Services Department at 589–7100 and give them your CAPP House address and CAPP House telephone number. WWDC will print up flyers announcing your CAPP House opening. When you receive them, enlist neighborhood youth to distribute them under the doors or in the mail boxes of surrounding blocks. You may wish to include some educational flyers with your CAPP House announcement (see list of free printed materials under "Education").

WWDC will regularly announce CAPP House locations and telephone numbers.

If possible, your CAPP House should be promoted in other ways, such as bumper stickers, mailings, buttons, posters in neighboring businesses, schools, churches, etc. Where financial conditions inhibit such investments, homemade signs will do. Or you may wish to raise funds for operating expenses of your CAPP House (see "Fundraising" section), or perhaps a neighborhood business could act as your sponsor, paying for printing costs, etc. It's most important to get your CAPP House address and telephone number in as many places as possible. People can't come for help unless they know you're there. Refer to "Media" section under "Impact Programs" for help in getting publicity.

II. Referral services

Most of your requests for help will probably be by telephone. Do not try to counsel these callers, but be warm and give them the name, address and telephone number of two or three centers which are applicable for their problems. *Leave the advice and treatment to those trained to handle it.* The CAPP House referral service is just that, a referral service. Volunteers should familiarize themselves with the various organizations listed (see "Referral" section).

III. Job placement service

The job placement service will probably be your mainstay, especially until your CAPP House becomes known for advice and references. Most of this work will be done by telephone during the volunteer's regular shift. However, getting out into the community and its businesses will also be important . . . making personal contact with possible future employers of ex-addicts. For details on "how to", see "Job Placement" section.

CANADA'S TRUDEAU BOWS TO RED CHINA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the power at the political helm of our good Canadian friends has gone berserk. Monsieur Trudeau is so contrary that he doesn't even adhere to the policies of his international collaborators; that is, that there are to be only two major powers—the Soviet Union and the United States.

For now the Castro of Canada, in the best interest of a grain market, has cast his people into the web of the Red Chinese.

The Canadian diplomacy may be good for farm markets, but wait until their industrial people try to compete with Red Chinese goods manufactured by slave labor.

Then too, parts of Canada are sparsely settled and could afford growing room for colonization by the Red Chinese.

The government in power in Canada is apparently dedicated to the preposition that it will establish diplomatic relations with all countries; that is, except Rhodesia and China, which are non-Communist.

We in America can expect to hear a simulated wave of protest from our internationally oriented leaders—not merely with Trudeau's recommendation of Red China but because he beat our administration to the line. And those who will be fearsome of our NATO ally now becoming a sanctuary for Chinese Reds—a threat against our early warning system—would do well to remember that while Canada has her Red Chinese, we here in the United States have our Red Russians.

The great diplomatic problem to be solved will be that of the longest undefended border in the world—between Canada and the United States. Should we now defend our border from Red Chinese infiltration when the Canadians have not defended it against our Washington-based Soviet diplomats?

As for the concern over Red China now gaining a seat in the United Nations—why not? Let us give her ours. In fact, most Americans would approve of moving the United Nations Organization to Peiping. Then we will not be saddled with the U.N. deficit and their new budget.

Mr. Speaker, a related newsclipping follows:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 13, 1970]

CANADA RECOGNIZES RED CHINA—ALSO EXPECTED TO SWITCH VOTE FOR U.N. SEAT

(By George Sherman)

Canada and Communist China today announced that they are establishing diplomatic relations.

In a joint communique issued simultaneously in Peking and Ottawa, the two governments agreed to exchange ambassadors within six months.

The announcement brings to a successful conclusion tedious negotiations begun in Stockholm in February of 1969.

Canadian sources indicated that Ottawa would probably now switch its vote in the annual General Assembly in favor of Communist Chinese membership in the United Nations.

Ottawa has persistently said that it would judge the issue according to the outcome of the negotiations over recognition.

The Nationalist Chinese government immediately severed relations with Canada.

"SOLE" GOVERNMENT

A statement issued by the Foreign Ministry said Nationalist China regards the recognition of Peking "as a most unfriendly act and has lodged a vigorous protest with the Canadian government" in addition to breaking diplomatic relations.

Read today in the Canadian parliament by Canadian External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp, the communique says that Canada recognizes the Peking regime as "the sole legal government of China."

But on the key question of whether that government should include the island of Taiwan, the Canadian government firmly opposed making any pronouncement.

The Communist Chinese demand that recognition means Canadian endorsement of Peking's claims to Taiwan was the main sticking point for months.

TAIWAN ISSUE

Canadian refusal to go along came in a paragraph of the joint communique:

"The Chinese government reaffirms that Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China. The Canadian government takes note of this position of the Chinese government."

But Sharp enlarged upon the Canadian position in his longer statement to parliament.

"Our position, which I have stated publicly and which we made clear to the Chinese from the start of our negotiations, is that the Canadian government does not consider it appropriate either to endorse or to challenge the Chinese government's position on the status of Taiwan."

U.S. officials in Washington said the Canadian action runs contrary to American policy on Communist China. Last week Canadian Ambassador Marcel Cadieux saw Assistant Secretary of State Marshall Green in the department to inform him of the impending Canadian move.

According to diplomatic sources the United States repeated its opposition to moving toward diplomatic relations, but Green indicated that Washington would do nothing to make the action more controversial.

Washington is particularly worried that the recognition could lead to a vote in favor of Communist Chinese membership in the United Nations.

At the White House, press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler carefully refrained from making any comment on the Canadian move. He said the announcement was "no surprise," as negotiations with Peking had been under way for "some time."

COMPROMISE FEARED

But the suspicion in official quarters here is that Ottawa has made an informal compromise with Peking over the thorny Taiwan issue. In exchange for not going along with the Communist Chinese claim to the island, it is believed Ottawa has promised to vote in favor of Communist Chinese admission to the United Nations this year.

Contrary to U.S. feelings, the Canadians believe that Peking is seriously interested now in taking over the Chinese seat. As long ago as September 1969, Mitchell Sharp said after a talk with United Nations Secretary General U Thant that Peking had indicated in Stockholm an interest in entering the United Nations.

Today Canadian diplomats say only that Canada will probably vote "consistently" with its decision to recognize Peking. It was not immediately clear whether this change—and its likely impact on other wavering U.N. members—might gain Peking the necessary two-thirds vote setting in motion the machinery for entry.

ITALY NEGOTIATING

Italy is also negotiating with Peking over diplomatic relations. If those talks are now successful on the Canadian model, another key Western ally could join the list of those voting for Chinese membership in the world body.

The debate in the General Assembly is scheduled for later in the Autumn, after the 25th anniversary celebrations beginning tomorrow and running through Oct. 24.

Throughout his statement in parliament, Sharp hit hard at the Canadian refusal to go along with Peking claims to Taiwan.

He said the Canadian refusal to endorse or challenge Peking claims to Taiwan "has been our position and continues to be our position." He said Ottawa was "aware" of the importance attached to the issue by Peking, "but we have no comment to make one way or the other."

IMPORTANT FIRST STEP

Sharp said the establishment of diplomatic relations was an "important first step" for opening all kinds of educational, cultural and trade exchanges.

"We have opened a new and important channel of communication through which I hope we will be able to expand and develop our relations in every sphere," said Sharp.

The communique also hinted that Canadian efforts to get guarantees for the safety of its citizens in mainland China have been successful.

The two governments had agreed, said the communique, "to provide all necessary assistance for the establishment and the performance of the functions of diplomatic missions in their respective capitals, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and in accordance with international practice."

HORTON WELCOMES NEW PRESIDENT OF COLGATE ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL, DR. ARTHUR R. McKAY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, every community must be exceedingly proud of its schools of higher education, for each is enhanced, inestimably, by these fine colleges and universities.

Certainly the 36th Congressional District of New York is no exception. This area which I am honored to represent in the Congress has many institutions at the college and university level. We who live there have good cause to be more proud than most.

Indeed it is with much personal pleasure and satisfaction that I share with my colleagues today the knowledge that one of our most outstanding schools will be welcoming a new president on September 1.

He is Dr. Arthur R. McKay, who on that date will become president of Colgate Rochester Divinity School-Bexley Hall.

Perhaps the fame of this great seminary is well known to all of you. Perhaps not known is the fact that this school is increasingly being referred to as an "ecumenical cluster." This, in the language of theologically oriented, means a close alliance between seminaries from different denominations.

The presidency then, of such an institution, must offer a most rewarding challenge to so qualified an educator as Dr. McKay. His credentials are such that there can be no doubt that his renowned Rochester seminary will continue to grow in importance, and that it will become even more an outstanding leader in its field.

Some of the world's great religious leaders are alumni of Colgate Rochester, and I am sure that they, too, are as enthused as I am in extending a welcoming hand to Dr. Arthur R. McKay.

A recent news story in the Rochester Times Union gave details on the background of not only the new president but some of the history of the seminary as well. May I share that newspaper's fine account with you now:

DR. ARTHUR R. McKAY, PRESIDENT OF COLGATE ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL

Dr. Arthur R. McKay, who will become president of Colgate Rochester Divinity School-Bexley Hall on Sept. 1, will lead a school well on its way to becoming what Dr. McKay thinks seminaries should be: An "ecumenical cluster."

That is theological jargon for a close connection between a number of schools from different denominations.

The man who just left the Colgate Rochester presidency, Dr. Gene E. Bartlett, asserts not only that the 153-year-old seminary is becoming an ecumenical cluster—he thinks a "whole new school" is developing on "the hill."

Dr. McKay, who has been president of McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago for 13 years, chaired a commission of the American Association of Theological Schools from 1966 to 1968, which recommended ecumenical clusters.

Colgate Rochester, historically Baptist, has affiliated with Bexley Hall, an Episcopal seminary which moved here from Ohio in 1968. In addition, Crozer Theological Seminary of Chester, Pa., a Baptist school, will move here in the fall.

St. Bernard's Roman Catholic Seminary has become more closely associated with Colgate Rochester through joint membership in the Rochester Center for Theological Studies. In addition, Colgate Rochester has affiliated with the private University of Rochester.

Dr. McKay says such clusters enable schools of separate traditions to maintain their identities, but let students learn in environments more like where they will practice their ministries.

He warns against seminaries becoming "ecclesiastical ghettos."

When former President Bartlett spoke of the "new school," he referred also to the new black presence there, which resulted after black seminarians closed the school for three weeks in March, 1969, and demanded more black professors, trustees and administrators.

The result was that the number of black trustees went from one to 12 on the 36-man board. In addition, the number of black teachers has increased from one or two to five plus a guest lecturer. And, blacks are entering the administration in such key roles as admissions director.

The now-graduated student who, during the black lockout, was the spokesman for the "Black Caucus," the Rev. Charles Walker, says that because of what happened. Colgate Rochester will become a national center for black church studies. He even goes beyond that:

"With the re-emphasis on biblical studies, it (the school) could be the focal point for revitalizing the Christian Church in America and calling the Christian ministry back to its primary mission—proclamation of the Gospel."

Confrontations, such as the one which closed Colgate Rochester, are not new to Dr. McKay.

Minority students at McCormick, a Presbyterian seminary, held a sit-in there in May, 1969, and as a result, the school is devoting more time and money working with the poor community in Chicago.

He and his wife, Ann, have three children.

HOWARD LEIGHTON INSTALLED AS PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply honored to be invited to serve as inaugurating officer at the annual convention of the National Association of Insurance Agents several weeks ago, and to take part in the installation of my good friend and constituent from Lowell, Mass., Howard Leighton, as president of that association.

As a man with over 30 years of experience in the insurance field, with great pride in his profession, and with a profound understanding of the problems and responsibilities, as well as the opportunities, that face the insurance industry, Howard Leighton will, I know, serve ably and conscientiously.

His inaugural address reflects the thoughtfulness and the foresight which he brings to his new office, and I am privileged to include his remarks in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

Never in my wildest dreams as an underwriter and special agent for the employers group—in the late thirties—did I envision that I would be chosen to head up an insurance organization which today is the largest of its kind in the world.

Never did I dream that one day I would be standing before the National Association of Insurance Agents to receive its highest honor.

I look upon the presidency of the NAIA as a great honor and an awesome challenge and I accept both the responsibility and opportunity with a grateful heart.

For more than 30 years as underwriter—special agent—and local independent agent—

I have strived to do the best that I could for our great insurance industry and the public on whose good will its success depends.

I hope that I may have the vision and vitality—the capacity and the courage—to merit the significance—the real meaning of the presidency of NAIA.

My selection as president of NAIA has special meaning to me because it comes from insurance men—professional insurance men as yourself.

I grew up with a profound admiration of the insurance agent—an admiration instilled by my father who also was an independent agent.

In my own opinion—no one in the entire insurance profession does more good for more people than the able—conscientious—professional agent.

He plays a vital and indispensable role in safeguarding the financial security and peace of mind of millions of Americans who are exposed to so many hazards and perils.

It is regretable that the invaluable service performed by the independent agent and the property and casualty insurance industry in our society goes so largely unheralded.

In fact, the property and casualty insurance business—which for generations has been serving the American people and meeting their needs in time of adversity—deserves much better treatment than it is receiving from the consumer press.

The criticism that insurance people receive from some nationally known newspaper and TV people is undeserved.

From the Chicago fire—from the annual slaughter on our highways—to the riots in cities and on college campuses—to hurricane Celia—the property and casualty insurance companies and independent agents have responded to crisis and met their obligations to the American public.

We have not shirked our responsibilities.

The consumer press, generally, does not want us to increase rates—cancel policyholders—or withdraw from markets.

If we are going to be critical of the news media—and I'm not referring to our friends in the trade press—insurance reporting is as good a place as any to start.

Insurance seems to be one of the many step-children of the business page of most of our daily newspapers.

There are many reasons why the general, daily newspaper doesn't do a good reporting job of insurance matters.

It is able to muster space for stock market, monetary and general economic news—but it seems that they can not and have not adequately reported on the insurance industry.

But yet—somehow and someway—many newspapers find the space as well as the expertise to criticize such items as an occasional slow payment of a hurricane loss—rate increases and policy cancellations—without adequate research for the reasoning behind such actions.

Any good newsman who can easily detect the cancellation of one policy in a million, surely can dig out stories about the endless crisis and continuous revolution in the insurance business.

The insurance industry is caught in the cross fire of a complex set of social revolutions, affecting our cities, colleges and private institutions—as well as an unprecedented period of inflation.

Due to these problems, investors are placing their funds elsewhere—thereby reducing capital in the industry.

These problems have a direct impact on the cost and availability of insurance protection for the homeowner and businessman.

But the American press—with its near perfect position to collect information and data and its tremendous countrywide news services does not tell the full story about the property and casualty insurance business.

It has failed to live up to its most minimal responsibilities in keeping the public informed on vital insurance matters.

An insurance business that has been plagued by a half a century of slaughter on the highways and a decade of underwriting losses deserves far better treatment from the press.

It is time it recognizes the full value of the private insurance business to the American economy and fulfills its responsibility to correctly inform the public.

For an industry as vast and undergoing such an explosive change—our performance has been remarkable.

After all—no business—no government organization—no civic group—no church—has yet attained perfection.

We are no different.

Most important—we are adapting to change—we recognize that mistakes have been made and are trying to correct them—we have provided new services, new coverages—we are striving to meet a public need.

Our performance in stiffening the economic backbone of the country is unmatched.

The executives of our companies and the professional, independent agents, are men of dedication—ability—honor—and integrity.

The National Association of Insurance Agents—which is approaching its 75th anniversary—is not showing any signs of age—instead it being *infused* with a new vitality—a new desire to better serve the American public.

The NAIA no longer reacts solely to the action of others. We now generate action.

Witness the one-bank holding company proposals—the joint agency-company operations study—the revisions in agency contracts—the drafting of a catastrophe loss program.

Those are some of the changes which have been instituted by NAIA.

To some—these changes have been disconcerting.

But we must be realists and recognize that we live in a time of great change.

It has been my privilege to personally witness the age of change that now embraces our national association.

I feel that some truly dramatic changes took place during the past year under the sound leadership of Lyle Huggins.

I strongly believe that every independent agent owes thanks for the devotion and direction Lyle gave—not only to the national association of insurance agents—but to the entire property and casualty insurance business.

And what about the future? ? ? ?

We must take a realistic look at our industry and our national association's place in the industry.

A *host* of problems beset us.

Problems of marketing—of rating—of political pressures and intervention—of profitability—of solvency and competition—to mention a few.

A few years ago the stresses and strains of these problems were dividing agents and companies. We were no longer a cohesive partnership. There was suspicion and distrust.

In many instances, the basic fundamentals of agency-company relationships appeared to have been forgotten. Our future appeared very bleak indeed.

Fortunately, we have come a long way since then.

Due, in a major part, to the statemanship of both the leaders of the companies and of the National Association of Insurance Agents, a strong and growing *cooperative* relationship has been established. Agents' committees and company committees meet regularly.

This improvement in relationships is the result of revived awareness of the basic fundamentals of company-agent economics.

Strength is of major importance to an insurance company. The balance sheet doesn't tell the whole story. It omits some vital and essential ingredients.

One is the talent—skills—efficiency—attitude and morale of the company staff.

The other—and of utmost importance to the agent—is the vitality—the skill—the drive—and the loyalty of the company's agency plant.

If these are high, the companies and the agents have no place to go—but up.

More and more—our company friends are recognizing that the resourcesful, energetic, entrepreneurial, independent individuals that comprise the American agency system constitute the most efficient and able insurance marketing system in the world—and that *we*—the *agents*—are here to stay—to *grow*—and to *prosper*.

Another fundamental in the company-agency relationship is that we agents can not serve our clients and prosper without strong and profitable companies to provide the protection which the public needs and is entitled to.

In essence, agents and companies *need* each other.

With these basic fundamentals understood and accepted, agents and companies have a sound foundation for the common good. As we face our problems, we must see the necessity to keep talking straight and clear—one to another—and we must realize the dangers of losing touch with each other.

We have established the basis for understanding—for trust—and for dialogue.

As we look ahead—we certainly have no shortage of problems in this changing world.

Our ability to cope with them will—in great measure—determine where we will be in the years ahead.

I pledge that our national association will continue to do all possible to promote the advantages of sound company-agency relationships.

In turn—I ask your whole-hearted support and involvement in programs designed to further the interests of the independent agent. And of the American agency system.

While I hesitate to single out any one committee—in view of the many NAIA committees which are involved in meaningful projects—I would like to mention the action taken by the agency-company operations study committee.

The property and casualty insurance business, functioning under the American agency system, is at a pivotal hour in its history.

The trend of underwriting losses has to be stemmed if the insurance business is to continue as private enterprise.

Never was there more need for companies and agents to know and appreciate each others problems.

I think that the kind of attention that companies and agents involved as they are in a joint study—are giving to the many operational problems is worthy of special mention.

As a final comment, I would like to commend the agents and companies for their vision in launching the joint study aimed at solving many operational problems affecting both agencies and insured.

As we receive and analyze the results of this important study, it is hoped that the long-range planning of the NAIA and that of the companies will include the clear and forthright dialogue that we need with each other.

In this way we can examine those aspects of the future where we can manage change—and we can successfully adapt ourselves to those changes which we can not manage.

In this way our common future—the future of independent agents and their companies will take on a forceful and forward looking image which will have an ever increasing strength in the future and the American agency system will continue to serve the insurance buying public to its best advantage for years to come.

RECOMPUTATION—AN OFFICER'S VIEW

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the matter of computing military retirement pay is vital to many retired officers who have made the military their career and who have proudly served their country.

Efforts to redeem President Nixon's campaign pledge to provide recomputation so as to give these retirees more realistic benefits have been hampered, according to Defense Secretary Laird, by the Department of Defense budget problems.

I am, for one, not entirely satisfied at that excuse.

I recently received an excellent letter on this subject from a retired Air Force lieutenant colonel who expresses his views on this matter most eloquently.

I would like to place this letter in the RECORD:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
September 25, 1970.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to apologize for not being more responsive to your August 4, 1970 letter, forwarding a copy of comments made by Congressman Rivers concerning the current Administration's failure to support recomputation.

I have been very active in attempting to correct the inequities in the present law prescribing the method of computing military retirement pay. In view of the attempt to shift the lack of action on this issue from the President to Defense Secretary Laird with the "Laird Open Letter" your letter poses a key consideration. In your letter you indicate "that the Congress would vote such a reform were it not for the President's veto." I realize there are many things to consider in taking such action. However, it may be timely to provide the President with appropriate legislation with which to carry out his campaign pledge.

Currently, budegtary constrains within the Department of Defense are being offered as the reason for not supporting a return to recomputation. There was no such equivocation in the President's campaign pledge. He unequivocally recognized the breach that had been committed, the government's responsibility in the matter, and promised prompt corrective action. In making this commitment, sharp criticism was levied against the Democratic Administration and Democratic-controlled Congress for their failure to remedy the situation. Twice in the past year, Congressman Van Deerlin has taken the floor to plea the issue of recomputation. Apparently, his words fall on deaf ears. It is essential that Democratic leadership take the initiative in prompting a return to recomputation. It is beyond my comprehension that those who administer the affairs of this great nation cannot find a way to correct this glaring injustice. Personally, I doubt that recomputation limited to those who entered the service before enactment of the Military Pay Act of 1958 would threaten the nation with financial catastrophe or establish an embarrassing precedent. The interests of the United States are not well served by prolonging disposition of this matter. The moral issues predominate, and in view of the background, resolution should not require further time.

Sincerely,

LEO F. CONWAY,
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Retired.

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES V. MANGANO, ITALIAN-AMERICAN MAN OF THE YEAR, AT ANNUAL DINNER OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL MENS ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night at the annual dinner of the Italian-American Business & Professional Men's Association in the grand ballroom of the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn, the Honorable James V. Mangano, administrative director and general clerk of the Kings County Supreme Court, was honored as the Italian-American Man of the Year.

My friend, Jim Mangano, has had an outstanding career of public service. He was elected to the New York State Assembly and served in Albany with distinction from 1935 to 1938. He was then elected by countywide election, as sheriff of Kings County, Kings County being another name for Brooklyn. At that time and after his service in the assembly, he was the youngest sheriff in the State of New York. Subsequently, he was given the high honor of being named administrative director and general clerk of the Kings County Supreme Court.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include the remarks he made in Brooklyn last night:

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES V. MANGANO

Mr. Chairman, Right Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Clergy, distinguished members on the Dias, members of the Italian-American Professional and Businessmen's Association, and all you fine guests. Thanks for being here.

I wish to express my profound thanks to the Italian-American Professional and Businessmen's Association for selecting me as the recipient of their annual award, and also to celebrate the discovery of America.

I humbly submit that I am only a mere symbol of the millions of Americans of Italian heritage—a leader among races who has made a great contribution to a great nation.

We are now standing in the twilight of the 20th century, fast approaching the threshold of the 21st century. The time has come for we Italo-Americans to take stock of our situation in order to solidify our gains and move ahead to our rightful place in American society. In order to establish a definite course of action we must look back in history. The future mirrors the past.

Four hundred seventy-eight years ago three small ships entered what is now known as the Bahama Islands under the leadership of Christopher Columbus. When this gallant Italian explorer struck the Spanish colors on that West Indian shore he not only discovered a new world, but conquered the Atlantic Ocean and expanded the influence of western civilization.

Subsequently there followed the great migration of the 1890's and 1920's when 2,300,000 of our ancestors came to this country. They came full of hope, full of desire and full of purpose. They came and gave of their sweat and toil in a labor of love. They built the subways, the railroads, the bridges and tunnels. And seated here tonight are the children and grandchildren of these early immigrants—doctors, lawyers, educators, political and labor leaders.

Unfortunately, there has been a discordant note in this great symphony known as America. Especially when the noise of the world stops, what do you hear? If it is very quiet perhaps we could hear the quiet melody of life. Do we?

In every field of human endeavor he that is first must perpetually live in the limelight of publicity. Whether the leadership is vested in man or an ethnic group, emulation and envy are ever at work.

The reward and punishment are always the same.

The reward is widespread recognition and satisfaction in helping your fellow man.

The punishment is fierce denial, detraction, jealousies, calumny.

There is nothing new in this!

It is as old as the world and as old as human passions—envy, fear, greed and a desire to destroy and surpass.

If the leader truly leads, whether he be man, nation or ethnic group what ultimately remains is that which is good and great. No matter how loud the clamor of denial, our contribution to the American fabric which deserves to live, *lives*, but we must infuse that life with a greater vitality. First of all, we ask not preferential treatment, but we demand to be accorded our rightful place in American life. We have earned that right because of the contribution our people paid for in sacrifice and blood.

Secondly, we must put our own house in order. We have got to root out our envy of each other which is self defeating and divisive. We must close ranks and present a common front.

Thirdly, we must broaden our perspective and re-arrange our priorities. We must encourage our people not only to enter the recognized professions, but to become a part of the mass media. We must have Italian-American writers, publishers, publicists, moving picture and television executives.

It is in this area where public image making is born. We must develop an intellectual class of Italo-Americans.

It is getting late in the hour of history! We have got to make our move now!

EDUCATION: QUALITY OR QUANTITY?

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been deeply concerned about our educational process and systems, since it begins to appear that we are becoming far too concerned with "quantity education" rather than "quality education".

For many the answer to the crisis in education is an outpouring of tax moneys to all institutions, especially, in recent years, those institutions of higher learning. The money crisis for colleges and universities is deepening, with an ex-

pected 11.5 million student enrollment by the year 1985. It is further estimated that by 1980 nearly $40 billion will be spent on higher education, compared to slightly over $26 billion now being spent.

Further affecting this increase is the so-called "open admissions" policy of some colleges and universities which recently led to the registration of 35,000 freshman students at the City University of New York.

In my judgment, we must give serious consideration to the future of our educational system and carefully guard ourselves so that we do not develop a mass production line education that will not prove to be meaningful for either the students, or our society.

An article in the October 19, issue of Time magazine did an excellent job of pointing up the problems we are facing in education, and I am including it in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues my have the opportunity to read and consider the direction that higher education can and must take in the coming decade:

OPEN ADMISSIONS: AMERICAN DREAM OR DISASTER?

Only a few years ago, most Americans heartily endorsed the nation's drive toward universal higher education. But now that 60% of U.S. high school graduates attend college, serious questions arise: What are colleges for? Who deserves admission? Or rejection? During the annual meeting of the American Council on Education in St. Louis last week, college presidents and administrators discussed a dramatic case in point: City University of New York and its new open-admissions policy. To some it seemed a triumph of democracy; to others, an omen that colleges may soon be overwhelmed with the "wrong" kind of students.

Tuition-free C.U.N.Y. has thrown open its doors this year to nearly any New York City high school graduate, regardless of his grades or the university's overburdened facilities. Even students who can barely read at ninth-grade level have been welcomed; C.U.N.Y. is determined to tutor them until they make it through a two-year community college or one of the city's topflight four-year institutions. Deluged with 35,000 freshmen, C.U.N.Y. is holding classes in rented store fronts and trailers; faculty members are taking turns at shared desks, and students are shunning jammed libraries to study in telephone booths.

Expansion and Exclusion. C.U.N.Y.'s switch from elitism to egalitarianism represents the academic world's most radical response so far to explosive changes in the nation's cities. In New York as elsewhere, rural blacks have flocked to the city; middle-class whites have increasingly moved to the suburbs. As a result, C.U.N.Y. and other urban universities confront rising pressure from poor youths, often members of minority groups, who yearn for the college degrees that they look upon as a ticket to U.S. affluence and status. "College is all kids talk about in high school these days," says Chris Vega, 18, a freshman at C.U.N.Y. "If you don't go to college, you just get any old job."

That desire for college is far fom being fulfilled. Though U.S. campuses have almost tripled their enrollment since 1950, the headlong expansion has excluded vast numbers of college-age blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos and poor whites. Blacks still make up only 6.4% of U.S. undergraduates, and almost half of them attend all-black colleges. Money is obviously an obstacle; census studies show that a family with an income below $3,000 is five times less likely to include a child attending college than a family that earns $15,000 or more. But equally important is the appalling performance of many urban public schools, which have failed to prepare slum kids for college—or anything else that counts in U.S. society.

In the light of its unusual history, C.U.N.Y. could have been expected to cope with this phenomenon better than almost any urban university in the country. The original City College of New York—then known as the Free Academy—was founded in 1847 to let "the children of the rich and the poor take their seats together and know of no distinction save that of industry, good conduct and intellect." "City" fulfilled its charter by schooling waves of immigrant youths, especially Jews, who were barred by many private colleges of the time. From the 1920s on, the "proletarian Harvard" produced more students who went on to doctorates than any other U.S. college, to say nothing of alumni as diverse as Zero Mostel, Bernard Malamud and Jonas Salk plus the current managing editor of the New York *Times* and the chief judge of New York State's highest court.

Then came the crunch of meritocracy; besieged by more and more applicants, City kept raising the cutoff point for admission—from a high school grade average of 72% in 1920 to 85% in 1960. But now the city's newly arrived minorities were black, poor, lacking academic tradition and doing so disastrously in high school that college seemed impossible. Eight years ago, only 2% of C.U.N.Y. freshmen were nonwhite.

MEANINGLESS DIPLOMAS

Often this pattern has little to do with abilities or ambitions. Convinced that most slum kids are doomed to failure, some New York teachers tend to guarantee it. Instead of being encouraged to take academic courses aimed at college, such students are commonly shunted into low-level programs that lead to vocational and "general" diplomas. Standards can be scandalous: one girl got a B in English for pasting together a scrapbook of pictures to illustrate the meanings of words. The kids—and their potential employers—know that a general diploma is virtually meaningless. Substantial numbers of New York's black high school students drop out before graduating; students from poor families wind up nearly three years behind the average in reading. Educational failure contributes to other problems: roughly 8% of New York's wage earners have incomes at or near poverty levels, and one in eight New Yorkers is on welfare.

The have-nots are often painfully aware of statistics showing that a college degree is worth roughly $4,000 a year more in earning power than a high school diploma. To compound their anger, the city's changing population patterns have surrounded some of C.U.N.Y.'s 18 campuses with increasingly resentful black neighborhoods. A year and a half ago, black students made the City College campus the focal point of their rage. They demanded that more blacks be admitted to the predominantly white enclave on a hilltop above Harlem. Weeks of turmoil, which included the burning of an auditorium, pressured President Buell Gallagher into resigning.

POLITICAL AGILITY

In the middle of the mess was C.U.N.Y. Chancellor Albert Bowker. With his mumbling speech and rumpled suits, the 51-year-old scholar may not have suggested the image of an urban savior. But Bowker came to the problem with impressive credentials. Born in Winchendon, Mass., he was a respected mathematical statistician with an undergraduate degree from M.I.T. and a Ph.D. from Columbia, As dean of the Stanford graduate school for five years, he had pushed his faculty to the top in national ratings and drawn the attention of New York City's board of higher education, which hired him in 1963 primarily to create a first-rate graduate school at C.U.N.Y.

Long before the City College outburst, Bowker proved his agility in New York's political jungle. During one power struggle with the board, he cooly resigned, taking two C.U.N.Y. college presidents with him until the trustees capitulated. The graduate studies improved apace: C.U.N.Y. now enrolls 28,500 graduate students. Partially because of pressure from two teachers' unions, salaries rose to $11,960 for instructors and to $29,800 for full professors. A few prestigious scholars, like Historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr., pull down $50,000, compared with Bowker's $45,000.

EXPANDING BRAINPOWER

Carefully consulting with community groups to determine local needs, Bowker pushed C.U.N.Y. into offiering a host of services for the city, including research in welfare problems and the oceanographic vessel *Atalntic Twin*, which studies pollution in New York harbor, C.U.N.Y. now trains teachers' aides and paraprofessional nurses. It retrains retired cops and firemen to fill critical shortages in nursing, teaches city planning to neighborhood leaders and runs eleven centers for teaching thousands of jobless adults such skills as how to repair air conditioners and mold plastics.

As he has worked to expand New York's brainpower, which is C.U.N.Y.'s most important function, Bowker has presided over incredible growth; since he took office, his university has added three four-year campuses and three community colleges to its units scattered throughout the city (*see map*). Two more will open next fall. They range from Georgian-style Brooklyn College and Park Avenue's Hunter College to raw two-year schools in poverty areas and the John Jay College of Criminal Justice for New York policemen. C.U.N.Y.'s 195,000 students make it the third largest institution of higher education in the country, after the State University of New York and the California state college system.

BACK-ROW OBSCENITIES

Sheer expansion, though, was hardly sufficient to meet the minority group pressure. In essence, C.U.N.Y.'s dilemma was whether it should go on picking only proven academic winners—or let in everyone who might benefit from a college education. In fact, Bowker already had a prototype solution: a five-year-old program for giving low-income high school graduates a chance at C.U.N.Y. The "College Discovery" project recruited, counseled, tutored and paid disadvantaged kids as much as $50 a week while they attended C.U.N.Y.'s community colleges. SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge) did the same for four-year campuses. Both projects taught the teachers as much as the learners learned.

"I took one kid out for ice cream," recalls one professor, "and when he ate it he clutched the side of his mouth in pain—his teeth were full of cavities." Violent headaches were common, until teachers realized that many students were too poor to buy needed eyeglasses. Even with glasses, they took a dim view of standard English courses rich in Henry James and Christina Rossetti, whose polished phrases merely provoked bored back-row obscenities.

The SEEK dropout rate was discouraging: roughly 60% during the first three years. Still, that was only 10% worse than the national rate for collegians with more conventional preparation. And gradually teachers found that they could stimulate deep intellectual curiosity with books and materials

that illuminated the black experience. SEEK and College Discovery staffers are now convinced that their efforts have dramatically changed the several thousand students who have already entered the programs. When SEEK produced its first four college graduates last winter, two were *cum laude* and all were headed for graduate school, including a remarkable hustler turned scholar, Arnold Kemp. By the time of the campus eruptions last year, the question for Bowker was whether the university could expand SEEK still further.

Marathon negotiations between City College faculty and minority students produced a preliminary plan that would have admitted half of City's freshman class "without regard to grades." Politicians denounced the scheme as a "quota" that would elbow out normally qualified students. Blacks were skeptical because the quota had a specified limit—like those implicit in methods for admitting minority students at other U.S. colleges and universities. Bowker was secretly pleased when the tenured faculty and the board of higher education turned the plan down.

As an alternative, some faculty members favored the "open access" strategy pioneered by University of California President Clark Kerr ten years ago. California now has a three-tiered system of public campuses: state universities are limited to the top eighth of high school graduates; state colleges accept the top third, and community colleges are open to all. The U.S. already has more than 1,000 two-year colleges and is adding more at the rate of one per week. In this higher-education message to Congress last March, President Nixon endorsed this expansion strategy wholeheartedly. "A traditional four-year college program is not suited to everyone," he said.

DO IT NOW

Bowker found himself in a squeeze. For one thing, community colleges have the image of ranking at the bottom of the academic pecking order and thus tend to set low expectations for both students and teachers. As Bowker saw it, admitting disadvantaged students only to community colleges might have created *de facto* segregation, further inflamed black grievances against C.U.N.Y. and led to the very disorder that he was determined to avoid. Opening up all campuses seemed the only solution, and Bowker became convinced that if such a program was to work at all, the university would have to gamble on installing it voluntarily before social and political explosions installed it by force. "This had to be done *now*," says Bowker. "So we did it."

As a remarkable result, C.U.N.Y.'s new freshman class includes 9,000 students who would have been flatly rejected under previous admission standards. One-third of the class is nonwhite, the biggest group of black and Puerto Rican freshmen in the U.S. The 9,000 include former laborers and domestics, cab drivers, carpenters and the sons and daughters of blue-collar workers. Many are the first in their families to enter college. They are awed—but all business. "These are the original American revolutionaries," says C.U.N.Y. Vice Chancellor Timothy Healy. "They want a piece of the action."

AUTOMATIC DEGREES

Will they get it? At least half the freshmen need some remedial teaching before they can deal with college-level work. But no one yet knows whether the techniques that worked for SEEK students can be applied successfully on a mass scale. Many critics, including Spiro Agnew and some faculty members, fear that C.U.N.Y. risks turning itself into a college-level version of the failure-breeding high schools. Other skeptics contend that students who receive automatic college places may become embittered when they encounter persistent academic difficulties. If they then demand automatic degrees, they could devalue the credentials they yearn for.

By contrast, Bowker insists that changed admission standards will not change degree standards—at least so far as he can help it. To avoid easy promotion, flunking students will be allowed to try and try again as long as teachers feel that they are making progress. Some may take ten years to earn a degree; but they will be no novelty among C.U.N.Y.'s many part-time students. Bowker also plans a special incentive: some bright students may soon be allowed to plan their own curriculums around a subject that fascinates them, and earn a new kind of diploma, a "university degree." As for the problem of teaching C.U.N.Y.'s huge classes, Bowker is undaunted: the swarms of students arrived just as the U.S. produced a nationwide surplus of teachers in many fields. When the university set out to hire 1,000 more teachers last spring, a single ad in the New York *Times* drew 4,000 responses, many of them from young Ph.D.s avid to help C.U.N.Y. effect social change and get well paid for doing it.

Ultimately, Bowker hopes to attack poor education at its roots: the public schools. He thinks that the open-admissions policy is already encouraging more slum kids to try for college and refuse to settle for general diplomas. Even under C.U.N.Y.'s new policy, those entering four-year colleges must either have earned an 80% average or rank in the top half of their school classes. Bowker is also mindful that C.U.N.Y. supplies 60% of the city's schoolteachers and reasons that his new minority students will eventually raise the schools' low ratio (11%) of minority teachers. Moreover, he wants C.U.N.Y. to take over several city high schools and try new teaching methods. One idea: a flexible middle school that would span the last two years of high school and the first two of college.

To safeguard research and scholarship while C.U.N.Y. is undergoing so strenuous a change. Bowker is working hard to recruit the outstanding students that draw outstanding professors. He seems to be succeeding; after all, C.U.N.Y. still charges no tuition in a day when college costs are soaring. And Bowker is particularly skilled at getting the necessary money. C.U.N.Y.'s budget (split between the state and city) is $327 million this year, and may hit $1 billion by 1975. Yet Bowker is confident that he can obtain these staggering sums during a period of severe financial pinches for most institutions because open admissions has generated a new base of political support for higher education.

BIG RESULTS, BIG MISTAKES

Thanks to C.U.N.Y.'s previous expansions, one-third of New York families include someone who either went to C.U.N.Y. or has a blood relative who did. Some alumni feel that open admissions is watering down the quality of their alma mater, but most are sympathetic. The city's unions have long demanded open college doors: their members have discovered that their children's high school diplomas are often passports to nowhere. Although blacks did most of the pushing, roughly 50% of C.U.N.Y.'s "high risk" freshmen are whites who had no chance before. In addition, many Catholics favor expanded admissions on grounds of pragmatism as well as social injustice: Catholic campuses are running out of space for parochial school graduates. As a final boon for Bowker, the state's frugal rural and suburban legislators are impressed by his cost-effectiveness figures. Says one official: "It costs $2,000 a year to keep a ghetto kid in C.U.N.Y., compared with $12,000 to keep the same kid in jail."

Such arguments may be shaky. If the new high-risk students are really poor, they will need more than free tuition to stay in school. Unlike SEEK students, they get no stipends. C.U.N.Y. is providing some grants, but many must help their families by living at home and drawing welfare, or leave home and work. Study is tough under such conditions. Conversely, no one knows how many of the new freshmen are not truly poor but merely middle-class students with modest school records who would otherwise have paid to attend private institutions. Finally, critics contend that C.U.N.Y.'s new students are being "overeducated" for nonexistent jobs, and would do better at technical training institutes. Nonsense, says Bowker. The city's economy is rapidly shifting away from manufacturing jobs and he insists that it will need all the service workers and paraprofessionals that C.U.N.Y. can produce.

Whatever the outcome, Vice Chancellor Healy describes the drama well: "We're going to get more and bigger results and make more and bigger mistakes—because we're moving faster and farther than anyone else." Clearly, open admissions is a daring attempt to bridge the gap between the American dream of useful education for all and the widespread failure of high schools that were supposed to provide it. The experiment could challenge and invigorate colleges all over the U.S. It might also provide a case study in academic disaster. For the moment, the nation can only admire the fact that open admissions is being tried at all.

JUDGES CLAIM TAXPAYERS LIABLE FOR RIOT DAMAGE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during debate on S. 1461 last Monday to raise the salaries for the criminal defenders of the poor, I had commented:

We seem ready to bend over backward to blame everything on the people. Why should not our Federal judges accept their fair share for the mess we find our courts in today? I think the ends of justice in carrying this extra financial burden would be more equitably handled if instead of paying the public defenders solely from taxpayers' funds we assessed a portion of it against Federal judges appropriations. If the softhearted Federal judges had to pay for their fair share of the mistakes in rehabilitation they have made, I feel confident that society would have fewer criminal repeaters and the law-abiding citizens would be better represented from the bench.

In this evening's paper we now learn that the Federal judges, so soft on the criminal element, can find no mercy for the taxpaying, law-abiding citizens whose property was destroyed in the riots, even where proven by a preponderance of evidence that the city officials were derelict in their duty in taking no action to safeguard lives and property. This is the cost to the taxpayers when the police are denied their responsibility of stopping crime.

Wasn't the clarion cry of the civil rights revolution, "Human rights above property rights"?

Perhaps our Federal judges, so quick to blame society for the vandalism by the freaks and dregs, feel that the merchants were at fault for operating a store and trying to make an honest liv-

ing. One thing is for sure, the judges did not so rule because they were afraid, in reimbursing property owners for the negligence of the officers, might create an impression that they were subsidizing crime.

The judges would put the blame back on Congress to pass upon the damages and to raise the needed indemnification—from the taxpayer, of course.

Mr. Speaker, a pertinent newsclipping follows:

[From The Evening Star, Oct. 13, 1970]

U.S. COURT REFUSES TO MAKE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PAY FOR RIOT DAMAGE

(By Donald Hirzel)

A three-judge federal appeals court panel today refused to hold the District responsible for 1968 riot damage to businesses, saying that relief should come instead through legislative action.

The court said there is no precedent of a governmental body being held responsible under such circumstances, and it did not intend to break such ground.

The court, in effect, struck down a series of suits filed by insurance companies who claimed the city did not adequately protect property they had insured during the rioting which followed the April 4, 1968, slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in Memphis.

Suits seeking millions of dollars have been filed by insurance companies and businesses in which both the city and federal authorities were named defendants.

The contention of the suits was that the city failed to provide adequate forces to quell the disturbances and to protect property. The federal government has been charged with being too slow in sending troops into the city after the riots began.

Today's ruling came in the case involving the G. C. Murphy Co. store at 3128–3130 14th St. NW., one of the areas in which the riot was centered. The insurance company charged the city was liable for some $936,613 in damages suffered in the destruction of the store.

The suit was dismissed in U.S. District Court after the government said the city was immune from such a suit.

Murphy's appealed the ruling, charging the city had a duty and obligation to "protect life and property during the riots. . . ."

Today's court ruling said that the unvarying response which the courts have given to such challenges, "is that . . . in the absence of legislation, municipalities and other governmental bodies are not financially responsible for destruction and injury wreaked by rioting mobs."

The court noted that no reported case holds the governmental body liable in the circumstances, or indicates that there could be liability without a statute or ordinance.

"It is agreed that there is now no such legislation for the District of Columbia. The problem for us, then, is whether we should move beyond the general rule and judicially create for the District a new principle of municipal responsibility. We will not do so," the court asserted.

NOT RULING ON MERITS

The court said because of the complexity of the claims it felt the ". . . legislative can, more easily and more comprehensively, obtain and evaluate the necessary information as to the differing financial impacts of the various methods of assessing responsibilities.

By imposing municipal liability for riot-caused damages ". . . we would be marching straight into a difficult region never before plotted by courts acting along," the court added.

The court said its decision ". . . does not in any way suggest that the victims of civil disturbances are undeserving of relief. But it is for the Congress (or other legislative body), not this court, to decide the extent to which those injured in the riot should be compensated regardless of the extent to which the police or military attempted to protect the particular property which each individual owns.

The opinion was written by Judge Oscar H. Davis, of the U.S. Court of Claims, sitting by designation, and Senior Circuit Judge Wilbur K. Miller and Judge Roger Robb, both of the U.S. Court of Appeals here.

HORTON COMMENDS EDITOR-PUBLISHER ANDREW D. WOLFE FOR HIS INTERVIEW OF FORMER AMBASSADOR EDWIN O. REISCHAUER

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, during these very unstable times in the Far East, it is highly interesting to know what a former U.S. Ambassador to Japan thinks about conditions in Asia. To get some pertinent answers concerned with these perplexing problems, a close and personal friend of mine, Andrew D. Wolfe, editor and publisher of the Genesee Valley Newspapers, Inc., of Greater Rochester, recently interviewed former Ambassador to Japan Edwin O. Reischauer.

Now professor of Japanese history at Harvard, Prof. Reischauer also served on the State Department staff and is given major credit for the U.S. success in rebuilding Japan as a democratic, peace-oriented nation. He probably has more influence than any other individual on U.S. policy in Southeast Asia, according to Mr. Wolfe. He was in Hong Kong recently for a meeting of Southeast Asian and American educators.

Andy Wolfe met and interviewed Professor Reischauer in the famed Old Peninsula Hotel in the Kowloon section of Hong Kong. It is a gray mass of a building centering on a large entrance courtyard. Though only 16 miles from the border of Communist China, the hotel maintains form, if not entirely the spirit, of the days of British colonialism. At teatime, according to Andy, in the elegant gold-ceilinged lobby, a stringed orchestra plays and platoons of waiters whisk burnished silver and sparkling china to guests.

It was in this hotel that Editor Wolfe talked with Professor Reischauer who is described as being a slender, energetic, and tremendously articulate man of 59 years. The actual interview was conducted in a third floor suite, overlooking busy Hong Kong harbor. Present was the former Ambassador's wife, the granddaughter of a former prime minister of Japan, where the Reischauers were to visit following their stay in Hong Kong.

May I share with my colleagues in the Congress the fascinating interview which recently appeared in the Brighton-Pittsford Post under the banner headline "Famed Asia Expert Looks for Relative Stability in the Far East:"

Question. Prof. Reischauer, what is your assessment of the U.S. campaign in Cambodia?

Answer. "In terms of reducing the immediate threat to South Vietnam, it probably has been successful. Tactically, it probably has reduced the pressure on South Vietnam for a number of months.

"But in terms of having expanded the war and involved the U.S. in Cambodia, I feel it has been a mistake. It might have been embarrassing if we had not gone in, but it will be even more embarrassing if Cambodia collapses a month or two after we pull out.

"Thus on balance, I feel the U.S. intervention has not been a success."

Question. What are your views on President Nixon's general policy in Vietnam?

Answer. "I've always believed that Nixon has wanted to get out of Vietnam, although some of my colleagues haven't. The problem for Nixon has been to get out without building up disillusionment among people on whom he depends for election."

Question. What do you recommend as a U.S. policy for Vietnam now?

Answer. "I think we should establish a definite date to accomplish troop withdrawal—by the end of 1971, for example. When American withdrawal becomes obvious to Saigon, they'll be able to make a tolerable deal with Hanoi. I think this can be done, and we ought to be out of Vietnam before the election campaign in 1972."

Question. Does this suggest that you think the Saigon regime has become reasonably strong?

Answer. "I think some progress has been made, although one of the university presidents at our meeting here is more pessimistic."

Question. Wouldn't China move in?

Answer. "I don't believe China will get into the position of trying to conquer small Southeast Asia countries. They have never tried to change their southern border in 900 years, and I think they are too rational to try to start now.

"They might try to stir up subversion in other countries, but up to now they haven't been very successful, and I don't think they will be. The revolution in Vietnam, for example, had already started in 1945, and they did not play a role in that."

Question. Should there be a continuing American presence in the Far East?

Answer. "I think that it is essential for America to play a role in Southeast Asia for some time to come. This should be expressed in two ways—

"First, economic contributions and aid, and

"Second, a military presence, but this can be done only with the consent and cooperation of the Japanese. If they weren't for it, it would be foolish for us to attempt a major military role in that part of the world.

"This military presence would be primarily in the form of preserving freedom of the seas. This would prevent any nation or group from taking over the entire area.

"Our presence also ought to have the potential of inhibiting thoughtless acts of agression by small powers which could bring on a major war.

"Finally, I think that our military presence should involve specific commitments to some areas, such as Japan and South Korea. South Korea is becoming so strong that we may be able to take our troops out of there in five or ten years. But there could be a danger if some elements in South Korea felt they were strong enough to take over the north by force.

"Control of the seas will make possible the protection of islands like Taiwan. But in general I think America should make its presence felt largely through its relationship with Japan."

Question. What about the Philippines?

Answer. "It appears that the value of military bases there is outweighed by the fact that they can be used as the basis for so much agitation."

Question. Isn't Japan becoming so strong that it can control what happens in Southeast Asia?

Answer. "Yes, I don't think the American people as a whole realize that Japan is potentially a third super-power, or a demi-super-power. Within three to five years, I think that Japan will have almost a veto on American power in this area. And by 1980 they might have a role in the Seventh Fleet. But I don't think the world is ready for a Japanese fleet to do all this."

Question. Do you believe there is a danger that a new isolationism, growing out of the Vietnam War, could lead America to quit Asia?

Answer. "This is a real danger. You hear it all the time with people asking that every dollar now going overseas be used for the blacks, or the poor. This is nonsense, for the one-third of the world that is prosperous must help the two-thirds that is poor.

"Our AID programs must be expanded and redirected. You've got to remember that they have been so ineffective because they've been used to strengthen military alliances rather than to help the economics of the nations involved."

Question. Isn't this what people object to as economic imperialism?

Answer. "The phrase 'economic imperialism' is a 19th century idea which doesn't mean anything. That whole concept is wrong. The problem is not to complain about economic nationalism, but to attract the investments of the outside world to these countries."

Question. Your comments suggest that you are optimistic about this part of the world. Is that so?

Answer. "Generally, yes, this is the fastest growing part of the world, and it has tremendous assets. Over the next 30 to 50 years it can play a central role. I think that overall there is the probability of continued economic growth and relative political and military stability."

Mr. Speaker, following their discussion of the Far East, Editor Wolfe asked Professor Reischauer for his thoughts about today's young people. While the professor is guardedly optimistic about hopes for peace and stability in Asia, he has a deep concern about America, particularly its youth. He said:

No society has had to contend with mass affluence. Economic realities in other societies have been a disciplining factor for youth. We have not yet discovered how to handle this situation.

The article continued:

The Harvard professor has been a leading critic of the Vietnamese War, but feels that causes of current youth problems go much deeper than opposition to the war.

"We seem to have been losing a sense of discipline—really self-discipline, and a free society cannot exist without self-discipline."

Reischauer said he thinks many factors have contributed to this situation—declining family authority, a growing permissiveness in the raising of children, and the "concept of instant gratification."

"There seems little comprehension of the complexity of problems which face society, and the intricate planning and actions which are needed to solve them."

The Harvard professor and former ambassador says he thinks that news media, notably TV, "may have helped bring about a vast change in the perception of reality. This generation may have a completely different understanding of time spans."

He continued:

"Much of the campus unrest really has nothing to do with the issues which are raised. It could be that what we face is a protest against a failure in child-raising."

He said that although some of these problems were appearing in most of the world's industrialized societies, the problems appeared far more severe in the United States, where affluence is most widespread.

He noted that in the Far East where family structures remain very strong, the problem is less.

He said he considers the problem to be "a major crisis." "I don't think society can go on in this direction," he said.

NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the national unemployment crisis is especially severe on Long Island where more than 6 percent of the labor force is now out of work. The situation is very bad and getting worse. The folly of deliberately creating unemployment to slow inflation has been proven, for the cost-of-living continues to climb paralleling the rise in unemployment.

There are a number of efforts underway on Long Island to stop the rise in unemployment and to restore full employment. One of the leading private groups in this effort is the Citizens Coalition To Save the Jobs on Long Island. I have been working with this group, composed of individuals from every segment of the labor force, and recently received a copy of a letter the coalition sent to the President based on a meeting I held with coalition representatives.

I deplore the callous policy of encouraging unemployment and regret the acceptance of this terrible situation by a complacent administration. I think we can return to full employment through a responsible use of our resources for vitally needed domestic projects including pollution control, housing, mass transit, and so forth.

It is also my belief that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help fight this problem through all available means. This is why I am pleased that the Comprehensive Manpower Act will be considered before the recess:

Because of the significance of this problem for the entire country and because of the especially bad unemployment problem on Long Island I would like to include in the RECORD the letter which the Citizens Coalition recently sent to the President:

THE CITIZENS' COALITION TO
SAVE THE JOBS ON LONG ISLAND
Greenvale, Long Island, N.Y.,
October 1, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Citizens' Coalition to Save the Jobs on Long Island is deeply involved in combating the problem of growing unemployment in this part of New York State. As part of our efforts, we have met with numerous public representatives, one of whom, the Honorable Lester Wolff, advised us to present our case to you along with a proposal that grew out of that meeting. Let me first indicate to you the nature of our organization and the problems that face us.

Included in our ranks are experts in the field of mathematics, who have applied their knowledge to analytical economics. Out of this work we have formulated a program to meet the economic crisis at hand. We have taken our program to the people in the form of a petition and found it to be widely supported. Besides obtaining thousands of signatures with very little effort, our program has been very well received when presented in public meetings and is in short what people know is needed.

Mr. President, before stating our basic program, let me remind you of the suffering and hardship that unemployment brings to the working man, i.e. he who has given this country its greatness. We see men who have worked hard for twenty years of their life being rewarded for their efforts by the humiliation and financial troubles of being jobless. These are men who are close to retirement and now lose the benefit of a pension. We see highly trained, well educated people now trying to scrape together a few dollars by selling frankfurters. We see people who are afraid to buy what the work force produces in an attempt to save money in case they become unemployed. People now go to bed thinking that perhaps tomorrow will be the last day on the job. Instead of seeing a doctor or dentist for a usual "check-up", people now let it go. And this, Mr. President, is only some of the immediate hardship. Let us not forget what followed the last time we were told "prosperity is just around the corner".

It should also be pointed out that the American people are literally being robbed of a decent life. At the same time unemployment grows, we have much work to do in the areas of mass transportation, housing, environmental control, medical research, education, rebuilding the cities and many other useful projects. We have the technical expertise and only have to put people to work.

We therefore claim that the greatest nation in the world can provide a decent job at decent pay for every American who wishes to work. These jobs should be aimed at the badly needed projects that were indicated and the burden of taxation to finance these programs should not be placed on these of ordinary means but on the super-rich and great corporations.

Upon the advice of the Honorable Lester Wolff and in harmony with the Nassau County Board of Supervisors we call upon you, Mr. President, to take the immediate step of sending a Presidential Task Force to Long Island with the sole purpose of working out a plan to put people to work on useful tasks. We feel this task force should have the power to allocate funds for useful projects that will employ people not unevenly make-work projects.

It should be the duty of this task force to spend the required amount of money needed to cure the unemployment crisis. We again stress that this money should create decent jobs, at decent pay, that benefit the community. Our analysis shows this to be sound economics and absolutely essential.

With regard to inflation, we feel that if the situation is severe enough to create unemployment the situation is then severe enough to institute price controls and a maximum profits tax. The working man should not bear the sole burden of a policy intended to curb inflation. Working people do not cause inflation—any shopper can see prices rising much faster than his salary—and should not be punished for it.

In concluding, it is again stressed that a Presidential Task Force as the one described is desperately needed and we sincerely hope that you take immediate action.

Thank you for considering this letter.

Sincerely,

FRANK BUIANOUCKAS,
Chairman.

SIMCHAT TORAH DEMONSTRATIONS OF SOLIDARITY WITH SOVIET JEWISH YOUTH

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill once described the Soviet Union as a "riddle wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma." That description of the U.S.S.R. remains true today, especially concerning the treatment of Soviet Jews by the Soviet Government.

Estimates of the number of Jews in the Soviet Union today range from 3 to 3.5 million, with 38 percent in the Russian Republic, 37 percent in the Ukraine, and 7 percent in Byelorussia, with the remaining 18 percent scattered throughout the other 12 Soviet Republics. There is little question today that this Jewish population is being placed under increasing pressures, and increasing discrimination despite Moscow's heated denials.

According to a number of observers, including Gunther Lawrence in his book "Three Million More?" the mounting Soviet antisemitism is being aimed at "genocide of the spirit rather than genocide of the flesh." It is evidently the aim of the Soviet Government to have the Russian Jewish minority fade away by being absorbed into the general culture of the areas in which they live.

These are harsh words, so before we give credence to them, we should weigh them carefully in the context of Russian history, Russian tradition, and Russian culture. It is necessary also to look at what has happened under 50 years of Soviet rule.

Parts of the U.S.S.R. are traditionally anti-Semitic. This is particularly true in western Russia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the Baltic States. This antisemitism flowered and flourished under the Tsars, resulting in the pogroms of 1905 and 1906.

Officially this attitude ended with the revolution. Within Soviet ideology, under the Soviet Constitution, and embodied in Soviet law, all nationalities are actively encouraged to perpetuate their group existence through cultural and educational institutions and activities in their own language.

Although the Soviet ideology is atheistic, all religions are also allowed—although certainly not encouraged.

During the first three decades of the Soviet regime, there was no question that the intent of this ideology, of a union of many cultures also included the Jews as well as the other 107 nationalities that make up the U.S.S.R. During that period there was a wide network of cultural and educational institutions and activities for Jews in Yiddish, which was recognized as their official national language. Before World War II, there was 10 permanent Yiddish theaters, while as late as 1940, 100,000 children attended Yiddish schools.

By 1949, under the Stalin repression, all Jewish communal-cultural institutions including publishing houses, were destroyed. The famed Jewish State Theater of Moscow was closed in 1949, and Yiddish actors, writers, and leaders were liquidated.

Although somewhat modified, the elements of this policy were carried on by Stalin's successors until today there is not a single Yiddish school or a single Yiddish class in the entire U.S.S.R.—this despite Soviet law which permits the organization of such classes at the request of 10 parents.

One need only look at the statistics of what has happened to Jewish religion in Russia to give further credence to Mr. Lawrence's charge of a "spiritual genocide," for in their religion lives the Jewish spirit.

As a result of both direct and indirect government action, from 1965 when 450 synagogues existed in the Soviet Union, it is now believed from non-Soviet sources that the number has shrunk to 60 today. There are no rabbinical schools or seminaries at all. Thus there is no replacement for the handful of aging rabbis who still carry on.

No Judiastic periodicals or devotional literature can be published—no prayer books, no journals, no bibles. No prayer shawls or phylacteries, essential to the services can be produced. There can be no meaningful official contact with coreligionists abroad. All these restrictions are peculiar to the Jewish religion alone. Except in isolated instances they cannot even publish religious calendars, indispensible as guides to religious holidays and observances.

There is evidence of discrimination in university enrollment and in job opportunities if your name is Jewish. Few Jews hold high army or diplomatic positions any more, and none are left in the party leadership.

Take all these moves together—hold them up against the traditional anti-Semitic background of many areas of the U.S.S.R.—and it seems pretty clear that there was a hope on the part of the Soviet leadership that the Jew would fade away into the nationalities of the various states. Strangle their religion, dry up their books, let their traditions die and the Jews die—not physically, but spiritually. Hence, Mr. Lawrence's term "spiritual genocide."

But then came a paradox.

For official identification purposes, Soviet Jews are identified by nationality. Jewish internal passports are marked with the letter "ye" for "yevrei" or Hebrew. If one parent is non-Jewish, there is a choice of nationality at age 16, when the child is issued his internal passport.

But unlike Armenians, Ukranians, or Uzbecks, the Soviet Jew has no national state within the Soviet Union. The only official "Hebrew" state—the way his passport is marked—happens to be outside the Soviet Union. It happens to be Israel. And this fact has affected the Soviet Jewish youth.

Fifty years after the revolution, 35 years after the last period in Russia when Jewish education and study was permitted, it is the young people and not the old who have become militantly Jewish and militantly Zionist and are creating a revival of the Jewish consciousness.

This took many observers by surprise. A gradual drying of interest in Judaism had been predicted. It seemed quite logical that Jewish youth without access to synagogues, reading no Jewish books, and having no Jewish cultural life, would become less and less Jewish and gradually assimilate into Russian society.

Probably the most important single factor in the development of the young Russian Jews has been the development of a free Israel since 1948. There was a state and a people with which they could identify. A state where their religion was practiced, their books read, their traditions preserved, the richness of their cultural heritage known.

In many respects the attitude of the young Jews of Russia are reminiscent of the blacks in our own Negro civil rights movement. They talk of needing first to overcome the "self-hatred" pushed on them by their society. They protest against the idea of "assimilation" as a solution to their problems. They seek spiritual identity not spiritual absorption.

This movement has not yet reached the point of militant Jews taking over the dean's office. It has reached the point where they openly celebrate their religious holidays in front of the few remaining synagogues. It has led to the establishment of an underground Jewish press, and clandestine classes in Hebrew. It has also reached the point where 60 Jews from Moscow and Leningrad had the courage to sign their names and addresses to a statement denouncing the government sponsored Jews who had denounced the State of Israel.

To judge this courage in its proper light, we must remember that they did this in a country where many dissenters still find themselves committed to mental institutions for observation and treatment, while still others are sent to Siberia.

Now from the paradox of this resurgence of a militant Judaism comes a modern dilemma.

Because of the situation in the Mideast, and the Russians' pro-Arab foreign policy, the Russian internal policy is becoming violently anti-Israel and anti-Zionist.

This anti-Zionism has resulted in police raids on Zionist headquarters, and a flood of anti-Israel, anti-Zionist, and anti-Semitic articles in the official press. I have read that some of these attacks, both in the text and in the pictures, equals or is reminiscent of Tsarist Russia, or the Nazi anti-Semitic weekly, "Der Sturmer."

And there seems good reason for the Russian Jew to worry. In the official anti-Zionist attacks—which the authorities state are not anti-Semitic, the Israeli and the government of Israel are routinely called aggressors, murderers, and Nazis. And to Russians and Russian Jews alike there is a very thin line between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. Code phrases like "anti-Zionism" have a long and grisly history in Russian.

In 1953, the phrase was "Doctors' Plot" but it was Jews who were killed or went to Labor Camps. More recently in 1961, we all remember the attack on "economic criminals" which turned out to be mostly

Jews who received the sentences. But the fear of anti-Zionism is greater, for if Russia continues to blame her problems on the State of Israel, it is a frighteningly short step in the average Russian's mind to make the Russian Jew share that blame.

But let me stress here that at the moment there is no strong anti-Semitic movement as we historically are used to the term. There is no outright pogrom—there are no public attacks on Jews or the property of Jews, and even the Moscow Synagogue is unguarded and unmolested. There may be fear that such acts could develop given the present anti-Israel, anti-Zionist attacks by the Soviet Government, but it would overstate the facts to say anything of that nature exists today. Let us pray it never does.

So, attracted from outside by the existence of a free Jewish state, and pressed from the inside by a rising militant Judaism and a fear of public reaction to the anti-Zionist attacks by the Government, the desire to emigrate—to leave Russia and go to Israel—has grown. Large numbers of Russian Jews want to flee that country.

In principle, this should be easy. In fact it is not.

In principle, the U.S.S.R. confirms the concept of emigration as a basic human right acknowledged in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article XIII, which the Soviets support. In fact, no meaningful number of Jews have been permitted to leave.

At a Paris press conference in 1966, when pressed on the subject, Premier Kosygin stated that there would be no objection to emigration from Russia to reunite families. Even this—which is a considerable lessening of the rights ascribed to under article XIII, of the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights—has not been honored.

To date only a minute trickle have been granted permission to join families in Israel or other countries, while tens of thousands of applications have been refused. How large this drive to emigrate may be, no one knows, as requests for emigration visas have increasingly become the cause of prosecution and persecution by Soviet governmental agencies. In addition to job loss, demotion and other subtle forms of persecution, to date 32 Jews who asked to leave Russia have gone not to Israel, but to Soviet prisons.

The reasons for the Russian attitude toward Soviet Jews is one of those mysterious wrapped in an enigma of which Mr. Churchill spoke.

No one supposes that the full 3.5 million Jews would leave even if they had the choice. Emigration is a nonreversible, drastic step in any person's life, and many Russian Jews consider themselves Russian first, last and always.

With the growth of militant Judaism and militant Zionism, and the increasing tensions these cause, it would seem logical for the Soviet Government to "let the troublemakers go." While in Israel I discussed this point with Deputy Prime Minister Yigal Allon.

He stated it to be his view that the refusal to allow such emigration had its root in Soviet ideology which holds that no one can be unhappy under the Communist system. Any large emigration—even a sign of flight—would in the Soviet mind indicate to the world that their worker's paradise, with equal justice to every minority, was a failure. It takes little knowledge of history to know that the Berlin Wall was not built to keep down the flow of emigrants from West to East Germany. It is not just Jews, they do not want to let any people go.

When I asked Mr. Allon what we could do in a practical sense to help, he said he felt that this same sensitivity to world opinion could be used to soften the Russian attitude toward Soviet Jews and to speed up emigration. That is if we—all of us, Jewish and other communities around the world, the free governments of the world—through the U.N. and in every way available to us, keep up a pressure for emigration as a basic human right as subscribed to under article XIII by the Soviet Union, it would soften the Soviet position.

That such a sensitivity to world opinion does exist has been demonstrated in small ways at different times. For example it has resulted in the printing of a few Jewish books in Yiddish or Russian, a lifting of the ban on the making of matzoh, the printing of 10,000 prayer books. Token though these may be, they do indicate that Soviet officials are becoming increasingly concerned about the unfavorable impressions of Soviet life circulating abroad.

Of course, these token steps still fail totally to provide the basic cultural and religious instrumentalities essential for Jewish survival in Russia, just as the minute trickle of immigration so far allowed totally fails to satisfy the demand to leave the Soviets.

With the view of bringing this form of pressure to bear on the Soviet Government, on October 8, 1970, I introduced in the House of Representatives a concurrent resolution which, if passed, will make it the sense of Congress that first, persecution by the Soviet Union of any person because of his religion should be condemned; and second, the President of the United States is urgently requested to take immediate action through diplomatic contacts to negotiate permission for Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel or to other countries willing to receive them.

When Gunther Lawrence asked with the title of his book the question, "Three Million More?" he is asking whether we in the civilized world can allow the possibility of either the physical or spiritual death of 3 million more Jews to be added to the 6 million who died in Nazi death camps.

I say, "No" we cannot. Not 3 million, not 300, not even three. That is my pledge and I pray it will be the pledge of every civilized nation and individual on earth.

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLORY REVIEWS KEY ISSUES OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, of the more than 26,000 bills which have been introduced in the 91st Congress, only a small percentage will enjoy consideration, and even fewer will be enacted. Despite this fact, at the time of the October recess, over 400 bills have become law.

The House of Representatives alone, has sat for a record 322 days in this period and has filled more than 68,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with debate.

It will not be possible to discuss in this brief report each and every measure on which I have voted. Every bill upon which the Congress acts affects, in some direct or indirect way, every citizen of this nation. I have selected legislation which I feel is of the widest interest to residents of the 12th District, and will report my position on these measures. More detailed information on any vote which I have cast is available through my congressional office, and inquiry from 12th District residents will be welcomed.

POLLUTION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Since the 12th District of Illinois borders on one of this country's great bodies of water, I, like many of my neighbors in Lake, McHenry, and Cook Counties, have become acutely aware of the deteriorating condition of Lake Michigan. As the Representative of this great district, I have felt a special responsibility for the lake. Early in the 91st Congress, I made a commitment to myself to attempt to obtain an infusion of Federal funds to assist the North Shore Sanitary District in completing its sewage treatment construction program, and introduced legislation to authorize $25 million for facilities to remove polluting wastes from the Lake Michigan Watershed. Following hearings on the bill, at which I testified, an amendment was adopted on the floor which embodied much of that which I had sought in my bill. The amendment provided $20 million for pollution control in the Great Lakes. The bill was signed into law as the Water Quality Improvement Act in April 1970.

The North Shore Sanitary District applied, with my support, for a Federal grant totaling almost $12 million, to augment the $35 million approved by the voters of the 12th District. The President announced his approval of this grant a short time ago, and I am delighted to report that this Federal contribution will enable us to continue our attack on the crucial problem of water pollution in a more meaningful way. In addition, appropriation of funds for the Great Lakes Naval Training Center also will help the North Shore Sanitary District to complete its plan to eliminate sewage effluents from Lake Michigan.

Surely, few issues have been more actively discussed and weighed by all segments of our population than that of the

environment. I share that concern, and have supported legislation to establish a Council on Environmental Quality; strengthen air pollution control measures, extending the program to include research relating to fuel and vehicles; establish national air quality standards, including pollution due to planes, autos, and fuels; and to encourage the recovery and utilization of solid waste materials; as well as other relevant bills.

EDUCATION

Emphasis remains strong on the quality of education in this country, as well as the availability of that quality education. I feel a particular concern for the problems of education in this Nation, and have, as a Member of the House, voted for passage of bills which would extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—including funds for impacted aid, adult basic education, Indian schools, teachers in disadvantaged areas, and so forth—through 1972; make available an additional $100 million for needy children not now being reached by the National School Lunch Act; put the special milk program for children on a permanent basis; and provide emergency student loan guarantees. With respect to the handicapped, I supported legislation to establish a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the handicapped and additional legislation to provide educational aid to programs for gifted and handicapped children.

Perhaps the most controversial vote relating to education was my vote to override the President's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill—and it was one of the most difficult votes I cast during the 91st Congress. The House and Senate passed a bill which increased the President's budget request by $1.1 billion, earmarking most of the additional moneys for educational purposes. The President vetoed the bill, and on national television stated that he considered the veto necessary because of inflationary pressures in our economy.

As a Republican Member of the House of Representatives, I feel a strong sense of loyalty to President Nixon and his legislative policies, understanding that only with the support of the members of his own party can he hope to implement the policies he believes necessary to solve this Nation's problems. On the other hand, one of the programs most seriously affected by the veto provided school assistance in federally impacted areas. These payments are given by the Government to school districts in lieu of property taxes for children whose parents reside in the school district and are employed by the Federal Govenment. The 12th District receives almost 50 percent of all impact funds coming to the State of Illinois. There are criticisms—some of them deserved—of the impact aid program. However, I believe that before drastic cuts are made, some alternative method should be devised to meet the Federal burden in this area. Despite political loyalty to the President, I was also aware of my obligations to the residents of the 12th District to fight for programs I believe to be in their best interests and in the best interests of the American people. An additional concern stemmed from the fact that the proposed drastic cut would create particularly difficult problems for schools in North Chicago and Waukegan, which serve a substantial number of students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Ultimately, I voted with 26 other Republicans to override the President's veto. We were unsuccessful. A second education appropriations bill was then passed by the Congress and sent to the President for signature. This bill augmented the budget request by about $650 million, as compared to the $1.1 billion of the original bill. Although I opposed the cuts, the bill did provide $440 million for impact aid, and I supported the appropriation which was, at that point, long overdue.

CRIME

One of the most crucial—and universally recognized—issues during the 1968 elections was that of crime in the streets. This Congress has taken action to wage a campaign against street crime, white-collar crime, and crime connected with drug abuse. Because of my assignment on the Judiciary Committee, I have been directly involved in some of the most controversial legislation considered in this Congress.

In 1970, the House, with my support, approved legislation reported from the Judiciary Committee to increase funding for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—an agency within the Justice Department charged with the administration and distribution of large sums of Federal money to State and local law enforcement agencies, to assist in upgrading, training, and procedures. Organized crime presents a somewhat different picture, and the solutions are not to be sought in the appropriation of funds as much as in the revamping of criminal procedures—the closing of loopholes—so that prosecutors can be more effective in dealing with the white-collar crime problem, that of the crime syndicate. As a member of the committee, I participated in long hours of hearings and extensive markup sessions before voting to bring the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, consisting of 12 titles, to the House floor. In addition to the provisions dealing with syndicate crime, the bill also establishes Federal controls over the interstate commerce in explosives—and provides the death penalty for fatal bombings.

Drug abuse is receiving increased attention throughout the Nation. I am delighted to report that I supported wholeheartedly a comprehensive measure, directed at treatment, rehabilitation, prevention, and education with respect to drug use, as well as toward strengthening drug laws and enforcement.

To the sorrow of the Nation, Washington, D.C., at the beginning of the 91st Congress, was in the forefront of the rising crime rate. The Congress legislates the laws of the District of Columbia, and, in the second session, we passed—and I supported—the omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia. It contains controversial sections—such as the "no-knock" provision applicable in certain circumstances for entries and searches, and the "preventive detention" clause allowing the detention for 60 days of persons in certain circumstances who are awaiting trial and are found to be dangerous to the community. The measures contain substantial provisions to safeguard individual rights. While there may be a constitutional test of these provisions, I became convinced, after thorough research, that both are necessary and constitutional.

There have been other dramatic issues in this Congress. We have been faced with legislation to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President—which I supported. If passed by the Senate, this measure would have extended the one man-one vote principle to the election of our President and Vice President.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The 91st Congress voted to extend the 1965 Voting Rights Act, due to expire in 1970. This act was designed to facilitate registration and voting in those areas of the country where black participation in the political process was severely limited. It has proven to be enormously successful, yet the task it was passed to achieve has not yet been completed. I supported the simple extension of the original act. Although this effort was originally unsuccessful in the House, it eventually passed in the form I favored—and which had the overwhelming backing of Civil Rights advocates.

LEGISLATIVE REFORM

This Congress has seemed to lend itself to disposing of issues which have been discussed for years. No legislation points that up more dramatically than the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, of which the Congress can be justly proud. It has been 24 years since the Congress last amended its ways of doing business. The legislation—for which I have worked since 1965, and which I supported by testimony, amendment, Floor speeches, and finally, my vote—has significantly improved the operations of both the House and Senate. Minority interests are protected, procedures are streamlined—including the acceptance of my amendment permitting electronic voting to replace the arduous roll call system which has occupied fully one-fourth of the time of the Congress in any given session—and, most importantly, a great deal that was previously secret will be made public. Virtually all committee meetings will be opened; public television coverage of committee hearings will be permitted; and previously unrecorded votes in the House and in Committee will now be recorded and made public.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

The problems of this Nation are as diverse as its citizens, and the solutions must be sought and assessed with a sense of relative urgency and priorities against the broad spectrum of the general welfare of our citizens and the health of our Nation—economically and spiritually.

In the face of once-rampant inflation, which is now hopefully being checked and stabilized, those on fixed incomes, those on the lower rungs of the employable ladder, those who are unemployable, those who are at the starting point of

an average married life—all have their individual and, in many cases, critical problems. I have supported legislation to provide an increase in social security benefits and to set the tax base at a more realistic figure; to establish a new family assistance plan, providing benefits to those who work, or who register for employment or job training, and day care for children to free mothers for employment or job training.

With regard to the elderly, we have provided that those over 65 who were ineligible for hospital insurance under medicare, may now secure such coverage, provided they pay the full premium. Also, we have authorized a study on possible inclusion of chiropractic care under medicare.

I have supported bills to strengthen the warning label on cigarettes; to permit lending of mortgage money for VA loans out of the National Service Life Insurance funds; to authorize a disbursement of $250 million to provide funds for mortgage financing at reduced rates of interest to FHA-approved home buyers; to increase rates of pensions payable to veterans of World War I and later wars, and their survivors, as well as monthly rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities; to provide occupational safety and health standards; to limit the amount of subsidy that may be paid an individual farmer under the Agricultural Act to $55,000; to reorganize the Post Office, so that it will operate as a Government corporation.

SUMMARY

This Congress has set a record for its length. The spectrum of American national concern has been reflected in the more than 90 messages the President has sent to Congress—messages in the areas of electoral college reform; domestic programs; income tax; organized crime; hunger and malnutrition; selective service; drugs; population; welfare; public transportation; education; Indian policy; labor disputes; environmental quality; social security, and so on.

We are a people involved. This is a time of dramatic interest by, and activity on the part of, the citizens of this Nation. Improved communications, increased leisure time, growing educational opportunities, all have combined to make the American citizen more responsive and more vocal on matters of national concern.

There are great and critical issues before us—and because the problems are great, the challenges are great. The exciting opportunity for extraordinary achievement, involvement, and change is with us. It is indeed a time for greatness if we but rise to meet the challenge.

The Congress has sought to rise to that challenge. Because of the divergence of political control, there is also a divergence of philosophy and approach. The art of compromise involving a President of one party and a Congress of the other, tends in some instances to neutralize what might have been dramatic results.

We seem to have merely skimmed the surface in this narrative. I prepare a weekly newsletter on matters of current legislative interest, and this newsletter is reprinted in most of the local newspapers that circulate in the 12th District of Illinois. More detailed information may be secured by writing to me as follows: Congressman ROBERT MCCLORY, 426 Cannon Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

GROWING SUPPORT FOR A STRONG AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1970, the House passed a Clean Air Act.

But in late July the entire eastern half of the United States suffered severe air pollution attacks as a pall of smog hung over our major cities. The frightening experience of late July demonstrated, if we did not realize it before, the severity of air pollution problems.

As a result, on September 22, the Senate passed the National Air Quality Standards Act of 1970. This clean air bill is stronger than the House version because it sets a definite timetable for a 90-percent reduction in automobile pollution. It also requires that all new plants and factories be built utilizing the latest and best air pollution control equipment.

Because it is vitally important that the stronger Senate clean air bill be passed, 44 Members on the House side have introduced the Senate passed version in the House of Representatives. This is an indication of our concern for the health of all Americans. Other cosponsors are expected in the near future.

The difference between the House and Senate versions is currently being resolved in a conference committee, and I want to commend the House conferees for already agreeing to major provisions of the Senate bill.

Below is a list of the House Members already cosponsoring the House version as well as an article from the October 9, 1970 Wall Street Journal describing the fine work of the conference committee to date.

COSPONSORS

Mr. Addabbo.
Mr. Bell.
Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Button.
Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Clark.
Mr. Clay.
Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Donahue.
Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Ellberg.
Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Fascell.
Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Gaydos.
Mr. Gude.
Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Hechler of West Virginia.
Mr. Koch.
Mr. Lowenstein.
Mr. Madden.
Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Mikva.
Mr. Moorhead.
Mr. Olsen.
Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Patten.
Mr. Pike.
Mr. Podell.
Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Rees.
Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Wolff.
Mr. Yates.

CONFEREES SET TO RETAIN 1975 AS DEADLINE FOR SLASHING POLLUTION FROM CAR EXHAUSTS

WASHINGTON.—Legislation commanding the auto industry to slash exhaust pollution by 1975 appeared to clear a formidable hurdle in Congress.

A conference committee of House members and Senators tentatively agreed to keep that deadline in the final text of a clean-air bill, according to a jubilant Sen. Muskie (D., Maine). The agreement, if it sticks, sharply improves chances that the bill can be enacted before Congress adjourns.

Last month, the Senate unanimously passed a measure requiring auto makers to achieve by Jan. 1, 1975, a 90 percent reduction in exhaust pollutants from the level currently permitted by Federal regulations. The industry could get a one-year postponement of that deadline if it convinces Federal authorities it tried faithfully to meet the low-emission goal, but just couldn't make it.

The Senate bill, sponsored by Sen. Muskie, was a shocker to Detroit. Auto executives personally lobbied against the 1975 deadline, and General Motors Corp.'s president, E. N. Cole, told Sen. Muskie that achieving the 90 percent emission cut "simply isn't technologically possible within the time frame required." Industry engineers hadn't been shooting for such low emission levels until 1980.

The industry had hopes of softening the requirement in the conference of House members and Senators. In June, the House passed a clean-air bill dealing mainly with pollution from factories, not vehicles, and the House conferees could have refused to accept the Senate's tough exhaust deadline. Some Congressional sources were predicting a drawn-out conference fight.

But at their very first meeting yesterday, the conferees stuck a tentative bargain that Sen. Muskie said would "preserve the deadline on automobiles." He said the agreement would retain the 90 percent requirement, the Jan. 1, 1975, target, and the potential one-year grace period.

In return, the Senate conferees agreed to a House proposal for a continuous monitoring of technological progress on auto-pollution control by the National Academy of Sciences, an organization that does various scientific chores for the Government. House conferees reasoned the academy would be an impartial umpire on the question of whether technological progress is too slow to meet the 1975 deadline. If the academy advises Congress between now and 1975 that the deadline is too strict, Congress could move it back.

The agreement was described as tentative because staff aides must still draft exact language outlining the academy's functions.

"It's very reassuring to have this resolved so quickly," said Sen. Muskie. The conferees won't meet again until next month, when Congress returns after the election for its lame-duck session. There are wide differences to be resolved in House and Senate versions of proposed controls on pollution from factories.

THE UNIVERSITY TODAY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, while pundits, politicians and cocktail party circuit riders continue to debate the findings and recommendations of the Scranton Commission report on campus unrest—which most have not bothered to read—another group of persons—our college and university presidents—are quietly going about the day-to-day job of administering our institutions of higher learning. They know full well that the primary responsibility for maintaining campus order rests with them and depends upon their abilities to exercise leadership and obtain the cooperation and support of the university community. They know from past experience that fools rush in where leaders fear to tread and that they therefore have a special responsibility to fill that leadership vacuum. They know too that students, faculty and the taxpaying publice are looking to them to defuse the explosive potential for violence and infuse the dynamic potential for intellectual ferment and constructive change.

One who is demonstrating these leadership qualities is President John T. Bernhard of Western Illinois University in Macomb, Ill. Characteristic of his leadership is the convocation address which he delivered to the WIU student body on September 15, 1970. In that address he presented the problems of war, racism, the environment and the university as challenges for the new generation of students to deal with constructively. He inveighed against the fanatics of the revolutionary left who "find themselves in what I call the Vietnam syndrome—they feel they must destroy the university in order to save it."

He goes on to point out how perverted this form of logic really is:

> These are the nihilists, who claim that only through destruction can a great and new society be built. How wrong, how terribly wrong they are! Because in destroying the university, they destroy the foundation stones of the society itself. They destroy all hope that society has for reform, growth and happiness. What a better legacy to leave the future generations of men and women. The university must be dedicated to the torch of learning (not the torch of destruction) aloft and alive. . . . to the pursuit of learning in peace.

He warns of the trend toward campus politicization which could transform the university into an "ideological football," thus inviting polarization and the destruction of scholarship and learning. In his words:

> The rule of reason must prevail or the university faces inevitable disaster.

That is not to say, states President Bernhard, that students should not be concerned about the great social issues of our times, but that the portrayal of concern should be in the "reasonable context" of a "nonviolent commitment to truth and social progress."

He disputes and refutes the premise that damage to property is somehow justified on the grounds that property is symbolic of inanimate materialism. Not only does this overlook the dangers of human injury but "the human factor which inheres in property."

He concludes by saying that not only should the students be provoked by the challenges they confront, but that they should channel their idealism to meet and resolve those challenges. While they may be impatient, exasperated and frustrated at the slow pace of change, they should recognize that change is inevitable and that the central challenge to them is in determining the direction and tempo of that change.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include the full text of President Bernhard's excellent convocation address and commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The address follows:

ADDRESS TO NEW STUDENTS, WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1970

(By President John T. Bernard)

At the very outset, before welcoming you as newcomers to the campus, I would like to introduce two of our pioneers and trailblazers at Western—two individuals who are heading up two very significant programs that typify the forward thrust we are trying to sustain at this institution. I wanted you to see them, and then perhaps have the opportunity through this coming year to make their acquaintance in depth. First, I will introduce our new University Ombudsman, Mr. Don Daudelin. And next, I'd like you to meet Mr. Charles Evans, who is the new Director of the Black Studies Program and Assistant Dean of Special Projects.

Mr. Daudelin is our new ombudsman for students. Some of you may not know exactly what that is, but he is really—a quick shorthand expression—the "chief gripe officer." If you've got any complaint about the so-called faceless bureaucracy at Western Illinois University, Mr. Daudelin is the man to see. And he has an ample supply of kleenex in his office, too! Seriously, we expect Mr. Daudelin to serve as the chief advocate of the students, and to ably represent their concerns and interests on this campus.

Mr. Evans comes to us after a long experience in the area of black cultural studies. He is a man who is very well trained, educated, and interested in the broad process of higher education. We look to him for leadership in Black Studies, in the development of Reach-Out Services, and also in the further growth of the Brooks Cultural Center for our black students at Western.

We feel that these two major programs, among others, are extremely important for the modern university; and we expect these two gentlemen to provide us with the leadership, and intelligent direction that we need.

I'm very happy to greet you on this occasion. It's one of those rare moments in a school year where I do have an opportunity to address such a large audience. During the year, I meet with many small groups; but this is one of my few chances to speak to such a large student gathering.

I bid you a very warm welcome! I hope that things are going reasonably smooth for you in adjusting to your living quarters, and in getting ready for your course work. I recognize that there are many problems. I wish that the weather could have been better for you, your parents, and friends who came a few days ago. I also wish that our adjoining roads could have been in better shape. There's one thing you soon discover when you're a university president: Certain things are definitely beyond your control, and two of these are the condition of the streets and the weather!

I dislike bringing up serious matters at this otherwise-festive occasion, but I really think that our perilous times justify some rather sober comments from me—comments which I hope will be of some provocative interest to you; and even though you may not agree with my remarks, I do hope you will give them fair consideration.

You come from many different walks of life. There is a very interesting cross-section at Western. We have students from rural background, students from urban centers, students who are well-to-do or wealthy; we have those of middle-income, and others from the poor sector of our society. We have students who are black, white, brown, yellow, with mixtures of all kinds. Thus, you bring to this campus a certain rich thread of diverse culture, of insight, of social experience, all of which adds to the total quality of university life. You also bring different motivations to W.I.U. Some of you, I daresay most of you, are interested in preparing for a career. The specific career, of course, is something that some of you may not have chosen yet; but you do recognize that the university contains those ingredients that are needed to prepare you for professional or employment opportunities.

But this is not enough. The university has to mean more than just that. You should also broaden your spectrum of knowledge about your world, your culture, yourself. We hope that you will widen yor appreciation of things so that you may add color and zest to your lives when you leave these academic halls.

We expect you to learn more about the specific problems of society. We don't want you to regard this campus as an ivory tower seated on a patch of green, completely surrounded by a deep moat which cuts you off from the outside world. In so learning about the problems of society you will be able to contribute significantly to the solutions that are so sorely needed. A rather tired, calloused, jaded world doesn't seem to be able to come up with dynamic answers. In this connection, I'd like to quote an important statement from Robert Hutchins:

"What education can do, and perhaps all it can do, is to produce a trained mind. It is principles, and everlastingly principles, not data, not facts, not helpful hints, but principles which the rising generation requires if it is to find its way through the maze of tomorrow. No man among us can tell what tomorrow will be like. All we know with certainty is that it will be different from today."

Those words were uttered over thirty years ago, but they still have a refreshing cogency which I would like to leave with you today.

I have mentioned the serious problems of society. What are these? I could go through an encyclopedic list, but that's not very useful for this occasion. However, let me draw your attention to a few which I consider extremely critical, and which should be very meaningful to you as a new generation of university students. Although I label these as problems, and problems indeed they are, I would hope that with your youthful energy and idealism you can look upon them as challenges to be met and to be resolved.

The first serious challenge I'd like to present to you is war—a very simple but dreadful three-letter word—war! War is the uniquely human invention of institutionalized violence and destruction. It's the terrible, malignant cancer of all mankind. It exists in our world today as a monumental confession of human failure. When all else fails, when human reason collapses, when good will among men is destroyed, war is the last resort of barbarians. Why has war persisted for so long? Why have past generations failed to bring peace? Address your minds and your hearts to these questions, and then you will be making a contribution of great significance. This institutionalized violence we call war has external and internal implications.

Externally, we see the obvious arenas of conflict—Indo-China and the Middle East. And in the Middle East we have further the

supreme irony of seeing the Holy Land transformed into a bloody cockpit. In addition to these formal theatres of war, there are also brutal assassinations, hi-jackings, and kidnappings of international power politics. However, while we may stand hesitantly on the brink of oblivion there is still opportunity for change in the offing. Our best chance is that young people, like yourselves, will accept the challenge and come up with new thinking, new spirit, a new world. We need your dedication to peace; we need your spirit, brains, enthusiasm and your idealism. These are not idle words. The world calls for your saving support.

The internal applications of institutionalized violence can be seen clearly at home today. In our land, as well as in other lands over the globe, a bitter stream of venomous hatred seems to pour out—bomb threats, deadly explosions, ambushes in the cities, arson, gang warfare. This stream withers everything it touches, turning the hearts of men against each other. To what end? To the end that we shall destroy each other? Heaven spare us that! But this is a somber consideration to which I think youth must address itself.

Another major challenge is racism—the racism of today's world. Can we really achieve freedom and justice for all, which is a part of the American dream, regardless of race, color or creed? Or are these only words, mere words, mere rhetoric? Further, do we have enough time to bring about the reforms and the necessary adaptations to the changes that we desperately need? Let us hope so. Your willingness to actually make these changes, to live by them, to achieve the necessary adaptations, to live in a flexible social order will inevitably pave the way to a future of justice and freedom for all. And the speed with which this is accomplished will depend upon the success of your own adaptation to the needs of this perilous time in human history.

May I now say a brief word to the black students who are gathered here? I say this very sincerely and without any note of condescension. I want all of you to know that you are welcome here—most warmly and heartily. We want you to succeed at Western as you progress toward your objectives in life. And I can pledge to you that the administration of this University is thoroughly committed to the proposition that you will receive justice and fair play here. Further, I will undertake all steps humanly possible to make sure that this condition is fully achieved on our campus.

In truth, sad to say, you will meet some bigots during your experience at Western, both on and off campus. I wish it could be otherwise; I sincerely wish it could be, but human nature being what it is, you will probably encounter some crude or subtle bigotry. However, and I wish to emphasize this—I am confident that the great majority of white students on this campus would like to be your sympathetic friends. They do want to relate to and understand some of the problems that black students and black citizens face today in America.

May I therefore offer a message of counsel—simply a few words of advice—please don't turn off white students with scorn, contempt, or sarcastic put-on when they try to show you friendship and concern. Of course, your hurts and grievances are certainly real and they are deep; and I know that they are bitter enough! Human history is replete with ample evidence of the cruel injustices inflicted upon the black man. But please, I beseech you, don't turn your backs on those who sincerely want to make amends for the failures of past generations. And I also hope that all of the white students on our campus would enter into this friendly understanding with the same spirit of fellowship and brotherhood. After all, we are in this world together; we're all on this same polluted spaceship; we all face problems of such great complexity that they transcend barriers of color, creed, nationality, or of any other discriminating element you wish to mention.

Another grave challenge deals with our environment. Have you ever asked these questions: What kind of an America do I want to live in? What type of world shall all humanity dwell in? The progressive contamination of all earth, air and water, if continued on unchecked, will lead inexorably to the destruction of all of us—black, white, rich, poor, Christian, Jew, Moslem; it makes no difference. Pollution and contamination do respect any boundary lines in humanity. To what extent are you actually concerned about the quality of life? If you are not, I urge you to think very seriously about these aspects of human existence.

There's an additional implication here. Beyond being concerned about the pollution of our earth sphere, what kind of a physical environment shall we have for our future world? What will 21st Century urbanism be like? What kind of monster cities will we have? What will our factories be like? What will be the design of our homes, our neighborhoods? Buckminister Fuller and others have just begun to tap the tremendous sources of environmental knowledge which we need to build happier and healthier lives in the years ahead. I am talking of your time in history—your century. You should be concerned about the plight of the world for yourselves and for your fellow human beings. Your ideas, your diligence, your zest, your energy are desperately needed here also.

The last but not the least serious challenge I offer you is the university itself. The university—not just Western Illinois University—but the American university in general. What is the condition of the campus today? Clearly the university is beset by mortal enemies—enemies who are intent upon destroying it in one way or another; they can be classified as either of the revolutionary left or the reactionary right.

The fanatics of the revolutionary left would like "to burn the cathedral to fry an egg"! Ironically, they find themselves in what I call the Vietnam syndrome—they feel they must destroy the university in order to save it. These are the nihilists who claim that only through destruction can a great and new society be built. How wrong, how terribly wrong they are! Because in destroying the university, they destroy the foundation stones of society itself. They destroy all hope that society has for reform, growth, and happiness. What a bitter legacy to leave the future generations of men and women!

And what of the sour zealots of the reactionary right? To impose their dogmatic concept of order they are very quick to bypass due process of law and to trample upon personal and academic freedom. In their own wildly radical way, they also aim to kill the heart of the free and open university.

The university must be dedicated to keep the torch of learning (not the torch of destruction) aloft and alive. All within the university context must be committed to this great cause; and I mean students, faculty, administrators, civil service personnel—all must be dedicated to the pursuit of learning, *in peace*. If we are not united on this issue—all of us within the university family—then we jointly become a vulnerable target for that self-serving opportunism of which we read much lately.

The university cannot become politicized, and thus be transformed into an ideological football; in so doing it literally invites destruction. The campus could tear itself apart as factions and cliques form, fighting each other with increased ferocity and eventually destroying the very life of scholarship and learning. The university must sponsor and protect the honest search for truth. There must be a very deep and abiding faith in the rule of reason on a campus. In essence, the rule of reason must prevail or the university faces inevitable disaster.

I pledge to you here and now, so that there will be no doubt in anyone's mind, I shall continue to do everything in my power—everything that is humanly possible—to make sure that Western Illinois University serves society as an open, free, self-respecting and unintimidated institution of higher learning!

In my opinion, this is my solemn charge as president of this school. If I did not live up to that charge, I would be clearly derelict in my duty. Obviously, I cannot meet this charge alone. I will need the support of all members of the university community; and you students form the major portion of that community. Without your support, without your encouragement, without your adoption of the rule of reason, I cannot succeed no matter how many decrees, rules or regulations I may issue from my office. Therefore, I implore you to ponder seriously the kind of climate you want to have at Western. We cannot tolerate any violent, disruptive, or destructive activity if we want a free campus. Any move in this negative direction would threaten the very security of the university because the pressures that impinge upon it today are enormous indeed. We are surrounded by enemies of various persuasions, but we cannot surrender to them under any inducement or excitement of the moment.

But please don't misunderstand me; I'm not saying you shouldn't be concerned. Of course you should! I'm deeply concerned about the problems and injustices of society. I'm sure that many of you share this concern. Obviously you must or you would not be participating human beings. However, there is a reasonable context in which you should portray your concerns; and I implore you to define that context as a nonviolent commitment to truth and social progress. If you reject that context, you then become vulnerable to a nihilism which at heart has nothing but a corrosive contempt for all humanity.

One final word on this general subject, which I think is important because it refers to a faulty judgment on a critical issue. I attended a conference last year and was appalled to discover that a central theme running through all the discussions implied that property damage could be separated easily from personal injury. Hence, if in the cause of social protest, some property was unfortunately damaged or destroyed, it was perhaps too bad but really not very serious as long as no human injury occurred. After all, property is merely the emblem of inanimate materialism!

I wish to question that premise. But I am not extolling property as such and placing it on a lofty pedestal. Instead, I am questioning the assumption that man can so easily separate property damage from personal injury. When violence and destruction are unleashed can man truly guarantee the line will be drawn between property and life? Was the bomb explosion at the University of Wisconsin in Madison such a guarantee? Certainly the property damage was astounding; that in itself was deplorable. But the most grievous result was the cold-blooded murder of one human being and the injuring of four others. Of course, we can argue in abstract terms that the perpetrators of this crime really did not intend to kill or to injure human beings. But, pray tell me, where indeed do we draw the line? The frank nihilist abruptly dismisses murder as a "necessary element of the revolution." Others are more hypocritical and tend to disguise this truth with smooth sophistry.

Too often, in our sometimes caustic interpretation of materialism and property in history, we tend to overlook the human factor which inheres in property. A few years ago, during a disastrous urban ghetto riot where much damage took place, an aged black citizen was interviewed. As he stood on the sidewalk with tears in his eyes, viewing the

gutted remains of a smoking building, a reporter went up and asked him why he was standing there looking at the charred ruins. The man said, very simply: "Well, it really wasn't much for sure; but it was my home." Now tell me where do we draw the line between property and humanity? Was not this personal injury as well as property damage? I say yes; most emphatically, yes!

In conclusion, we all know that these are serious problems. I want to reiterate though that they are really challenges; they are challenges which should provoke you as young men and women. Your idealism can meet these challenges. You can resolve them. You can come up with answers. You represent the faith and the hope of the future. Why do you think there is so much discussion in the councils of the older generation about the right of the 18 year old to vote? Because there is a very critical issue in the balance:—Can the 18 year old apply his or her idealism to productive purpose in solving the problems of society? That is the basic question. I say yes; the young can shoulder this responsibility for all civilization, and I think that the tide of history is showing this to be true.

We know that there will be change. We also know that there will be human progress. Of course, all of us get impatient, exasperated, and frustrated at the slow pace. But actually change itself is inevitable. The one common thread that weaves its way through all ages is the inevitability of change. Things tomorrow will be different than they are today—maybe imperceptibly so, but they are different nonetheless. It's as if a vast undercurrent existed beneath the earth's crust, taking charge of the events of man. The only unknown factors are the direction and the tempo of this inevitable change. Change itself is irresistable, but what about direction and tempo? You will determine that! If your determinations are made within the constraints of reasonable men, where the rule of reason prevails over the anarchy of the barbarian, human society will greatly benefit from your intelligent concern.

A final word about your own involvement—in society or at Western:—please participate as sovereign individuals; think for yourselves; be distinct persons; be mature men and women. We do not welcome hypotized herds and flocks at Western. Do not be deceived by demagoguery, either written or verbal, from whatever quarter or source. Maintain your personal integrity; make your own decisions, search for your own answers; be proud of standing on your own feet.

Each of you is unique; you are alone; you are different. There are no others like you. Remember that; and as you consider the problems which may exist on this campus (in terms of student politics, teaching quality, or curriculum relevance) or in the world at large (in terms of the serious challenges I have previously offered you), think as sovereign individuals. In this way, you will make the decisions which will benefit not only yourselves but the entire world.

I wish you the best of luck. We are delighted you are here, and I sincerely hope that you will have a socially enjoyable and an intellectually rewarding experience at Western Illinois University.

LETTER TO A STUDENT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by Prof. K. Ross Toole, which first appeared in the New York Times of September 23. This letter, an open letter to students, contains an important message for young people who desire a voice in their government. Although, I do not necessarily agree with all that Professor Toole says, I do think that his letter is worthy of consideration by all of us. His question, "Why Woodstock and not Watts?" is a most intriguing one and one which thousands of students who kept the McCarthy presidential campaign alive can and did attest to the power that they are able to exercise. There are many things that are wrong with our world, many things that need change, I think that the challenge is clear—is the response?

The article follows:

LETTER TO A STUDENT

(By K. Ross Toole)

MISSOULA, MONT.

DEAR WAITING STUDENT: If you haven't discovered it yet, now is the time. Upon what meat does the violent, rockthrowing, building-burning campus militant feed? On yours, Sir, your very own flesh. You, the standers-by; the doubters concerning the question of whether the American system can work.

It is very late and there are some things you should know—and you should know them whether you like them or not.

You are standing by basically because you say you are frustrated: the channels are plugged; you cannot make your voices heard. You are idealistic and you love your country, but maybe the violent ones are right. Maybe you will join because the only course left to you, you say, may be violence.

It so happens that you are wrong, dead wrong.

Across America there is a growing wrath about college violence. Not anger; wrath. Call it middle America, call it "those people out there," call it the "silent majority"—call it what you will, but every act of violence by the left on any campus in America feeds the fires on the right. And the power's there on the right; the power that will *force* legislatures and Boards of Regents to devise ironclad rules of conduct for students and faculty; a suppression which will put the 1920's to shame. It will destroy academic freedom and it will destroy your own opportunity to get an education.

I am sick to death of your drumbeat, overblown rhetoric, the monotonous litany, "We cannot make our voices heard. No one will listen to us." The violent left is heard. But you are correct in thinking that very few people listen. That is because the violent ones have nothing to say.

So the channels are plugged? You have no way to go? The wires are cut? You are powerless? Here again, the bull horn rhetoric.

The channels to change in America are not plugged. You simply do not know how to use them. I, for one, am sick of the fact that you haven't done your homework or tried very hard.

Just as a simple example: There are 31,000,000 voters in America under thirty. As former Chief Justice Warren put it, "Youth can lead a crusade anytime it wants to." If the 18-year-old vote stands the test of constitutionality, 11,000,000 more youths will be added to the roles. That is 41,000,000 out of $120,000,000 registered voters.

Consider Eugene McCarthy and his supporting youth: It was largely the power of youth that forced an incumbent President, in effect, to resign. And what then? Did you go on working? Did you apply yourselves to the hard pragmatism of political power? Indeed not. You slunk off because you had been defeated.

You have no power? Tell me, how many of you went to Woodstock? Nearly 460,000. What did you do there? What you really did was indulge yourselves, *en masse*. What if, instead of an orgy of self-indulgence, you had appeared 400,000 strong in a slum with scrub brushes, and each with a bottle of one-a-day vitamins?

What if you had joined one fawn-eyed man named Cesar Chavez, picked the grapes and given the proceeds to his union? What if you gathered to help the migrant workers in Florida?

And if the giant citrus companies had refused to let you work, could they stand there naked in the light of your effort and in the bright eye of television? I think not. Why Woodstock and not Watts?

How about facing up to the fact that what stands athwart man's chances for a better life is not technology, machines and the military-industrial complex—it is man himself who stands there. It is you.

Get the facts and forgo the rhetoric. Stop confusing bloviation with the truth. And, remember, the building you burn will be your own.

HORTON THANKS VOLUNTEER TRANSPORTATION SERVICE OF NORTH EAST AREA DEVELOPMENT FOR GREAT JOB

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a great pleasure to recognize publicly the efforts of good people who go beyond the call of duty to render assistance to those in need.

Such is the purpose of these remarks today. On behalf of the entire community in Greater Rochester, I would like to express appreciation to the members of the North East Area Development, Inc., who, for almost a year now, have been doing a great job with a volunteer transportation service.

In Rochester, and I am sure everywhere else, there are many fine citizens who, for one reason or another, do not have adequate transportation facilities when trips are necessary to doctors, clinics, other medical services—yes, and even to grocery stores.

The aged, the infirm, the financially handicapped, or the wife whose husband needs their only car for travel to and from work, often find emergency trips confronting them and, more often than not, public transportation will not solve the problem. Short of hiring a public conveyance at a price these people can ill afford, there is little they can do to help themselves.

This need was long recognized by members of the North East Area Development, Inc., a community-oriented organization, and last fall they decided it was time to act. They formed this volunteer transportation service to fill a desperate need in quite a vast portion of Rochester.

There are now a dozen drivers who use their cars and donate their time, all at no remuneration, to transport those in need. I believe those devoted to this fine cause are more than deserving of a pat on the back and a very sincere "thank you" from all of us.

Headed by Mrs. Patricia Montalvo, coordinator of NEAD'S volunteer transportation service, the list of drivers in-

clude: Mrs. Marilyn Mahl, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Roeck, Miss Ernisse, Mrs. Dorothy Beye, Mrs. O. Caulfield, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Hahn, Mrs. Hallenbeck, Miss Bette Rowe, and Mrs. Helen Lansberry.

One senior citizen, Mrs. Stanton, to show her appreciation for the kindness of the drivers, voluntarily acts as a baby-sitter when the need arises for one of the motorists.

The success of this splendid group is so great that there is talk and planning in other sections of the city to form other volunteer transportation services. This, of course, would be most welcomed by all concerned.

The NEAD group recently received a fine tribute in a feature story in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. Written by Mr. Alan Koonse, it gives more details of the activity and I would like to share it now with my colleagues.

The article follows:

WHEELS TURN, GIVE LIFT TO STRANDED OLDSTERS

(By Alan Koonse)

It's a long walk to Genesee Hospital from the northeast corner of Rochester for a 74-year-old woman who doesn't drive and doesn't have a way to her monthly medical checkups.

And there's a mother of three who needs to transport her young children to clinics for shots and other health services.

Last October, a northeast Rochester community organization decided that transportation for many residents to doctors and medical services in Rochester was a major problem.

Since then, members of North East Area Development, Inc. (NEAD) have started wheels turning to provide transportation for community residents when certain situations arise.

Mrs. Pat Montalvo, coordinator of NEAD's volunteer transportation service, said that since March 31, NEAD has had 13 volunteer drivers who devote their cars and their time without pay.

The volunteer transportation service, covers Rochester's northeast side: From Goodman Street North on the west, to North Street on the north, to University Avenue on the south, and the city line on the east.

"We have a big area to cover," said Mrs. Montalvo. "But we feel that mothers with baby's and older persons who don't have cars need transportation in special situations."

These special situations, she said, are to help elderly persons get to grocery stores, to take a young boy with a broken ankle to a hospital, or to take young mothers to health clinics when their husbands have the car at work.

Mrs. Montalvo points out the volunteers service is not an ambulance service. "We are not doctors and nurses, so our drivers can't take cases where there is bleeding or major injury, because we are not set up for that at all."

Friday's volunteer service is devoted to transporting mothers and children to the "Well-Baby" Clinic set up by NEAD at Parsells Avenue Baptist Church. There, they receive free medical supervision, plus shots and clinical care.

"We contacted an insurance associate for the state and we were informed that it was not necessary to get an insurance policy for the drivers because their own insurance covered us," Mrs. Montalvo said.

Many of the drivers, she said, have jobs and families and volunteer on their days off. But she added that the most urgent problem the service faces is its need for more volunteer drivers.

"So far everything has worked out okay. Senior citizens are taking advantage of the service to get to their doctor appointments. Others are asking if we need help," Mrs. Montalvo said.

She said one elderly woman volunteered to babysit for the drivers to show her appreciation for the service.

"VIETNAMIZING" VIETNAM'S ECONOMY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year you sent me as a member of the House Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia on a 2-week inspection trip to see, if we could, what additional information we could find to bring back and report to our colleagues about conditions in South Vietnam and the surrounding area.

Our report has long since been presented—and, perhaps, forgotten. But it bears repeating that all of us returned as concerned about the economic threat to the viability—and stability—of the present Saigon regime, as we did about whatever military threat the Vietcong were then posing to that same government, and the people of South Vietnam.

This is a subject that was thoroughly and carefully explored in our report to this House—and we offered certain specific recommendations for early consideration by both the Saigon government and our own Government's representatives in Saigon. Some of those recommendations have by now been accepted and implemented, but the most important move in this connection would clearly be the Saigon government's announcement, several days ago now, of a drastic monetary devaluation as part of its sweeping program to fight corruption and stabilize its faltering economy.

The Vietnamese currency, the piaster, which was pegged at 118 to the dollar when we were in Vietnam, has now been devalued to 275 to the dollar, which may still not be enough for, I understand, the black-market rate for U.S. greenbacks in large denominations in Vietnam—Saigon, at any rate—has been running at about VN$400 to the dollar. However, this is a clear effort by President Thieu—and at some political risk to himself—to bring his nation through the transition from reliance on the United States to fight the war toward dependence on its own resources to do that job. For that effort, he should be congratulated, along with Vietnam's national legislature that gave him the necessary authority to take these steps—one of which, also badly needed, is a 20-percent pay boost for the Vietnamese Army and civil servants who have been asked to fight—and work—at something less than subsistence wages.

This is all a very complicated matter, a sidelight, really to how our military involvement in this tragic little nation has complicated all things for its citizens. To give some further insight in the overall problem the following article from the October 5 edition of the Wall Street Journal may be helpful—in the reading of which my colleagues might especially note the concluding sentence that goes:

The U.S. Government, as part of this serious exercise in nation building, needs itself to adopt policies that will encourage those with power in Saigon to tax and govern fully.

The article follows:

"VIETNAMIZING" VIETNAM'S ECONOMY

Over the weekend the South Vietnamese government decreed a "parallel" exchange rate among other measures designed to curb inflation; for certain transactions, notably exports and piaster purchases by foreigners (including allied soldiers), the rate was set at 275 piasters to the U.S. dollar. Many in the U.S. Congress do not think the steps are adequate. The following article, written just before the announcement, gives an idea of why the legislators feel that way.

Dr. Enke has been a division head at Rand Corp., a visiting professor of economics at Yale and a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (economics). During the past five years he has directed several studies of the Vietnamese economy. The views expressed in this article are his responsibility, not that of his past or present employers.

(By Stephen Enke)

Vietnam, according to reporters, is headed for an "economic" crisis that will jeopardize "Vietnamization." But the impending crisis is in reality financial rather than economic, and the remedy is not more U.S.-financed imports but a realistic exchange rate for the piaster and increased domestic taxes in South Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese piaster is at this date still officially exchanged at a rate of 118 to the dollar. This is the rate at which our Government buys the piasters it needs to hire local labor, buy local provisions, and so forth. It is the rate at which Vietnamese importers officially buy foreign exchange if they can get licenses and dollars to import. It is the rate at which GIs are supposed to buy piasters, but seldom do, for the black market rate runs between 300 and over 400 piasters to the dollar. The 118 rate is more than five years old, and during this time the domestic price level has tripled.

DEFICITS AND PAPER MONEY

The piaster depreciates because money in circulation has ben increasing around 30% a year on an average. When the Saigon government's budget is in deficit it issues additional paper money to fill the gap. Even after receipts from customs and other import-related taxes, there is a large and increasing deficit every year.

The South Vietnamese government receives more from import-related duties and customs than it does from all domestic taxes on land, beer, gasoline, business and other incomes, and everything else. The income tax falls disproportionately upon government employes, who almost alone have tax money withheld from their wages, and yields little. Agricultural land pays almost no taxes even though good rice land may produce a crop worth 25,000 piasters or so per hectare at the farm.

It is imports that provide most government receipts. These are financed by the U.S. Government, not by exports. They cost the U.S. one way or another over two-thirds of a billion dollars a year. These varied imports include rice, building materials under the Commodity Import Program, together with motor-scooters, durable consumer goods and other "luxury" items otherwise financed. These imports have not, however, been yielding all the government receipts they could. This is because import licensing is restricted, and the piaster is officially over-valued.

Consider imported widgets. As inflation continues, the sale price of widgets in Saigon rises. But the cost to the importer is the same, if the piaster price in dollars or yen is unchanged and the import taxes paid are unchanged. The widening margin results in excess profits for the importer, except insofar as he must share them with officials. These excess profits and pay-offs are a sort of "leakage" in U.S. support.

If only nominal profits were earned, the South Vietnamese government would receive more piaster receipts per dollar of U.S. support. This would happen if the piaster price of foreign exchange increased as the internal purchasing power of the piaster declined. A substantial across-the-board devaluation of the piaster and institution of a flexible piaster price on dollars to licensed importers is therefore urgently needed.

The South Vietnamese government is likely to have larger deficits and print money more rapidly because of past and future U.S. troop withdrawals. Presumably the Department of Defense and GIs will buy fewer piasters with dollars as fewer soldiers remain in the country. It is these dollars, which the Saigon government sells to importers for unrestricted use, that yield the most budget revenues per dollar through high "luxury" goods duties. Accordingly, foreign exchange reserves have been falling, until recently import licensing was restricted to reduce sales of foreign exchange to importers. The result has been to make import licenses and associated exchange more profitable to those fortunate to secure them. The loss of potential government receipts per dollar of U.S. support is thereby increased.

Those U.S. officials who influence our annual support level must attempt some very difficult estimates. They must try to assess how much faster domestic prices will rise relative to the circulating money stock and how much socially divisive inflation is tolerable. If these officials want import licensing to become unrestricted, in an effort to plug the leakage in U.S. support, they must try to guess what piaster exchange rate (X) is compatible with what U.S. support level (Y) and what budget deficit (Z), all subject to the requirement, say, that the Saigon government's foreign-exchange reserves neither increase nor decrease.

No mortal economist knows how to juggle this collection of X, Y and Z. If the South Vietnamese Government taxes less than expected at home or spends more on wage increases than expected, the Z budget deficit will be greater than "planned." With unrestricted import licensing, importers will want to buy more foreign exchange, all financed by U.S. support. As a result, if foreign-exchange reserves are to be held constant, there must be either an increase in the Y support level or in the X exchange rate. More Y costs the U.S. taxpayer more and gives Vietnamese consumers more imported goods. A higher-than-X piaster rate costs our taxpayers no more and provides Vietnamese consumers with no less.

ARGUING FOR "X" RATES

The strongest arguments can be made for letting the X exchange rate be the variable. Then the related Y support level and Z budget deficit can be set annually for each year. Unexpected tax short-falls or spending over-runs by the South Vietnamese government, resulting in more deficits and money in circulation, then alter the exchange rate but not the level of U.S. support or the physical inflow of imports.

Arranging for an officially flexible exchange rate is not difficult and requires every little time for preparation, whereas collection of a productive land tax would take a year to organize. There could be a weekly auction of unrestricted foreign exchange and of restricted Commodity Import Program dollar credits. The Saigon government as auctioneer could protect itself against collusion by setting a minimum piaster price each session. It should make sure that all legitimate purchasers of foreign exchange for current account transaction can become accredited attendees at such auctions. Dollar exchange in different "lot" amounts could be auctioned against sealed bids. The total dollar sum to be auctioned weekly is easily determined from the known level of U.S. support.

The alternative of a supposedly single act of devaluation can only be partially effective. For prestige and political reasons the new official piaster price on the dollar will almost certainly be set too low. As inflation continues the true external value of the piaster will continue to fall. Import licensing will have to be reintroduced, excess windfall profits and pay-offs will reappear, and U.S. support will again be partially wasted. So in time there will have to be another undignified "catchup" devaluation.

These suggestions are aimed at coping with a financial, not an economic, crisis. The piaster may be ailing, but the consumers of South Vietnam are not. The availability for consumption in Vietnam of non-military goods is probably a third higher than it was five years ago.

Obviously, the war and inflation have benefited some more than others, so that an internal redistribution of real income is desirable. Rice growers and farmers generally are doing quite well except when they are refugees from their lands.

One major reason that South Vietnam is not suffering economically is that unemployment has been eliminated. With new demands for services and goods, and more money in circulation to "lubricate" such transactions, there has been an increase in the gross domestic product for several years, with only moderate price increases. Young men might go into the armed forces, but their work around the farm was taken over by relatives.

Under these conditions, if real income needs to be redistributed for equity reasons, this should be done by usual fiscal means. Profitable rice and urban lands should be taxed to pay for supplemental soldiers' wages. There is no justifiable reason why the U.S. taxpayer should finance more imports so that the real incomes of those worse off can be supplemented by piaster expenditures without inflation.

Originally the idea was that U.S. support should compensate for lost domestic production of consumer goods because of mobilization for war. But no such consumption gap occurred during the years that underemployment was being eliminated. Gradually, the U.S. began instead to fill the *budget* deficit gap with imports, so that the less the Saigon Government taxed and the more it spent the more imports the U.S. financed to contain inflation. Less fiscal responsibility was rewarded with more consumer goods imports. Thus the U.S. Government during previous Administrations came to establish a perverse set of incentives for the South Vietnamese government.

THE GOVERNMENT MUST GOVERN

The fundamental object of "Vietnamization" is surely to make the South Vietnamese government and people more self-reliant and independent. The goal of the U.S. is to help them to help themselves. In part this means that they do more of the fighting if we will give them the necessary equipment. But it also means that the South Vietnamese government must increasingly govern, not only as regards maintaining physical security, but also by performing more functions of government more adequately.

One such crucial function of government is taxation. No country can really become a nation that lacks a government with the ability and will to tax. The U.S. Government, as part of this serious exercise in nation building, needs itself to adopt policies that will encourage those with the power in Saigon to tax and govern fully.

CIVIL DEFENSE-CIVIL AIR PATROL JOIN FOR COMMON GOOD

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of two nationally organized volunteer organizations working for the common good of American citizens was given over the weekend of September 19–20 in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania when civil defense and Civil Air Patrol members staged a series of emergency training exercises.

The exercises were set up by Northampton and Lehigh County Civil Defense officials to determine the Civil Air Patrol's ability to meet requirements of civil defense in time of national or local community disaster. Operations were conducted out of Queen City Municipal Airport at Allentown and Braden Field near Easton, Pa.

The exercises took the form of a series of tests involving theoretical or simulated disasters. One test or mission called for a survey of traffic conditions in the area of a mythical accident, another the airlifting of blood plasma from Braden Field to Allentown's Queen City Airport, a third, an aerial reconnaissance of a reservoir and the Francis E. Walter Dam, both in the Pocono Mountains.

Civil defense officials flew on traffic surveys of the northeast extension of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, to check on conditions at tunnels running through the Allegheny Mountains, linking Philadelphia and the local regions, north to Scranton. Civil Air Patrol pilots flew the planes, CAP ground crews serviced the aircraft.

And so it went, from early morning, until darkness called a halt to aerial operations. Teamwork, cooperation, and coordination between the two fine organizations spelled success. It was my pleasure to observe the operations on Sunday, September 20, and I can say that I was much impressed by what I saw.

Here were young cadets and middle-aged officers, all neatly groomed and uniformed, training to be of service in time of need, in time of call by our Government. Civil Defense officials were business like in presenting the tests, in seeing that requirements were met.

CAP operations were commanded by Capt. John Silver, of Bethlehem, and Lt. Col. John Rackus, of Fullerton. Civil Defense work was directed by Northampton County Director Mark Farrel and Lehigh County Deputy Director Clinton MacInnes, with Clarence Diehl, Northampton County coordinator, serving as liaison between the two volunteer organizations.

Other missions during the weekend were the airlifting of blankets from Queen City Airport to other bases in eastern Pennsylvania, the airlifting of portable stoves from Allentown to Reading Municipal Airport. Radiological monitoring was done by Dr. Ronald Lauer, Kutztown State College educator and Lehigh County Civil Defense radiological monitoring officer.

As part of the exercise, Civil Defense officials also ordered aerial surveillance of a theoretical protest march from Albright College in Reading to Easton.

The theoretical march was along Route 222 and old Route 22, passing through Kutztown, Allentown, and Bethlehem. MacInnes explained that such a surveillance could be requested of Civil Defense by the State Police, in which case CAP could be called on to provide planes and pilots.

While these operations were being carried out in the Lehigh Valley, similar exercises were being held by the two volunteer groups throughout Pennsylvania. Reports reaching my office indicate similar success was enjoyed throughout the Commonwealth.

I am pleased to call attention to the efforts of these two fine volunteer organizations—Civil Air Patrol and Civil Defense—to be adequately prepared to serve our Nation in time of peace and in time of disaster. They deserve the gratitude and commendation of all Americans whose lives are made more safe by their service.

CHARLES N. DeROSE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform this body of the passing of one of the truly remarkable men of western Massachusetts—Charles N. DeRose, a man of many talents, many interests, and great vitality.

Mr. DeRose was publisher of the Daily Hampshire Gazette in Northampton, but that is only one small feature of this man's career. A genius for mechanics and electronics led him also into the radio and television fields. But even the major role he played in communications does not adequately describe the great range of Charlie DeRose.

It does not, for example, tell of his great civic involvement that led to the success of the new Hampshire Regional YMCA or, some years ago, helped save the Three County Fair.

Charlie DeRose, as a youth, was an outstanding athlete, starred in football at the University of Vermont, later coached that sport at Northampton High School and, throughout his life, was an avid sportsman.

His friends, who were legion, always marveled at his ability to fix just about anything. When it could not be fixed, he could just as easily develop a new mechanism to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie DeRose was even more than the many talented person I have described here briefly today. He was also a warm and true friend to thousands in his native western Massachusetts and he will be sorely missed by all of us.

To better illustrate the depth of this man and the high regard in which he was held, I would like at this time to include in the RECORD just a few of the many news accounts of his death and editorial tributes which appeared in the Massachusetts press.

The news accounts and tributes follow:

[From the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Sept. 19, 1970]

CHARLES N. DEROSE, GAZETTE PUBLISHER, IS DEAD AT 63

Charles N. DeRose, publisher of the Daily Hampshire Gazette and one of the most prominent figures in the business and civic life of Northampton, died suddenly early today at his summer home in Watch Hill, R.I., of a heart attack.

A lifelong resident of Northampton, he had been associated with the Gazette most of his life and was one of the founders of radio station WHYN and television Channel 40.

Born Sept. 11, 1907, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. DeRose, he received his education in local schools, graduating from Northampton High School in 1926 and from the University of Vermont in the class of 1930 with a B.S. degree in mechanical engineering.

BETTERMENT

DeRose devoted much of his life to the betterment of his native city. The community had no greater booster and he gave unstintingly of his time to literally dozens of organizations and causes designed to make Northampton a better place in which to live.

The Hampshire Regional YMCA is one of the most recent community improvements to benefit from his organizational ability.

He was general chairman of the drive to raise a million dollars for the first facility of its kind built in recent years.

Much of Mr. DeRose's time in the past five years had been devoted to the modernization of the Gazette. The Gazette became the first daily newspaper in Western Massachusetts to go to offset printing when a high-speed Goss Urbanite press was installed in 1966.

Upon graduation from college, Mr. DeRose joined the Hawthorne division of Western Electric Co. in Chicago where he remained for two years before returning to Northampton to join the Gazette.

He was in charge of advertising and circulation during this period.

Radio was one of Mr. DeRose's greatest personal interests most of his life. A ham radio operator since he was nine, his call letters, W1CND, were known through the world.

RADIO FIRM

It was this interest which led him into the field of commercial radio in 1940 when he joined associates to organize the Hampden-Hampshire Corp.

Northampton's first radio studio was opened in 1941, together with a studio in Holyoke, when he became vice president and general manager of WHYN.

The company ultimately obtained a television license and opened Channel 40. He remained as head of the station until its sale several years ago.

Despite the demands imposed by his varied business interests, Mr. DeRose found time to be active in many business and civic organizations.

One of the most successful Community Chest campaigns in Northampton's history was conducted under his leadership and until the day of his death he made himself available to United Fund officers. He was currently serving in the Industrial Division.

A longtime member of the Northampton Rotary Club, he served as president. He is a life member of Northampton Lodge of Elks, a past president of the Chamber of Commerce, a past president of the Massachusetts Broadcasters' Association and a director of the Massachusetts Electric Co.

ACTIVE MEMBER

An active member of the Edwards Congregational Church, he was chairman of the committee which raised the funds required to construct the edifice on upper Main St. He served the church in many capacities during his lifetime, and was a director at the time of his death.

Upon his return to Northampton in 1932, Mr. DeRose made his first venture into political life and was elected to the Common Council from Ward 2.

He later served on the Board of Public Works and headed an airport study commission in the mid-forties.

In April 1942, he enlisted in the Army Air Corps with a commission of first lieutenant, serving until Sept. 1945 when he was discharged with the rank of major.

At the time of his discharge, he was director of supply and maintenance at Lowry Field, Denver, Colo.

Mr. DeRose was one of a half-dozen local businessmen who came to the rescue of the Three County Fair in the mid-thirties when it was threatened with extinction.

Assuming the presidency of the fair, he led the fight for parimutual racing as the only means of saving the historic institution. He served as president on two separate occasions and had been a director since 1937.

FINE FOOTBALL PLAYER

But there are many men in Northampton who remember him as "Buster" DeRose, a fine football player for Northampton High School and the University of Vermont and later as coach of the Northampton High School football team.

And others recall him in the early days of softball in Northampton when he was one of the leading pitchers in the league.

An ardent boating enthusiast and a dedicated fisherman, Mr. DeRose spent many pleasant hours on his boat. He devoted much of his leisure time fishing for blues and striped bass off the Rhode Island coast. His hobby took him to many parts of the country while vacationing.

Membership in the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the New England Society of Newspaper Editors were among his professional affiliations.

Mr. DeRose assumed active management of radio station WHMP upon the death of his uncle, Dr. Nathan Williams.

He was a director and member of the investment committee at the Nonotuck Savings Bank and served on the boards of directors of the Pioneer Valley Association and the Northampton Historical Society.

MARRIED IN 1938

Mr. DeRose married Cora Elizabeth Farmer in the Edwards Congregational Church on Jan. 12, 1938. She died in July, 1966.

He is survived by two sons, Peter L. and Charles W., both of whom are associated with him in the operation of the Gazette.

The funeral will be at 2 Tuesday afternoon in the Edwards Church with the Rev. Richard K. Beebe, pastor, officiating.

Calling hours at the Charles R. Dutton Funeral Home will be Monday from 4 to 9 p.m.

[From the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Sept. 21, 1970]

A NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER

In many cases the publisher of a newspaper is pretty remote from the general public, moving in the higher circles of business and politics.

But for many Northamptonites Charles Nathan DeRose was known simply as "Buster" while for about everyone else he was Charlie.

He loved Northampton and Hampshire County and made no bones about it. And he loved people and enjoyed being with them.

His oft-repeated aims for the Gazette were to present all the news fairly and dispassionately, and make the Gazette an open forum for all sides of all questions.

The Gazette, he said, should present something for everyone from the youngest reader

to the oldest, from the most sophisticated to the least.

He was a director of a bank and an electric utility, but he was also the "guy working on the press if the crew were shorthanded," and he was ready to move a desk or stoke the fires at a cookout or join in a sing along at a Christmas party.

Charlie disliked being inactive and when he was hospitalized recently he was like a caged tiger waiting to get out and get going. He loved the sea and loved to fish and being in the hospital was cutting into his fishing time. He was back at both loves much sooner than anyone had expected.

He called himself a "black Republican" but his newspaper was scrupulously nonpartisan in political campaigns, and that was the way he wanted it.

He believed in helping people, and was active in the campaigns for the Hampshire YMCA and for the Three County Fair at a time when both groups needed help.

He supported the Cooley Dickinson Hospital as well as efforts to bring industry to the community, and was active in work to promote the Pioneer Valley.

Charles didn't agree with most of the campus radicals and unrest, but he believed strongly in the need for strong educational institutions and in the value to the communities of Hampshire County of such as Smith, Amherst, and Mt. Holyoke Colleges, Northampton Junior College and the University of Massachusetts, as well as the new Hampshire College.

He was a sports fan and a sports enthusiast.

But most of all he loved his community. He'd sit in his cluttered, spartan office and look out the window and say:

"You know the kind of people who work for the Gaeztte should love a small town . . . should love to live in the country . . . I wouldn't want to live anyplace else."

A lot of people out here in the country are going to miss Charlie.

[From the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Sept. 21, 1970]

TRIBUTES TO GAZETTE PUBLISHER: "MAN OF ACTION, WHO'LL BE MISSED"

"The area and the community is better for his efforts . . . we will miss him . . ."

The theme was repeated time and again as messages of condolence and eulogies for Gazette Publisher Charles N. DeRose, who died Saturday, poured in from all strata of life in Western Massachusetts.

Politicians, business leaders, recreation people all commented on his indefatigable efforts to better life for all in his native Northampton and Western Massachusetts.

Funeral services for the business and civic leader will be held at 2 p.m. Tuesday at the Edwards Church, Northampton. Visiting hours at the Charles R. Dutton Funeral Home in Northampton are from 4 to 9 p.m. today.

Mr. DeRose died in his sleep at his summer home in Watch Hill, R.I., He succumbed to a heart attack.

Among the messages received were:

MAYOR SADDENED

Mayor Sean M. Dunphy said, "I am saddened by his death. It will be a great loss to the community and the communications media which he served so well. He contributed much to our city through his own personal efforts and through the facilities of his newspaper and radio station.

"Both of these facilities were always available to any community cause or need. He served the community well as an elected and civic leader and as the operator of a major business."

Charles Lyons, president of the Hampshire United Fund, commented, "We have lost a tremendous man and I just hope the bereaved family can go through this as they did the loss of their mother. It's a terrific shock to lose such a great guy.

"He was dedicated to the community and trying to make it a better place in which to live. We're always trying to find people like this and when we lose one it's really tough."

FELLOW ROTARIAN

Harvey Finison, president of the Greater Northampton Chamber of Commerce said: "We're shocked, of course, by his death. I was a fellow Rotary member. He was an active member of our Rotary and always a wonderful fellow to be with. We will miss him greatly."

Richard Pickett, president of Northampton Jr. College, said:

"My first real connection with Charles De Rose was during the YMCA building fund drive. No one will know the effort that he put forth in making that drive a success.

"The Hampshire Regional YMCA building is indeed a memorial to his leadership in this community, for without his drive and determination we could not have succeeded.

"Charlie thought big and insisted that we 'go for broke.' One cannot know of all the good works that this man has done in this community, and I am privileged to have known and worked with him.

"Mr. DeRose was a member of the Board of Trustees of Northampton Junior College and gave of his counsel in assisting the transformation of this institution from a business college to full junior college status. My life has been richer because of this association, and we will all miss him."

MORINI AND M'COLGAN

State Representatives from Northampton Louis J. Morini and Edward A. McColgan expressed sorrow.

Morini said, "I was shocked. I had known him since grammar school and he was one of the best-loved civic leaders here. I feel a real sense of loss."

McColgan reported that, "Charles DeRose's death was a loss not only to his family and close friends, but, in a greater sense, to the entire city of Northampton. He was a vigorous booster of this city, a man who involved himself entirely in the activities of his community.

"There were many civic projects that drew on his leadership and experience and as a result were successful. He will be missed.

"He has achieved in his lifetime a goal which many seek. He made contributions to his fellow man and left our city a better place in which to live."

JUDGE RYAN

Special Justice Luke F. Ryan, a classmate at Northampton High School, said, "Charlie and I went through high school together, and I mean through it, graduating in the class of 1926. In high school projects as in later life and community affairs, his participation was marked by enthusiasm, ability and success.

"To have him stricken at the height of his power is a tremendous loss to the community, to his church, his family and to his thousands of friends.

"Charlie will be sorely missed and not easily replaced in the community. We often spent happy moments reminiscing about our high school days, the football teams, working on Nesaki, and the trip we took to Washington when we were seniors.

"The class went by train, but Charlie and I went in his old Model T Ford—top speed 25 miles an hour.

"He was a tremendous, really tremendous guy and a valuable friend."

BERKSHIRES CITED

Donald Miller, publisher of the Berkshire Eagle said today: "Charlie DeRose was a good and true friend of the Berkshire Eagle and to the people connected with it. When we started our Radio Station, WBEC it was DeRose who built it.

"Personally we have always been close friends with the Gazette and with Charlie and his wife, Cora. We went on many fishing expeditions together. He was truly a great friend and a shocking loss not only to Northampton but to Western Massachusetts and Berkshire County as well.

"He was always available to help anyone who needed it."

A joint statement from Donald Miller, publisher and Lawrence K. Miller, editor of the Berkshire Eagle:

"We at the Berkshire Eagle are proud to have known Charles N. DeRose, and to have had his professional advice on offset printing and radio broadcasting over the recent decades. He was a bulwark for this end of Massachusetts in helping to maintain the sense of independent regional identity that we cherish. Our own feeling of loss is great. Charlie put us on the air in broadcasting just after World War II. He knew and taught us much. He was friendly, had the common touch and was generous to a fault. He was great company and everyone who knew him is poorer in spirit for his premature departure."

DWIGHT STATEMENT

William Dwight, publisher of the Holyoke Transcript Telegram said today, "if I get talking about Charlie, I'll go on forever. He was an absolutely tremendous guy, his mechanical genius was absolutely amazing, there was nothing he could not do.

"His energy, vigor and vitality was really baffling, it was so complete and so constant.

"I have been associated with Charlie personally and in business for most of our adult lives, having both the newspaper, the radio and TV in common.

"He was a true friend, not only to those connected with him in the business world, but from every walk of life. His personality was absolutely immense. We who have had the privilege of knowing him and being connected with him in any way have been close to the best that life can give."

John F. Murphy, Northampton postmaster and a close personal friend said: "Charle DeRose loved Northampton and her people. And he demonstrated this deep affection by giving freely of himself all his life.

"The community has lost a great benefactor. I have lost a close and steadfast friend. I join thousands of my neighbors in mourning his death and sharing his family's grief."

Richard Garvey, managing editor of the Springfield Daily News, said:

"As I grew up in Northampton I saw Charlie DeRose in many roles—football coach, ham radio expert, young city father, Air Corps officer, radio and TV executive, and editor and publisher. His career was varied, but one thing never varied, his intense application—and success.

"His living monuments in Northampton are likewise varied: a church, a YMCA, an Agricultural Fair, community newspaper and a radio station, and they likewise enjoy success.

"No one in Northampton can be blamed for not thanking him enough for these. He would never stand still long enough to listen to our thanks, but those using his living monuments will thank him in their and better ways."

Howard Banner, County Treasurer: "Charlie and I have been friends since way back in High School and he has never changed, or slowed up in any way.

"The minute school was out back in the old days, we'd go home, get into our old clothes and bum rides down to their place at Pleasant View in Rhode Island.

"He could make the most simple things fun and existing. Then I was associated with him in the Three County Fair business . . . always helpful, always looking on the bright side, never taking a negative attitude on anything. or letting those around him look on the gloomy side.

"I knew both him and his wife, Cora, very well. Her going was a great tragedy and so

is this. My greatest sympathy goes to his boys and to all his friends.

"He will be missed."

John Osley, Osley Construction Co., said "I have known Charlie for many years and have never heard him say a bad word about anyone. He always tried to see something good, and if a slurring remark was passed in his presence about an absent one he tried to turn it off.

"The last time I saw him was at the Three County Fair, which he really was a great friend to, and we had planned to see him on Saturday. He and Cora were friends of long standing and were much loved in Northampton.

"He's a great, horrible loss."

Edward J. O'Dea, former editor of the Daily Hampshire Gazette, and probation officer, said: "Those who have had the privilege of knowing Charlie DeRose as I did are lucky indeed. There was only one like him. He was a friend worth having, and had friends in every walk of life in Northampton and in the county. His loss will be terrific."

William F. McDonald, chairman of the Northampton Recreation Commission said, "It really was a terrible shock for me to hear this because I've known Charlie for a great number of years . . . in the high school when he played football and also when he coached the team.

"But over and above that I've known what kind of a citizen he has been, helping so many causes. The city has lost one of its outstanding citizens who has done a lot for the community. Northampton is going to miss him."

Congressman Silvio O. Conte, of Pittsfield, said: "The death of Charles N. DeRose was a shock to all of us who knew him and respected him for the many contributions he made to Western Massachusetts in both the civic and business arenas.

"For me his passing represents a great personal loss. I was privileged to know Mr. DeRose throughout most of the 20 years I have spent in public life and I always found him a fair arbiter of public issues and a conscientious seeker of truth in the very important role he played in the news business.

"Beyond that he was a warm and valued friend. We, in the western part of the state, are diminished by his passing. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family."

Richard J. Hafey, City Editor, Worcester Evening Gazette: "He was really a tremendous guy. I worked for him when I first got out of college and he was always helpful, always interested and never too busy to give of himself and his time. I learned a great deal under him and from him. His going is a great loss to Northampton and to his friends."

[From the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, Sept. 19, 1970]

DeRose, Northampton Publisher, Dies at 62; Former General Manager of WHYN Stations

Charles N. DeRose, 62, of Northampton, publisher of the Hampshire Gazette and former general manager of the WHYN television and radio stations, died during the night of a heart attack.

He was found this morning at his summer home in Watch Hill, R.I., by his son Peter, who had driven down from Northampton to join his father for a weekend fishing on his father's boat. Peter had telephoned him earlier this morning to tell him about his plans to be with him over the weekend and received no answer. He thought he probably was out on the boat but went to Watch Hill and discovered his father had died during the night. DeRose early in the summer had an operation to remove a kidney stone.

DeRose was born in Northampton. His father, the late Charles A. DeRose, was for many years general agent there of the Boston & Maine Railroad and his mother was publisher of the Hampshire Gazette.

GRID STAR

He attended the Northampton schools and University of Vermont where he was a star football player. He also played semi-pro football. After finishing his education he joined the Hampshire Gazette.

He was one of the pioneer amateur radio operators and his interest in electronics led him into founding along with his late mother and William Dwight Sr. of this city and the late Minnie R. Dwight the Hampden-Hampshire Corp. This started with a 250-watt station in South Hadley Falls in 1941 and as general manager he built the organization into a kilowatt station, an FM station and later Channel 40 based in Springfield.

During those years he spent much time in Holyoke and South Hadley and had a host of friends here.

When the radio and television stations were sold in 1967 to the Gannet group in Portland, Me., he concentrated his energies on expanding the Hampshire Gazette. He pioneered in offset printing in the Connecticut Valley.

He had many interests not the least of which in his youth was flying. When World War II broke out he joined the Army Air Force and was discharged with the rank of major.

DeRose was active in civic affairs. He headed a YMCA major building fund, and was prominent in Community Chest campaigns. He served on the Northampton Board of Public Works during the administration of Mayor Pierre Drewson.

He married the former Cora Farmer of Amherst, who died in 1967. They had two sons, Peter, who lives with his father on Prospect St., Northampton, and William, who resides in Amherst. Both Peter and William are associated with the Gazette.

He was a member of Edwards Congregational Church.

The funeral will be held Tuesday at 2 p.m., in the Edwards Church, Northampton, with the Rev. Richard K. Beebe, pastor, officiating.

Calling hours at the Charles R. Dutton Funeral Home, Northampton, will be Monday, from 4 to 9 p.m.

[From the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, Sept. 21, 1970]

Charles N. DeRose of Northampton, who died suddenly over the weekend, was a mechanical genius of rare capacity. We can speak with authority on his engineering talents for we were associated with him for years in radio and television, and also worked alongside of him in the newspaper world. He grew up in the Hampshire Gazette and became publisher on the death 10 years ago of his mother. We were friends and neighbors and had a unique association down through the years. Charlie, that's what everyone called him, had tremendous vitality. It was energy spelled with a capital E. There wasn't anything he couldn't do with his hands and wouldn't if the occasion required. We recall a miserable March day, a Sunday, when we had to get the underground wiring installed for the radio transmitter at South Hadley Falls preparatory for putting WHYN on the air. No one was available to do the job. He borrowed a hand plow and laid hundreds of feet of wire underground by himself. Nothing fazed him. We faced countless crises together in those days and somehow because of his imagination and industry they were licked.

Charlie was a pioneer in areas of life which interested him. He was a nationally known authority among ham radio operators. He'd be up at daybreak calling here and there around the country. The equipment he had at his home in Northampton and on his automobile was the best and most complete anywhere. No newspaper plant in this part of the world has better production equipment. He was one of the first to envision the potential of offset printing and had the first newspaper offset press running in the valley.

His vigorous application of his skills to his business and hobbies spilled over into the life of his community. The modern Three County Fair is a testament to that. It was on the rocks at one time and he assumed the presidency and brought it back to life. He was called upon time and again to shoulder projects for the betterment of his city and answered the calls always with high enthusiasm and a natural joy. He loved life and lived it to the hilt.

[From the Greenfield Recorder-Gazette, Sept. 22, 1970]

Nice Tough Guy

A combination of practical businessman and visionary engineer was Charles N. DeRose, publisher of the Daily Hampshire Gazette in Northampton and a newspaperman 40 years.

Like many others, he inherited a prosperous property. Unlike many others, he had helped to make the Gazette a solid publishing business and he kept improving it steadily until the day of his death.

Mr. DeRose was a man of many interests and a great capacity for enjoying life. As a youth he was an outstanding athlete and he coached Northampton High School football teams. But he also loved baseball and in adult life he pitched in Northampton softball leagues. Boating was still another enthusiasm and it took him from the Connecticut River to the Rhode Island shore.

His home community owes much to Charlie DeRose. When the Three Counties Fair was threatened with extinction during the Depression, he led a local group which helped the fair stage a comeback. He was a general chairman of the drive to raise a million dollars for the Hampshire Regional YMCA, headed the committee which raised the funds necessary to build a new edifice for Edwards Congregational Church and served on many Northampton civic and fraternal groups for the improvement of the city.

In the communications field, Mr. DeRose was both a power and a pioneer. He joined the Hampshire Gazette staff in the early 1930's and contributed in scores of ways during his mother's years of newspaper operation. Meanwhile he made use of his engineering education in the organization of a new radio station WHYN with offices in Holyoke and Northampton. After World War II, television developed rapidly and the Hampden-Hampshire Co., of which Mr. DeRose was president, soon opened WHYN-TV, Channel 40. He severed his connection with the station only a few years ago.

In everything he did, Charlie DeRose had imagination and aggressiveness. It was that way in newspaper work where he became the first Western Massachusetts publisher to enter the offset printing field. There he was only briefly ahead of The Greenfield Recorder and the two papers have long worked together in developing techniques of operation in both pressroom and composing room.

He is gone now and he will be missed by hundreds of persons who thought they knew him well. Each can tell stories about the sharp-voiced Northampton publisher and they all add up to a complex person who was more idealistic and dedicated than he appeared on the surface. The valley is poorer by his unexpected and untimely death.

HORTON CONCURS THAT JO LOMBARDO IS AN UNUSUAL LADY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Irondequoit Press, of Rochester, paid tribute to Josephine C. Lombardo for some of the work she has done in behalf of her community. I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and at the same time, share with them my own feelings about a most unusual lady.

Jo is a personal friend of mine and for many years I have witnessed her amazing ability to get involved actively in civic and community endeavors. Facetiously I might say it would be easier to list the things she has not been a part of, than to attempt to enumerate all of the wonderful activities she has helped to succeed.

A certified social worker in New York State, Josephine Lombardo is currently engaged professionally as community relations advisor for the city of Rochester in the Community Relations Bureau. As such, she acts as the liaison between the city administration and the people, dealing with whatever problems arise that concern the citizenry and for which action which should be taken by the city council or other branches of the city government.

She is also serving as a member of the Personnel Committee of the New York State Association for Retarded Children. She is on the board of directors of the Irondequoit Council of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce; president for a second term of the Nazareth College Alumnae Association; Secretary of the Catholic Youth Organization; president of the Social Workers Club of Rochester; program chairman of the Soroptimist Club of Rochester; cochairman of the 1969–70 Community Chest-Red Cross Drive for Irondequoit.

I have given only a partial listing of the many organizations and groups that Jo is presenting helping in one capacity or another. I would say she is a perfect example of the contention that if you want a job well done, get a busy person to do it.

Jo Lombardo is an inspiration to all who know her, or are aware of her tireless efforts to help those who need her talents. To my knowledge she has never sought recognition for her many good deeds but it is with great pleasure that I take this occasion to salute her, to thank her on behalf of the entire community, and to concur completely with the editorial I want to share with you, that she is "An Unusual Lady."

The editorial follows:

AN UNUSUAL LADY

Jo Lombardo, after two years as president of the Irondequoit Council of the Chamber of Commerce, has stepped down. The fact that the presidency has changed is not in itself news, but Jo Lombardo is news. It is not unique for a woman to be president of a business organization, but it certainly is unusual. This is a man's world according to the current women's liberation movement, but Jo entered into the activities of the Irondequoit Council giving the impression that she didn't recognize the so-called discrimination between the sexes.

Under Jo's guidance the Irondequoit Council not only continued the policies established by the prior men presidents, but she kindled those policies and added an energetic and ambitious program of her own.

Under Jo's guidance the luncheon meetings were stepped up, the executive committee tackled town problems with more zest. Jo's energies and persistance continually challenged the Council to get the job done.

Jo's interest in Irondequoit was clearly expressed in her enthusiasm and persistance in examining carefully all things connected with the welfare of our community.

Jo, a job well done—the town is in your debt.

COMMENDS "OPERATION DECENCY"

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, many of us have introduced legislation to help combat the rising flood of smut and pornographic materials being sent into homes and distributed at the newsstands. While we are trying to get legislation passed, however, there are encouraging signs that our people back home are doing something about this problem right now.

One year ago in March, a group of organizations from the beach areas of Jacksonville, Fla., met under the sponsorship of the Jacksonville Beaches Woman's Club and launched a program designed to help rid that area of smut. As Mrs. John Hanna remarked:

Operation Decency has endeavored to tip the scales in favor of dignity, respect and honor.

Their first year's activity is evidenced by their report, which reads as follows:

Operation Decency is a new and positive approach to the problem of smut, obscenities and mind pollution. We plan to accomplish this by the effective use of newspaper ads, cartoons, radio tapes, billboards and bank marquees in a program similar to that used by the Cancer Society.

Project aim is to balance the scales in mass media. Recognizing that it is the demand for this type of material that creates the supply, we hope to change the demand.

Civic, social and religious organizations were called together, as well as youth groups from the Beaches areas, to launch this program, sponsored by the Jacksonville Beaches Woman's Club on March 10, 1969. Our first year's activities included a Demonstration for Decency by the Beaches youth, saying, in essence, "We Dig Decency"; a 30-car motorcade to a theater featuring only family-type movies, bank marquee signs indicating "Decency is not Dead," etc.

We stress particularly the positive approach, because analysis of previous projects has proven repeatedly that the negative approach, such as pickets, bans, etc., has only succeeded in bringing increased profit to the cause we oppose.

In March 1970, Operation Decency celebrated its first anniversary with a town-type meeting. Plans projected for the coming year include:

Morality in May's program, encouraging ministers in our area to give sermons on Mind Pollution;

A mail-out campaign to stop unsolicited smut from arriving in the home;

A slogan contest for the young people to stimulate their concern for their own self-worth.

More importantly, every week, every day, there are issues which cry out for support. Our organization tries to take advantage of such situations, build a program around them, and promote them in our immediate area.

Contacting ministers, civic organizations and PTA groups, they arranged for a "Stand Up for America" program in their promotion of decent movies, they sent notes home through schoolchildren telling of special movies that were good for the family, with a cost of 25 cents for children and 50 cents for adults. These movies have proven so successful that the manager of the theater planned to continue them through the summer.

Our Fourth District crime control committee, of which Mrs. Hanna is a member, expressed great interest in this program, particularly becaue Operation Decency was able to accomplish so much in 1 year—on so little. They spent less than $100 on this project.

Mr. Speaker, at a time in America when so much needs to be done in the areas of pollution, crime, and all the other vast problems that face us, let us all commend this group of interested and aggressive citizens who are helping to get the job done.

A REAL POLICEMAN

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an article which appeared in the October 5 edition of the Washington Daily News, captioned "Pfc. Donato Is a Real Policeman."

In describing the actions and personal nature of one member, Pfc. Dick Donato, of the "lollipop" squad, the author has shown the human side of policemen and has very aptly described the successful community relations program of the traffic safety unit of the Prince George's County police department.

Without a doubt, we need more articles of this nature, particularly to help our children realize that the police are our friends and protectors:

PFC. DONATO IS A REAL POLICEMAN—A MAINSTAY OF PG'S "LOLLIPOP" SQUAD

(By Dave Ferguson)

At 27, Pfc. Dick Donato is one of the youngest members of the Prince Georges County Police Department's Traffic Safety Unit. He's a "crumb duster" on the "lollipop squad."

He loves, lives, and works with kids. Since he was assigned to the unit a year ago he has

worked to make children more aware of the dangers of walking to and from school, of the need to be safety conscious, and alert to the ways of preventing accidents.

It was a child, his daughter, who got him to apply for the Traffic Safety assignment.

"Before joining Traffic Safety," Pfc. Donato says, "I was working with an undercover unit. I had long hair, a beard—the works. We were staking out a barn, trying to bust a gang of auto smugglers. It was the most exciting police-community work I've ever done.

"I had just come in from three days in the field. I hadn't washed or changed clothes. Boy, was I grubby!

"I went home and my daughter was telling me about her day in school. One of the guys in the safety unit had given a talk to her class. When she finished, I told her a little about what I had been doing. When I was done, she said, 'That's nice, Daddy, but when are you going to be a REAL policeman?' I almost died!"

The Traffic Safety unit was set up in 1954 by then Pfc. Thomas Rogato, who now ranks as major in charge of all county uniformed police. After investigating the accidental death of a girl in a freak school bus accident, Pfc. Rogato concluded the girl wouldn't have died if a greater emphasis had been placed on safety. Today, the unit's activities have expanded widely and even tho it now has eleven members, the individual workload is still high. Two of the unit's members, Pfc. Donato and Cpl. Ed Travers, are assigned to a total of 52 schools and more than 36,000 students.

Schedules are divided between meetings with principals and faculties, juvenile investigations in liaison with schools, answering school bus complaints, conducting safety tours and demonstrations, and judging truck safety, Maj. Rogato's involvement with the county's "Roadeos." The latter is an off-shoot from trucking fleets when he was first beginning the unit.

"When I first started, I got a lot of help from the truck fleets. Truck drivers are on the road more than we are. They're safety-conscious and they work at it. They know where the hazards are and what should be done to correct them. They were always willing to help. I often wish I could get the same cooperation from the motoring public."

And the results of the unit's efforts are impressive. Pedestrian fatalities for 1969 decreased from the '68 level by more than 32 per cent. Of the four children-pedestrians killed in 1969, only one (a two-and-a-half year old girl) was attributable to the child. No deaths occurred to children while they were in the "charge" of the safety unit, i.e., during the time the children left for, and returned home from school. No children were injured at patrolled corners.

The successes of the "lollipop squad" in community relations belie recent charges that the community doesn't relate to the police. The "crumb dusters" quickly become neighborhood heroes. They are the police department in the eyes of their communities. When people talk about the police, it's often in terms of what their traffic safety officer says and does.

STUDYING AT MARYLAND U.

Pfc. Donato is a part-time student in police administration at the University of Maryland. He lives in the integrated area where he works and is convinced that the solution to police-community problems lies in programs like traffic safety.

"The way I look at my job," he says, "is to make people aware that policemen are human beings. We don't like to use force, but will to preserve the peace. We know that people have problems, but they have to know that violence isn't a solution.

"There are indications that we're getting to the kids, and this is what we're after," Pfc. Donato says. "They're starting to realize that cops don't eat raw meat."

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIREMEN'S WEEK

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is now awaiting signature on the President's desk, a bill which I think is worthy of special note. House Joint Resolution 1154, which proclaims the week of October 24 through October 31 National Volunteer Firemen's Week, has been concurred in by both Houses and is now ready for proclamation. During the Senate's consideration of this joint resolution, it was amended to read, "Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Firemen's Week from October 24, 1970, to Ooctober 31, 1970."

Volunteer firemen provide a most valuable community service, not only on the eastern shore and in southern Maryland, but throughout the entire United States as well. Certainly, this great service and dedication to duty is deserving of the recognition of the community and the Nation.

In order to demonstrate the interest this measure has with the people chiefly concerned, I would like to include the following letters from volunteer fire companies in my district:

FEDERALSBURG VOLUNTEER FIRE CO., INC.,
FEDERALSBURG, MD.,
September 1, 1970.

Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MORTON: The members of the Federalsburg Volunteer Fire Co. support your resolution proclaiming National Volunteer Firemen's Week September 19–26, 1970. The efforts of many young men bring about this vital community service.

Thank you for your interest in our organization.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM BLANCHFIELD,
Secretary.

THE QUEEN ANNE-HILLSBORO,
VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY, INC.,
Queen Anne, Md., August 31, 1970.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Member of Congress,
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: The Queen Anne-Hillsboro Volunteer Fire Co. of Queen Anne, Md. wish to support resolution #1154 which authorizes and requests the President to proclaim September 19, to September 26, 1970 National Volunteer Firemen's week.

We are very much in favor of this resolution and would like to see it go through, not only on the Eastern Shore but throughout the entire United States as well.

Thanking you for your support, We are
Yours sincerely,
WILLIAM COOPER, *President.*

SALISBURY FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
Salisbury, Md., August 21, 1970.

Hon. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN MORTON: In reference to Resolution H.J. Res. 1176, honoring Volunteer Firemen from September 19 through September 26, 1970.

The members of Salisbury Volunteer Fire Department #2, Salisbury, Maryland, would appreciate their letter being recorded in the Congressional Record, stating that they would like to go on record to proclaim September 19, through September 26, as National Volunteer Firemens Week, and would be most grateful knowing this Resolution has been passed; and, to know that some people, somewhere, realize that these gentlemen are giving up their free time, and sometimes their lives, to serve their community.

Thank you for your interest in our firemen and our community.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT M. BUSICK, Jr.,
Secretary, Salisbury Volunteer Dept. #2.

KENNEDYVILLE VOLUNTEER FIRE CO., INC.,
Kennedyville, Md., August 29, 1970.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORTON: In re to the "H.J. Resolution 1154" regarding National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970.

Our company "The Kennedyville Volunteer Fire Company" of Kennedyville, Maryland, *is in favor of the bill.*

We appreciate the concern.

Sincerely,
LESLIE M. DULIN, Sr., *President*
Kennedyville Volunteer Fire Company

PRESTON VOLUNTEER FIRE CO.,
Preston, Md., September 9, 1970.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in regard to your Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 1154) to proclaim September 19–26 National Volunteer Fireman's Week.

We the Preston Volunteer Fire Company, Inc. give you and Mr. Glen Beall our full support. For very few communities realize the value and the taxes saved by the Volunteer Fire Companies.

Yours sincerely,
JACOB M. GARVEY,
President.

ROCK HALL FIRE DEPARTMENT,
Rock Hall, Md., September 9, 1970.

Hon. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROG: Thank you for your letter of August 19 with reference to H.J. Res. 1154.

It is very gratifying to know that with a work-load of much more important matters, you still find time to think of the volunteer firemen.

All to often the volunteer firemen are either overlooked or just taken for granted in the role they play in protecting their communities and the lives of its people.

Therefore, the officers and members of the Rock Hall Volunteer Fire Co. whole heartedly approve and endorse H. J. Res. 1154 and again thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully.
P. JAY ELBOURN, *President.*

EWELL VOLUNTEER FIRE CO., INC.,
Ewell, Md., September 6, 1970.

DEAR MR. MORTON: I am speaking for the Ewell Volunteer Fire Department. We will be pleased and honored if the Senate Judiciary Committee approves the resolution honoring Volunteer Firemen. That is, the resolution for the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970.

Thank you for being mindful of the Volunteer Fire Departments of America.

Many thanks.

JERRY L. EVANS,
President.
LEONARD S. EVANS,
Vice President.
ELMER L. EVANS,
Chief.

HORTON THANKS MRS. MARK ELLINGSON FOR HER REPORT ON RECENT 50TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE OF THE WOMEN'S BUREAU

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my distingushed colleagues in the House of Representatives were quite aware of the 50th anniversary conference of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, when that meeting was held back in June. But perhaps many of us were so busy with our own responsibilities here in Washington that we were not able to be completely aware of its actions and accomplishments.

So, it was with much genuine interest and real pleasure that I discovered that one of those attending the conference had made a thorough report. That report was made available for the public to read when it was printed in the Henrietta Post in my congressional district.

The reporter is an outstandingly fine lady who has been a friend of mine for many, many years. She is Marcia Ellingson, wife of the former president of Rochester Institute of Technology, Mark Ellingson.

Both Marcia and Mark are such devoted people in all causes that aid mankind, that I cannot stress too highly my deep admiration for them. They continue to lead exceptionally busy lives in their desires to be of service to their community, and so it was no surprise to me that Marcia would find the time in her busy schedule to attend the conference of the Women's Bureau.

Many will recall that Marcia Ellingson was a founder of the Woman Power organization which for several years has devoted tremendous attention and energy to the premise that much of woman's abilities and talents is not being properly tapped in the attempt to solve many of the world's problems today.

Marcia and her group were instrumental in writing one of the major planks in the 1968 platform of the Republican Party; and, it is with much pride and satisfaction that I continue to see the fruition of her ideas.

In her many years as a dynamic part of the academic world, I have always been aware of Marcia's burning desire to right the wrongs of the world, to aid those in distress, to give a lifting hand to the oppressed.

Now that she is relieved of the responsibilities of the wife of the president of a great institution, because of Mark's retirement, I daresay Marcia will find herself busier than ever in seeking ways to be of service.

So it gives me pleasure to pay tribute to her in this manner and to wish for her and Mark continued happiness in the years ahead.

I commend to my colleagues Marcia Ellingson's report on the 50th anniversary conference of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, which appeared recently in the Henrietta, N.Y., Post:

"WE'VE COME A LONG WAY, BABY"—A PLEA FOR WOMEN'S SERVICE

"ROLL UP YOUR SLEEVES, HELP NURSE AMERICA BACK TO HEALTH, PRIDE, HAPPINESS"

(NOTE.—Mrs. Mark Ellingson of 3940 East Ave., Pittsford, wife of the former president of Rochester Institute of Technology, attended the 50th anniversary conference of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, June 11–13 in Washington, D.C. This is her report.)

(By Marcia Ellingson)

What was it like when 1,000 women attended the 50th Anniversary Conference of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor in Washington, D.C.?

Was it true that, as stated in the UPI press release across the nation, "First Lady Pat Nixon attempted at a White House reception to soothe the feelings of about 600 women who were irate because President Nixon had not made a personal appearance at their convention?"

Was it true that when Mrs. Nixon faced a scattering of insults and was handed a large number of 'NOW' (National Oragnization of Women) buttons and brochures from militants demanding equal rights for women, she never lost her composure?

Was it true that "Some 200 of the women invited boycotted the reception for what they called Nixon's 'lack of concern for women,' " although Mrs. Nixon assured them that "both of us have always supported equal rights?"

As the only woman from upper New York State who was present, I am glad to have the chance to "tell it like it was" in the land of Susan B. Anthony.

The distinguished head of the Women's Bureau, Elizabeth D. Koontz, first Negro director and U.S. delegate to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, did a good job inviting women of every age, every color from white to ebony, every economic level—including some girls from economic opportunity programs, some women on welfare, some who paid their own expenses, some representing women's organizations and unions.

Their names told that these were the daughters of all the sorrowing sons who fled from Europe to the hope of a better land—a complete mix with the Mexican-American and Indians who were here before they came. Dress was colorful—American Indian, Afro-America, mini, pants suit and modern. It was, indeed, as entitled, "American Women at the Crossroads."

In the final day it was noisy, turbulent, shocking to many of us.

But the formal conference started out well with a very special interest in James Hodgson, designated that day, to replace the Hon. George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor who was moved to a White House post.

He outlined the Labor Department's concern with "people problems in the labor market, at the bargaining table, and in the working places." He hopes to move from a time of dual standards for women and men to a time of single standards. He believes every person in the U.S. has a desire to feel useful, and needed. President Nixon's message, opening the conference, had expressed encouragement toward equal rights. Mr. Hodgson spelled out means of national stewardship and equity with local control and decisions, experimentation and diversity being a desirable condition.

Mrs. Jacqueline Gutwillig, President Nixon's choice as chairman of the Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women, a stunning woman, lady pilot, once head of the WAAC Aircraft Warning Service, pointed to the importance of passing the Equal Rights Amendment.

Eloquent and dynamic, Mrs. Koontz, director of the Women's Bureau, made her point that to attack another's freedom one destroys his own. Very few activities are exclusively masculine or feminine. Women need increased recognition of individual potential and shared partnership with men.

Girls need better preparation for a life where only part of their energies are spent in mothering their own children; where many women are heads of families needing child care centers and more part time jobs; when most women need more realistic education.

She urged, vehemently, that women know the political system and use it, knowing where to put the pressure on and keep it on.

Hon. Arthur A. Fletcher, inspiring Negro Assistant Secretary of Labor, assured delegates that change is possible in Washington today, our very crises teaching us that caring is the winning response to a crisis and work is the key to its solution and our own personal happiness.

One outburst from the floor was quickly satisfied by Mrs. Koontz when a beautiful miniskirted coed from Florida demanded why she saw no representation from young people and the poor. A woman rose, heatedly asking what she thought the poor looked like, and Mrs. Koontz asked all the young people to rise—producing a very good number, many of whom had been given their expenses.

Superb dramatic presentation recalled the violence and repression of the Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Carrie Chatman Catt years of struggle toward the present women's rights to vote and own property, to enter the man's world of jobs.

At dinner, Miss Anita Pollitzer, one of the few women still living who worked with those leaders, led the procession of memoirs by the leaders of each decade—those who helped win the wars; Rosy the Riveter, who helped build ships and industries and overcome the depression.

Finally, the evening ended with a thrilling word in Spanish and English from blue-eyed, strawberry-blond Cruz Delia Morales expressing her young hopes for the future.

All this thoughtful coming together was further deepened in meaning at workshops where each section of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities was discussed and studied with recommendations for the final general meeting.

No woman could return to her life and section of the country without having been changed by this intense and close experience with 1,000 very individual women of all ages.

Women had heard good things about themselves, been praised by Mayor Washington as the greatest force helping citizens of Washington, the city, toward legal right to vote. Each had heard and felt something of the differences, the variations in ways of American women, and yet her common cause with them to help her people and her country.

The turmoil broke out at the Final Plenary Session when the capable Geraldine Rickman, president of Community Opportunity Programs in Education, stunning in her mini and African head style, attempted to present the summary of the workshop recommendations.

Many broke in to shout for time from the floor before the meeting was adjourned for the White House visit. Each wanted her special interest or her union to be given time.

Then, like a family squabble, where big sister screams at mother because Daddy bought little brother a bicycle and would not pay tuition to send her to school, the bitter complaint about President Nixon disrupted the meeting. Even the wife of Mayor Washington complained from the floor.

The reason for anger was that Mr. Nixon had spoken personally to the Boy Scouts, who don't even have a vote, and had only sent a message to the Women's Bureau.

Mrs. Koontz arranged that the meeting be adjourned so that all could, if they wished, go to the White House. There, security around Mrs. Nixon was very alert and in evidence. She was warmly hospitable and listened to everyone who passed. The full Washington pomp was present with the Ma-

rine Band and gracious service in the gardens.

Having spent their venom on Mrs. Nixon, the small percentage of the people who had previously torn the meeting apart were controlled by Geraldine Rickman while real work was done on reaching consensus. Able lawyers, social workers, professional women and union leaders made their points of debate and decisions were accepted.

In retrospect, one can say, "We've come a long way, baby."

We stand strongly with the Indian woman from North Dakota, beautiful in her beaded costume, who pleads for the experienced woman workers in their jewel factory who are paid $1.65 an hour while white men are brought in and paid $4.95.

We yearn for the righting of the individual wrongs, but know that the majority of the women still retain their essential feminine desire to create life and nurture it in partnership with men.

Women are beginning to see the new demands upon them that they learn to use modern means already available to those bold enough to grasp them. As they send more women into politics and public service, they can train more young girls to aspire to full partnership with men. Many of us came home hoping, indeed, such human power will save our nation.

While more people than ever before in the world enjoy delightful luxuries in America, the needs of the poor and the weak are appalling.

We need every woman's skill to open the way for our trained, dedicated and disciplined young people to shape a better world.

Some of us don't want to "burn our bras" or wear pants suits unless we're gardening or on a picnic, but we cry for every woman to roll up her sleeves and help nurse America back to good health, pride and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, last March the Secretary of Defense paid tribute to Mrs. Ellingson by naming her as a member of the Defense Advisory Committee of Women in the Services. By undertaking this crucial assignment, Mrs. Ellingson will be helping to advise the Defense Department on policy matters dealing with women in the service. She will also help to promote acceptance of military service as a career for women. and recommend measures to assure effective use of our women in the service.

I'm sure all of you will join with me in expressing great admiration and respect for the fine efforts and accomplishments of Mrs. Ellingson.

THE JAPANESE CONTINUE TO BOYCOTT ISRAEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1969, I reported to my colleagues findings of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith that Japanese commercial interests had knuckled under to Arab pressure and were boycotting Israel.

A year and a half later, the situation shows little improvement. The Japanese continue to play the Arabs' game.

I condemn those Japanese business interests which continue to feed the flames of discord in the Middle East, while our Government seeks peace and reconciliation there.

Japanese compliance with Arab demands is particularly reprehensible in view of their outcry at our attempt to implement certain reasonable tariff and import controls. Apparently the Japanese find it perfectly acceptable to undermine American foreign policy, on the one hand, while undermining the domestic American apparel, textile, and electronics industries, on the other, all in the name of gain.

It is not acceptable to me, as I am sure it is not acceptable to most of my colleagues.

I place in the RECORD the article "Japan and the Arab Boycott" from the October 1970 issue of the National Jewish Monthly. The article was written by Abraham H. Foxman, director of the Middle Eastern affairs department of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith:

JAPAN AND THE ARAB BOYCOTT

(By Abraham H. Foxman, director, Middle Eastern Affairs Department of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith)

When the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations charged this past summer that two of Japans leading manufacturers—in addition to Japan Air Lines—were participating in the Arab states' economic boycott of Israel, it was only the latest reminder of that curious by-play of successful Arab international intimidation that had accompanied the Jewish state through its 22 years of life.

The Arab boycott, originally undertaken in 1946 to block Israel's establishment, and since then maintained in an effort to wreck her economy and restrict her military potential, had now enacted its price from giants of Japan's burgeoning heavy industry. And the complicity of the Japanese firms is rather openly admitted. The Nissan Motor Company (Datsun cars), Japan's second largest industrial concern, flatly told an Israeli applicant for a Nissan franchise:

"We are now exporting 20,000 units a year to the Arabic countries . . . According to the boycott resolution . . . the transaction with your country will surely create the total ban of our export to the Arab countries."

In a discussion in Tokyo on April 2, 1970, the Executive Vice President of Toyota Motors—the company previously had firmly denied yielding to Arab threats—told Arnold Forster, General Counsel of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, who is chairman of the Presidents' Conference Anti-Boycott Committee: "We have been trading with the United Arab Republic and considered starting with Israel business. However, we encountered boycott threats from the United Arab Republic against our trade with Israel. Under the pressure of the Egyptian boycott, we were unable to do anything."

Israeli companies requesting a Toyota franchise have not been treated to such candor. They have been told that the Japanese company could not increase its sales outlets without "sacrificing the requirement of old distributors and dealers."

Such excuses, Mr. Forster has pointed out, at a national press conference held at the ADL on July 15, 1970, ran clearly contrary to recent reports published in business journals. The October 27, 1969 issue of *U.S. News and World Report*, for example, had carried a business roundup reporting: "Japanese car makers are negotiating with almost all European nations . . . Key deal: Toyota Motor will deliver 3,000 cars to Czechoslovakia."

Mr. Forster also cited the Journal of Commerce, March 18, 1970, reporting that Toyota and Nissan had completed plans for the construction of assembly plants in Europe, and the May 7, 1970 issue of the same publication reporting Toyota plans to enter the market in Indonesia, Thailand, and South Korea.

The Toyota executive had told Mr. Forster that he would soon send a representative to Israel to make a market potential survey. But apparently the plan had been shelved. In fact, the Lebanese newspaper *L'Orient* on June 30, 1970 quotes Muhammad Mahjoub, head of the Arabs' boycott agency, as stating that Toyota had assured him it had no relations with Israel.

A report publsihed in the *Japan Times* in February, 1970, Mr. Forster indicated, that Nissan Motors "is currently pushing plans for establishing a jeep assembly plant in Saudi Arabia jointly with local interests and that preparations also are being made to form a joint truck production facility in Iraq."

Japan Air Lines, which has resisted a mutual landing agreement with Israel's El Al, has recently shown some indication it may be willing to alter its position, according to Mr. Forster's report. In the absence of an agreement, neither country's airline lands in the other country. In 1967, the Israeli ambassador to Japan and the president of Japanese Air Lines agreed to open discussions, with governmental negotiations to follow. Nothing happened because of JAL's failure to follow through. After three years of fruitless correspondence, JAL finally accepted a request from El Al to meet with El Al's representatives in September, 1970 for further discussions. The results remain to be seen.

In the meantime, the threat that is explicit in the Arabs' blacklist, first formally complied in 1953, still has the power to humble at least a few giant corporations. The targets of the Arab boycott are companies or individuals falling into a number of categories, including: ships carrying goods to or from Israel (individual ships, not shipping companies); firms marketing Israeli exports abroad; firms investing money in Israel; motion pictures favorable to Israel or to Jews, or which feature actors known to support Israel (among those blacklisted since 1959 are Elizabeth Taylor, Frank Sinatra, Jerry Lewis, Helen Hayes, Harry Belafonte and the late Marilyn Monroe). The Arab League has also written to major film companies and other U.S. concerns demanding to know the number of Christians and Jews among their top officials.

The boycott mechanism employs three basic documents: (1) an affidavit, which must be submitted by firms undertaking business with Arab nations for the first time, affirming that they are engaging in no boycottable offense—i.e., trade with Israel; (2) a "certificate of origin" for all goods shipped to Arab countries; (3) a query sent to firms suspected of violations, often containing an open threat of blacklisting. In one typical letter, sent to an American businessman in 1962, the Commissioner General of the Central Office for the Boycott of Israel stated that the boycott's rationale:

"As a measure of self-defense and with the view to safeguarding the rights and the vital interests of the Arabs of Palestine, the Arab countries strictly adhere to a set of boycott regulations directed at Israel. In brief, these regulations prohibit any Arab from having any dealings whatsoever with any Israeli person or business, or with foreign persons or firms maintaining such dealings with Israel. Violation of these regulations entails the blacklisting of violators in all Arab countries with the result that all commercial transactions with such violators are banned."

From its inception, the blacklist has gone far beyond the terms of the original boycott and become anti-Jewish as well as anti-Israel. In correspondence with American firms, importers in Arab countries have asked to be assured that desired goods are "not of Jewish origin" or manufactured "in any Jew factories." Regulations further forbid dealings in Arab countries through "Jewish-owned" ships that sail under the American flag. Saudi Arabian customs regulations in effect as early as 1953 forbade the importa-

tion of any goods marketed by Jewish firms. Examples, specified by a Saudi Arabian official: Macy's and Gimbels. Libya more recently confiscated a shipment of beer cans that had two inverted triangles resembling the Jewish star of David as a trademark.

The Central Office for the Boycott of Israel, headquartered in Damascus, is a nongovernmental organization operated by the Economic Council of the Arab League. Regional affiliated committees in various Arab nations, however, are under the control of the governments of those nations. These committees make recommendations, but the actual boycott is effected by the various Arab governments.

The history of the boycott is, ironically, largely a history of its misfirings. The Renault Automobile Company, for example, found after yielding that the promised Arab market was for the most part a myth. Israel, on the other hand, offers a market far out of proportion to its size. Furthermore, much of the boycott is imaginary. The boycott office will often remove a firm from the blacklist which never has been on it, or state that a company has complied with their terms when in fact the company has done no business in Israel and does not contemplate doing so. Such "successes" help to explain why the boycott has failed in its major objectives over the years. It has in fact spurred Israel's economy—the remarkable growth of the young nation's merchant marine, for example, is undoubtedly due in part to the need to look further than the Middle East for markets and for sources of supply.

Another of the boycott's ironies is that it has been selective. Some 80 international banks do a thriving business with Israel while continuing unhampered in their business affairs in Arab states. Among Japanese firms, despite the attitude of Toyota and Nissan, there are many which have done business in Israel with no loss of trade from the Arab world.

It is impossible to know all of the business firms throughout the world which have knuckled under to the boycotters' threats—for the simple reason that the knuckling-under can be done in the privacy of an executive's mind, exhibiting no positive outward signs of what is essentially a negative decision. It is possible, however, to list some of the major firms doing business in Israel in clear defiance of the boycott. The Anti-Defamation League first did so in 1963, naming among others Ford, RCA, Westinghouse, IBM, Monsanto, General Tire, and Republic Steel. In 1966, a major psychological defeat for the Arab League was the reversal in policy of the Coca-Cola Company, which granted a bottling franchise in Israel after many years of stalling and subterfuge with respect to franchise applications.

In 1965 the U.S. Congress passed an Export Control Act containing compromise anti-boycott provisions requesting firms harassed by Arab blackmail attempts to file reports on same with the Department of Commerce. This was a no-teeth formula enacted in place of an original proposal which would have declared submission to the boycott illegal for American companies. The inadequacy of the compromise tended to force firms to comply with the Arabs' intrusion into American foreign trade and to camouflage their submission as Coca-Cola had done for so long. A similar situation has existed in Japan, reports the ADL's Arnold Forster, where the government has failed to adopt policies that would protect the nation's industries from Arab pressures. Obviously, if the governments of all the major industrial nations would protect their own private business firms, the boycott would have to die to keep the Arab nations alive.

On returning from his 1970 trip to Japan, Arnold Forster declared that the large Japanese firms which had capitulated to the threats had done so "out of fear rather than good business sense." The Arab boycott was built as much out of bluff and braggadocio as out of bitterness and intimidation. With many companies in many nations, good business sense had prevailed over fear. But good business can be fortified by good governmental policies, and there is a firm basis upon which governments can take a part: Mr. Forster has pointed out that submission to the Arab boycott is clearly against the regulations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), of which 76 countries—including the United States, Israel, and Japan—are signatories.

Another answer, and perhaps the ultimate one, is individual courage and adherence to principle. An example is found in a letter to the Arab boycott committee from Howard M. James, President of the Scherr-Tumico Corporation, which had received a blacklist threat after announcing plans to open a plant in Israel. Mr. James' letter, dated May 22, 1962, read in part:

"We are not impressed by your threats of intimidation and coercion through boycott and blacklist. . . . The effort you are expending in fomenting hate and strife . . . can better be used to bring something of substance for your people. . . . Cease your war with the Israelis and you will find this corporation and most all of America ready and anxious to extend to you a welcome and a helping hand."

DRAFT DECAY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have said for a long time that the draft system is breaking down and badly in need of replacement. I have introduced the National Service Act of 1970 (H.R. 18025) with bipartisan support.

This past Sunday's New York Times carried a front-page article outlining one aspect of this decay in the draft system—the rising number of medical exemptions which are being granted.

The article is most interesting, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

MORE YOUTHS LOOK FOR A MEDICAL "OUT" TO AVOID THE DRAFT

(By David E. Rosenbaum)

WASHINGTON, October 10.—Deliberate and increasingly successful pursuit of a medical exemption from the military draft has become routine among college students.

No longer able to avoid the military by entering graduate school or draft-deferable occupations, a growing number of young men have found physical disqualification a painless alternative to being drafted, going to jail or leaving the country.

Usually, these men are aided by private doctors who write letters for them documenting genuine, exaggerated or, in a few instances, fabricated medical conditions.

TARR SEES "INEQUITIES"

Noel Perrin, a Dartmouth College English professor who conducts periodic surveys of the senior class, estimates that more than 60 percent of the men in the college who have taken the Army physical examinations have been permanently disqualified from the military.

One day last spring, for instance, 34 of 43 Dartmouth students who took the bus to Manchester, N.H., for their pre-induction examinations were disqualified.

Dr. Curtis W. Tarr, the Director of Selective Service, said in an interview that the rising number of medical deferments was "a cause for serious concern because it's one of the real inequities still left in the draft system."

The reason for Dr. Tarr's concern and the inequities about which he spoke can be seen in figures compiled by the Army's Medical Statistics Agency:

In 1966, 24.2 percent of the draftees examined for the first time were disqualified for physical or psychiatric conditions. In the fiscal year that ended last June, 32.5 percent of the draftees failed the medical examination, an increase of 8.3 percent in three and a half years. In that period, the number of men examined increased slightly. In July, the last month for which statistics are available, 40.7 percent were disqualified.

While 41.5 percent of the whites who took the medical examination in July failed, only 32.4 percent of the blacks failed. In every state, the percentage of whites who failed is considerably higher than the percentage of blacks.

In 1969, 45.7 percent of the potential draftees examined in Massachusetts and 42.3 percent in New York were disqualified. In South Carolina and Georgia, the percentages were 17.9 percent and 27 percent, respectively.

In every study conducted, it can be seen that the rate of medical disqualifications go up in direct proportion to the education level of the men surveyed, according to Dr. Bernard D. Karpinos, an Army statistician.

There is little evidence, of course, that black people are healthier than whites, that Georgians are healthier than New Yorkers, that educated men are unhealthier than dropouts or that Americans developed more medical problems as opposition to the war in Vietnam intensified and draft calls increased.

MEDICAL HISTORY IS KEY

The explanation for the inequities apparent in the Army statistics became clear in a series of interviews conducted in several parts of the country with military and private doctors, Selective Service officials, draft counselors and young men trying to avoid the draft.

All the sources agreed that a man was more likely to be disqualified in the mass-production Army examination if he had been treated by doctors regularly all his life and was articulate about his medical history.

There are 74 armed forces entrance and examining stations in the country, most of them staffed by one or two Army doctors and a few private physicians hired on a per diem basis. This handful of doctors is often called on to examine several hundred potential inductees in a single day. The attention given any one man is usually minimal.

Men called for their pre-induction examinations are told to bring with them documentation of disqualifying medical conditions. It is the rare man who is disqualified without a letter from a private doctor attesting to his condition, unless, of course, the man has an obviously debilitating condition.

HARDER FOR BLACKS

A doctor recently discharged from the Army after having served for two years at an examining station said:

"A white kid, a college student who came in with asthma or an ulcer or a psychiatric problem had usually been treated for his condition for years. He knew the doctor who saw him for asthma at age 15 and had a letter from the doctor. We might not be able to verify the condition, but we would still disqualify him.

"The typical black kid came from a ghetto or a rural area and he might have had the same conditions. But he had never been treated for them, and we never found out about them. We tried to give the best examination we could, and you'd be surprised at how many disqualifying conditions we found in poor blacks, and poor whites, too, for that matter. But I'm sure that many, many of them slipped through."

While this may explain, at least in part, the reason why more whites than blacks

and more men from urban states than from rural states have for years failed the draft physical exam, it does not explain the sharp increase in disqualifications in recent years.

This increase, nearly all the sources interviewed agreed, is due to the opposition to the war in Vietnam and particularly to the draft among young men from middle and upper-income families.

"The fact is," said Col. Paul Akst, director of Selective Service in New York City, "that people want to fail and they're finding ways to do it."

Dr. Tarr agreed. "Young men, especially students, know the regulations and are being coached on how to fail the physical," he said.

A draft counselor in Maryland said this was always the first route a man should take in avoiding the draft. "When a guy comes to us and wants to beat the draft," he said, "we tell him first of all to go to a sympathic doctor and get a complete checkup. There's a good chance that the doctor will find something wrong with him that will cause him to be disqualified. If he can't, then we consider other ways, but it's one hell of a lot less painful to get a 4-F or a 1-Y than it is to go to jail or Canada."

These "sympathetic" doctors fall into two categories. In the first are responsible physicians who are thoroughly familiar with the Army medical standards and who try to find in young men conditions that genuinely do not meet the standards.

The second, and by far the smaller, category consists of doctors who are outright frauds. They will, for a fee, write letters for potential draftees alleging a physical or psychiatric condition that does not exist.

Many doctors in the first category belong to organizations such as the Medical Committee for Human Rights or Physicians for Social Responsibility. In addition, there are doctors in this category in nearly every university infirmary.

Dr. Quentin Young of Chicago, the founder of the Medical Committee for Human Rights, said his organization had begun examining potential draftees a few years ago because "the draft is so oppressive, and we wanted to help guys who couldn't afford a doctor to document their conditions."

The committee has chapters in 30 cities, and most member doctors do not charge for their examinations. Still, Dr. Young said, "the vast majority of the men we see are white. If I said 20 per cent were black, I'd be exaggerating."

He said his organization was considering setting a policy that "every white guy who comes in must bring a black guy with him."

Dr. Young said that he would never falsify a letter to keep a man out of the draft, and a former Army doctor said, "We really respected Quentin Young and the other doctors we knew belonged to his group. If he wrote a letter about a man, we knew it was right."

This is in contrast with doctors in the other category, some of whom appear to make their living by writing bogus letters for draft dodgers. There do not appear to be many of these doctors, but most Army doctors agreed that there is probably at least one in every large city.

One doctor the Army physicians are convinced is falsifying letters is a New York City psychiatrist. A doctor at one of the three examination stations in the New York City area reported that an average of five of the 250 men examined each day at his station carried a letter from this psychiatrist.

The letters vary so little from one to another that they can accurately be called "form" letters. Normally only the name and one or two other words are different. The diagnosis is nearly always the same: "Manic depressive illness, depressed type, with paranoid features."

The Army doctor estimated that 60 to 70 per cent of the men carrying these letters were disqualified immediately and that a large percentage of the rest were subsequently disqualified on appeal to the Surgeon General of the Army.

If there are five such men every day at each of the three examining stations, then 75 men a week are reporting for examinations in the New York area with letters that may be fraudulent from a single doctor.

One young man who visited this psychiatrist's office reported that the doctor's fee was $250, "cash in advance," for an examination and a letter.

Colonel Akst, the New York City draft director, would not acknowledge in an interview that he knew of this psychiatrist because, he said, "I don't like to name names." But it was clear from his expression that he was familiar with the letters.

He estimated that 5 per cent of the 40,000 men who were disqualified at the three New York area stations—Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn, Whitehall in Manhattan and Newark—had fraudulent or "grossly exaggerated" letters.

Men who claim psychiatric disorders at their examinations are usually interviewed by a private psychiatrist hired by the Army on a per diem basis. One such private psychiatrist who works regularly at one of the New York area examining stations said in an interview that the obviously fraudulent letters "put us in a terrible bind." He explained:

"She (the New York psychiatrist) writes and says that she has examined the patient 'extensively.' Now most responsible doctors would probably give the dates of the visits or at least the time span of the treatment, but anyway she says she has examined him 'extensively.'

"The most we have to interview the man is 10 minutes or maybe 15, and we really would have to go out on a limb to contradict this doctor who is supposedly qualified."

In addition, the doctor who works for the Army said, the examining stations are under considerable pressure from the Pentagon not to accept men who should have been disqualified.

Every time a man is discharged from the service because of a medical condition that existed prior to his induction, the doctor said, the Army physician who examined him before induction is required to explain in writing why he did not detect the condition.

Thus, he said, whenever there is the slightest doubt in the Army doctor's mind, he will disqualify the man, especially at a time when there are far more qualified men than are needed to fill draft quotas.

Several of the doctors suspected of being frauds have been reported to the Surgeon General of the Army, but no action has been taken.

Col. George Sgalitzer, the surgeon at the United States Army Recruiting Command, who is in over-all charge of the examining stations, refused to be interviewed on the subject of fraudulent doctors.

In written replies to inquiries, he declined to reveal how many doctors suspected of writing bogus letters had been reported to him or what action he had taken, but he did say, "Our own efforts to reduce the number of suspected fraudulent physicians' letters have been hampered by lack of evidence."

Dr. Tarr, the Selective Service director, said he had "heard" that some had also been reported to the Justice Department for possible prosecution, but a Justice Department spokesman said that he did not know of any such reports and that no investigations were under way.

Because medical disqualification is such a simple method of draft evasion, many young men are delighted to learn that they are sick. Dr. Young told the following story:

"One kid came in and said there was nothing wrong with him, that he had no symptoms, but that he wanted me to find something wrong with him to keep him out. I couldn't find anything, but in talking with him I learned that an uncle had diabetes.

"Now, I would never order a glucose test on a 19-year-old on such flimsy evidence, but I did in this case, and sure enough he had diabetes.

"I remember saying, 'Congratulations, you have diabetes.' Imagine when people want to have serious illnesses."

HORTON EXPRESSES PRIDE IN THE GENEROSITY OF ROCHESTER AREA FAMILIES IN OPENING HEARTS AND HOMES TO "FRESH AIR" YOUNGSTERS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, for many years the summer season has marked the year's highlight of the kindnesses of the Rochester area families to those less fortunate than themselves. Now they are proving once again that the "Fresh Air" program is a great humanitarian operation of such magnitude that its many blessings cannot, probably, be overestimated.

This year hundreds of families in my 36th Congressional District will be opening their hearts and homes to underprivileged children from the inner cities of both New York City and Rochester.

The yearly movement of these city youngsters to the suburbs of Rochester is underway now. Their reception into the area homes is a splendid example of the willingness of good people to share their material blessings with little folk who might not otherwise ever know the pleasures of enjoying the great outdoors, sunshine, fresh air, and the relaxed loving kindness of a family which cares.

Just one fine example of the good this program does was cited in a newspaper story in the Brighton-Pittsford Post recently. It told the story of one "Fresh Air Kid" who really made good.

It stated that Mr. and Mrs. Richard Rochow, Pittsford chairmen of the Fresh Air Fund, know what the program is all about from personal experience.

For the past 7 years, since she was a frightened 11-year-old, Elizabeth Hopes of Brooklyn has been visiting the Rochow family at their home at 203 West Bloomfield Road, in Pittsford, for at least 2 weeks each summer.

As a "Fresh Air Kid," Elizabeth came to be part of the Rochow family, which includes the Rochow's three daughters and son. Elizabeth, herself, is one of 13 children who lost their mother 6 years ago.

For a time she lived with a family for whom she babysat in South Orange, N.J., where she attended high school and from which she was graduated this summer. She is the first member of her immediate family to earn a high school, college-entrance diploma.

Several weeks ago Elizabeth came to visit the Rochows, whom she credits largely with her decision to seek a college education.

With them she journeyed to the State University College in Cortland, one of three at which she was accepted and where she will begin studying immediately, seeking a degree in either sociology or physical education.

This is only one fine example of the lasting good that is accomplished when we share out blessings with others.

The Brighton-Pittsford Post, in a story written by Pat Dougherty, told of some of the behind-the-scenes work and planning that goes into this successful "Fresh Air" program.

May I share it now with my colleagues so that they, too, may know some of the pride I take in the fine people of my district who work hard to make a happy summer for hundreds of inner city children.

The article follows:

AREA FAMILIES TO OPEN HEARTS, HOMES TO "FRESH AIR" YOUNGSTERS

(By Pat Dougherty)

Today—paper—work, applications, lists and phone calls.

In a fortnight—some 700 excited kids, yelping with joy, as suburban residents open their hearts and homes to entertain youngsters from the New York City area for two weeks.

"If statistics can ever jump to life, it's with the Fresh Air program," said one community chairman. "Now we have only names on a sheet, but in a couple of weeks, every one of those names will become an individual in his own right, with his own personality."

For months, volunteer workers have been accepting requests for visitors from area families, interviewing prospective hosts and striving to match interests, ages and inclinations.

Now, the preliminary work is nearly finished, and the first contingent of young visitors will arrive at the New York Central Station next Thursday, remaining with host families until July 22. The second group will come the following day, returning to New York Aug. 6. Guests may remain on invitation until a final departure train Aug. 20.

Similar preparations have been underway by chairmen of the children-to-children program, started here 3 years ago to broaden avenues of communication between the suburbs and Rochester's inner city—specifically the vicinity of Hand St. served by St. Bridget's Church.

Again this Summer, youngsters will visit area families for 2 weeks, building family-to-family relationships. A total of 200 host families took part in the program last year, according to Mrs. J. Lloyd Lill, Jr. of 70 Parkridge Dr., Pittsford, who helped launch the program.

An informational meeting to finalize the Summer's program was held last month at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Justin E. Doyle of 15 Sandbrook Rd., Pittsford.

Altogether, some 230 Fresh Air kids are slated to visit homes in Pittsford, Penfield, East Rochester, Fairport and Brighton, according to Mrs. Donald Van Vechten, 51 Southland Ave., Brighton, area chairman of the program.

Applications for guests are open in Penfield, Pittsford and some other area suburbs, and may be filed with area community chairmen.

Quotas already have been reached in East Rochester, where 65 children will be entertained. And in Fairport, with a guest list of 50 already filled.

Some 35 children are scheduled to visit homes in both Penfield and Pittsford, and more can be signed up if host families apply.

PROJECT GREEN THUMB

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House will debate today the Comprehensive Manpower Act, H.R. 19519, which I strongly support. This legislation continues many already well-established employment service programs such as Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Operation Mainstream including its Project Green Thumb and senior aid programs. This legislation also permits inclusion of programs for senior retired citizens, such as Green Thumb, in public service employment programs under title III.

This mainstream project, Green Thumb, is now functioning in 17 States and 210 counties. Providing as it does for meaningful and constructive employment for many senior citizens, the program as administered has been a model of cooperation and coordination and has been enthusiastically received.

The current edition of Life magazine contains a short story which attests to the support this program has received. As stated by some of the participants in this article, Project Green Thumb, has made a substantial difference in their lives. I commend the article to my colleagues:

MUSCLING OUT OF RETIREMENT

If America has a lost generation today it is surely that group we euphemistically term "senior citizens" and doom to poverty and boredom. Old farmers are especially afflicted: few have much money (they did not even come under Social Security until the 1950s), and their lifetimes of hard physical labor were habit-forming. Thus news of the success of a program aimed at helping such men comes as a happy exception to the general geriatric gloom. For retired farmers in 17 states, the answer has proved to be Green Thumb. Funded by the federal government and administered by the National Farmers Union, the project got under way in 1966 and now employs some 3,000 men. Their ages average 69—the oldest is 94—yet they put in a solid eight-hour day three days a week on useful projects that range from grass and tree planting to cleaning out lakes and building picnic tables and fireplaces. Their pay is a modest $1.60 an hour, but for most of them what counts is the opportunity to work. One man, retired for several years and feeling poorly, joined Green Thumb and has now helped build two dozen new parks. Now that he's 78 and feeling fine, he's thinking about getting married.

Fred Moench lived with relatives until joining Green Thumb three years ago. Now he owns a house trailer. "The best thing is not having to worry about hanging around the kids," he says. "Oh, they liked having me, but you know, an old man can get to be a real pain in the butt after a while, no matter how much you love him."

Twenty-five years ago Rolland Dissmore was so badly afflicted with arthritis that his doctors ordered him to give up farming. "I couldn't get much of anything to do," he says. "The most work I had was washing the dishes while my wife worked uptown. I started on Green Thumb three years ago. I feel stronger every month."

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

A growing concern about our environmental crisis is sweeping the Nation. State and local governments are increasing their pollution control activities. Corporations are coming out with new devices to combat pollution. Members of Congress are finding that increasing amounts of time are needed to deal with the problems of pollution in their districts and States.

The Nation is stirring itself, and none too soon. We are beginning to realize that pollution is no longer an acceptable form of behavior. In the Ninth District alone, 80 percent of those responding to my 1970 questionnaire felt that funds to fight pollution should be increased. Each day, I receive in my Washington office letters asking, "What can I do to help?"

As individuals, we can begin with the time-tested procedures of a free society to save our environment—the ballot, the petition, and court action. It is necessary to develop a widespread local interest in pollution control and then act. As a first step, an inventory of local polluters and polluting activities might be taken. The inventory should include: Sources of air and water pollution; methods of solid waste disposal and handling; availability of recreation and park resources; environmental effects of highways, airports and other public works projects; sources of noise pollution; and the use of pesticides.

There are several things to do with such an inventory. Local newspapers and radio stations should be urged to pay greater attention to polluting activities. Municipal officials and State and National legislators should be advised and urged to help. Concerned citizens also should file complaints and initiate court action to compel polluters to stop fouling the environment.

As consumers, we must all realize that all of us contribute to pollution in varying degrees. A truly effective attack on pollution will require changes in our lifestyle. If we are to erase the litter from our landscapes, clean the air of smog, rid the water of pollutants, all of us are going to have to adopt a less wasteful way of life.

The private sector, as well, must become aggressively involved in pollution control. This is not an easy decision for American business, and some of the cost of pollution abatement might raise eyebrows among stockholders. Without the active involvement of business, however, the chances for success in the fight against pollution are not encouraging.

Without doubt, national, State, and local governments will have to bear the major burden in the effort to control pollution. Specific steps can be taken;

—The establishment of a joint congressional committee to systematically oversee actions affecting, and solutions to, our environmental problems;

—A concerted effort to promote environmental education in our schools;

—Increased funding levels for pollution control programs at all levels of government. For the current fiscal year, only one-half of 1 percent of our Federal budget has been allocated to fighting pollution. State and local efforts are as bad if not worse.

—New legislation that places more of the burden for pollution control on those who violate pollution laws. The principle of "he

who pollutes must pay the cost of cleaning it up" must be adopted.

—State and local units must forge stronger partnership efforts to combat pollution. Pollution does not begin or end at city limits or State lines, so regional and interstate cooperation must be expanded.

—More research is needed to seek new alternatives to those procedures and products which contribute to our pollution problem.

The perils of delay are great. Forceful and meaningful action, especially by concerned individuals, is needed now.

CHIEF OF RESERVES PRAISES NAVAL CENTER AT AVOCA

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Naval Reserve at Avoca, Pa., one of the finest, modern, best equipped in the country, recently underwent a thorough inspection by Rear Adm. Edwin M. Rosenberg, chief of the entire Naval Reserve, and his staff.

The September 18 edition of the Wilkes-Barre Record carries a thorough story on the facility, which is most complimentary.

I was instrumental in having the Reserve center established in Avoca, a town which I am privileged to represent in the Congress, and this story is a source of pride. I submit it for publication in the RECORD:

CHIEF OF RESERVES PRAISES NAVAL CENTER ON VISIT TO AVOCA

Rear Adm. Edwin M. Rosenberg, who won reinstatement into the Navy after a successful battle with cancer, now the commander of the entire Naval Reserve in the United States, made his first official visit to the Naval Reserve Training Center, Avoca, accompanied by members of his staff from Omaha, Nebraska, for an inspection of the personnel, administrtaion, and training.

He told of the expanding need for Naval Reservists under the new policy of the Defense Department and said he was pleased to note the training center near the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton airport "incorporates the most modern training facilities for a ready reserve."

Under the new Defense Department setup emphasizing the need for reserve forces support, "we might have to call reservists on a day's notice," he observed.

In discussing the Naval Reserve shore establishments readiness compared to Naval Reserve units assigned to training ships, he said the top award for Naval Reserve unit performance this year will go to "a center in the eastern part of the United States."

He said at a luncheon given by the Navy League that he was pleased to note "people are still interested enough in freedom to make the effort to be here today."

He praised the civilians who have supported the various Naval Reserve projects and lauded the Naval Reserve personnel for combining the basic qualities of know-how and spirit for effective training."

Adm. Rosenberg, invited the civilian community to observe the work of the men and their equipment at the training center. "It's your center, too," he told the guests at the luncheon. "You should be interested to learn how it's used for protecting freedom."

Adm. Rosenberg said the Naval Reserve headquarters at Omaha is in an ideal location to serve the entire nation and said there is "no thought of moving or adding district headquarters in other parts of the country."

He said the Naval Reserve program gives youth an opportunity to complete his military obligation while serving most of his time at home. Two years of active duty is included in a six-year enlistment, he noted. Most of the early tour of duty is spent at the training center, followed by two years active duty and two more years at the training center as the windup.

Cmdr. Charles R. Piersee, commanding officer of the Naval Reserve Training Center, and Capt. Robert T. Conway, commanding officer of the Naval Reserve unit, welcomed Admiral Rosenberg and his staff to the center.

Included in the inspection party was Capt. Edward W. Fidler, a Scranton native, who was commanding officer of the Naval Reserve Training Centers at Kingston and Dunmore. Capt. Fidler presently serves as Chief of Staff for Naval Reserve in the Fourth Naval District which includes Pennsylvania, Ohio, Delaware and Southern New Jersey.

Representatives of the Navy League and the Cancer Society units in Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties joined Naval Reserve personnel, active and retired, at the luncheon.

Commanding officers of the Naval Reserve unit's surface divisions attending were Cmdr. E. T. Davies, Cmdr. Kenneth Lewis, and Lt. Cmdr. Leonard Zavada; also Commander David Philbin, chief of staff for the local Naval Reserve.

Capt. Conway presented Adm. Rosenberg with an anthracite desk set as a memento of his first visit to the Northeastern Pennsylvania region.

Adm. Rosenberg was stricken with cancer early in 1946 and survived several operations and constant radiation treatment during an 11-month period. He was placed on the Navy's retired list in 1947 and after his recovery he was recalled to active duty in 1948. He was returned to the Navy's active duty roster in September, 1950 by a special act of Congress.

FACTS CONCERNING FUEL OIL FOR NEW ENGLAND

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few demagogs have been running around claiming that New England is going to freeze to death this winter for lack of fuel oil. The Nixon administration is not going to stand for this a minute, nor does a so-called oil crisis exist at this time in New England.

The difficulty in this area derives in large measure from reduced availabilities of residual fuel oil because of tanker shortages and developments in the Middle East. Because of pollution requirements and price differentials, No. 2 home heating oil is sharply up in demand.

Many areas are converting to No. 2 distillate oil and there is a prospect that the demand for this classification of fuel oil will sharply increase in the near future. It being presently under quota invites pressure for increase in the quotas assigned.

The New England Fuel Institute has asked for an increase effective November 1 to 150,000 barrels a day for District 1—the Northeast—for 6 months. I support this, but this is prevention. There is no fuel shortage at this moment.

As Charles Burkhardt, executive vice president of the New England Fuel Institute, points out in the excellent article that follows, appearing in the Boston Evening Globe for Monday, October 5, what we need in this country is a long-range energy program. This is particularly true of areas such as New England that are exposed to extreme weather conditions and sharply varying winters.

WHY THE OIL CRISIS? FUEL OFFICIAL EXPLAINS

(By Charles H. Burkhardt, executive vice president, New England Fuel Institute)

The present worldwide restrictions on the supply of residual fuel oil, coupled with a shortage of large tankers necessary for long haul transport, is no piece of fiction, nor is it the result of any sustained machinations on the part of the major oil companies.

It is convenient and popular to assume that the major international oil companies are the cause of the black oil shortage. It smacks more of the truth that they are the victims rather than the cause. However, this refers primarily to residual oil.

The worldwide situation presently affects residual oil, sometimes known as black oil or heavy oil. This residual oil is completely different from No. 2 distillate oil known as home heating oil, which at this moment is not in short supply but very well will be if utilities and other industry users are to dip into home heating oil stocks to extend the supply of residual oil or to use home heating oil as a substitute for residual oil. This is a problem that makes necessary additional stocks of home heating oil, which can be obtained by increasing the import quotas or eliminating import quota restrictions entirely.

These import quotas have visited for years an economic inequity upon the New England consumer that specifically affects at this time No. 2 home heating oil. These quotas are completely anachronistic. Developed over 13 years ago, they no longer fit the energy needs of this region and should be discarded. There are no import quotas on residual oil, such having been lifted several years ago.

The world-wide shortage of residual oil, if it continues, will cause serious power shortages throughout the East. This is a further complication. Electric utilities are not able to obtain adequate supplies of residual oil; therefore, many will enter the market to buy lighter distillate oils in quantity in order to get by. Shortages of natural gas that will not be alleviated until late 1971 further cloud and distort the home heating market. No fewer than six New England gas utilities have sent letters or other notifications to their customers, stating they are taking no more new heating customers until further notice.

This tends to stabilize the home heating market quantitatively, as there can be no vast shifts from one fuel to the other. Shortage of coal, because young men do not wish to work as miners, doesn't help either. And the high sulphur content of coal renders its use impolitic at the present time.

At no time have so many political, social, national and international history-making events conspired to produce a single result—in this case, interruption in the supply of oil extending from crude to the refined product.

Nowhere is this more evident than with residual oil. Everything conspires to thwart

an adequate supply. Here are some major problems:

1—As a residue of the refining process residual oil is sold for less than the cost of crude. Its production is economically unsound.

2—Domestic refiners have found successful methods of eliminating the production of residuals in the manufacture of gasoline, distillate oils and other petroleum products. As a result, the major supply must be imported.

3—Large oil tankers are becoming increasingly unavailable and expensive.

4—The closing of the Suez Canal has substantially increased the demand for tankers, as Persian Gulf cargoes must go around Africa to get to the Western refineries.

5—Energy requirements, specifically the demand for residual oil, has more than doubled in major countries of Western Europe, especially England and West Germany.

6—More than 90 percent of the residual oil consumed on the East Coast is imported from overseas, and therefore international developments have a direct effect on the availability of the product.

7—The British government this year changed its policy of supporting the coal industry in power generation and is now encouraging conversions to oil. This alone has increased Britain's demand for residual oil by 50,000 barrels per day.

8—The Syrian government refuses to allow the trans-Arabian pipeline to be repaired. This cuts off 500,000 barrels per day of crude oil that would go to refineries in Europe and other parts of the world.

9—The Libyan government has ordered foreign oil companies to reduce production of crude by 500,000 barrels per day.

10—These two Mideast nations, by arbitrary action, deprive the world of one million barrels of crude per day with the resulting diminution of the production of residual oil.

11—These developments, plus a considerable amount of scare and precautionary buying throughout Europe because of politics and inflation, have pushed tanker rates to the highest level since the Suez Canal crisis of 1966. In July, 1970, it cost $3.44 per barrel to deliver oil from the Persian Gulf to northwestern Europe, compared to $1.01 per barrel a year ago.

12—The further result of this is evident. Shipments of oil from Europe to the United States are reduced, while residual oil shipments from the Caribbean have substantially increased.

13—Freight rates from the Caribbean to the United States at the same time have risen 214 percent, or 47 cents per barrel.

14—The demand for residual oil on the East Coast rose 24 percent in the first quarter of this year over the same period last year. This has been aggravated as a result of the failure of the domestic coal mining industry to grow fast enough to meet the demand for power generation.

15—Electric utilities, especially in the eastern United States, have completely converted from coal to oil.

16—The utilization of residual oil for power generation is complicated and compounded by air pollution regulations.

All forms of energy as fuels are now dislocated as to supply. This includes residual oil, gas and coal.

Nothing will be gained by inflammatory, accusatory, political rhetoric. It is a crisis that only reasonable, intelligent judgment and rational understanding will solve. No nation, not even the United States, will long endure without a long-range energy pattern and program. It had better come about soon! Profit and politics can no longer be the sole reasons for thwarting such a solution.

SUPPORT FOR COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER BILL

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House hopefully will take up the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1970, H.R. 19519.

This bipartisan legislation is of vital importance and I was pleased to receive the views of both the AFL–CIO and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in support of this bill.

For the information of the House, I include at this point the text of the letters from both organizations:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The AFL–CIO urges you to support the Comprehensive Manpower Act, H.R. 19519, now scheduled to be considered by the House immediately prior to the recess.

H.R. 19519 is a bipartisan bill representing major reform in the manpower field. Its main provisions include: a public service employment program creating badly-needed jobs; a program to upgrade the skills of employed workers; and establishment of a mechanism through which states and local areas can provide their own comprehensive manpower services.

With national unemployment continuing to climb, this bipartisan bill, with its job-creating provisions as well as its reform of present federal manpower programs, is urgently needed.

Assuming the granting of a rule, the AFL–CIO urges you to support H.R. 19519 as reported overwhelmingly by the House Education and Labor Committee and without amendments unless accepted by the sponsors of this crucial legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEIGER: The National Chamber is pleased that the House Education and Labor Committee has reported the Comprehensive Manpower Act, H.R. 19519.

The bill reflects a realistic attempt to improve the nation's manpower training programs. As such, it is a distinct improvement over the previously passed Senate manpower bill.

We are gratified to note that the bill contains recommendations that the National Chamber made to your Committee in our testimony on April 29 and again in our letter of September 28, 1970:

—The consolidation of manpower programs will permit the development of truly comprehensive local manpower programs. The present proliferation of categorical programs is the problem most commonly cited by our members in their criticisms of manpower programs.

—The public service employment program in the House bill is of sufficient size to cope with the current needs in the public sector, and yet is reasonably limited to permit proper administration.

Finally, the authorization provided by your Committee's bill is much more realistic than the highly inflationary Senate authorization.

The Chamber is glad to support H.R. 19519, which consolidates manpower programs and provides for a comprehensive manpower program. We earnestly hope the important features we have cited will be maintained during floor debate and, just as essential, that the House position will be adhered to steadfastly in conference.

Cordially,

HILTON DAVIS,
General Manager Legislative Action.

BILL TO REQUIRE UNIT RETAIL PRICE LABELING

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 years since the Congress passed the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. This historic piece of legislation, which required labeling of products as to their identity, manufacturer, and net contents, went far in providing consumers with a consistent and uniform system of labeling and packaging. Unfortunately, it did not go far enough. Today's consumers are confronted with an unending variety of new products and new containers. Very often, the same brand product can be found in two, three, or more containers of different size, weight, and price. It is not surprising that, faced with this proliferation of new product choices, the average consumer is enveloped by confusion and uncertainty.

In an effort to reduce this uncertainty, and provide genuine relief for concerned shoppers, I am today introducing legislation that would require the labeling of consumer products by their unit retail price. Basically, the unit retail price of a product is its price expressed in terms of a single whole unit of weight, measure, or volume of a product. It is arrived at by dividing the total retail price figure by the net quantity figure. The result—known as the unit retail price—would typically be expressed in terms of price per ounce or price per pound. A similar method used extensively for the pricing of meat and meat products has met with widespread acceptance. The essential value of such a pricing system is obvious: By facilitating comparison shopping among competing products, it represents the single most effective weapon that consumers can utilize in the fight against deceptive or misleading labeling and packaging.

For many years, housewives and other buyers have tacitly assumed that purchasing products in the largest container available constituted the most economical purchase. Fortunately, the inaccuracy of this assumption is easily demonstrated by reference to the recent price of Ivory liquid detergent in a grocery chain store in Hartford, Conn. A shopper desiring to

buy a bottle of this product would be faced with three choices: a 12-ounce bottle selling for 35 cents; a 22-ounce bottle selling for 59 cents; and a 32-ounce bottle selling for 87 cents. In order to make the most prudent purchase, the shopper would have to first determine the unit retail price for each of the three sizes. In this case, she would find that the smallest bottle had a unit retail price of 2.91 cents per ounce; the medium size was 2.68 cents per ounce; and the largest size was 2.72 cents per ounce. Thus, the medium-size bottle rather than the largest bottle represented the best buy. This is but one example of how the unaware consumer is mislead into paying more for less.

Although it is not especially difficult to make the above calculations, the time needed to repeat them dozens of times would be prohibitive. In fact, several supermarkets have conducted trial experiments by giving each shopper a simplified calculator to enable them to more readily find the unit retail price. Even this method, however, proved burdensome and impractical.

The bill which I am today introducing would provide the most effective and appropriate mechanism for disclosing to shoppers the unit retail price. Essentially, the bill would require that consumer commodities—as that term is defined in the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966—must be accompanied by a retail price mark, either affixed to the package, or placed in close proximity to it. This price mark would include both the overall retail price of the commodity, and its unit retail price per single unit of weight, measure, or volume. Such price designations would allow immediate consumer identification of those products representing the most economical purchase.

A particularly significant provision in the bill would allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—or the Federal Trade Commission, depending on jurisdiction over the product involved—to base the unit retail price on factors other than weight or measure of the entire net contents.

If the Secretary determined that a unit retail price based on net contents is misleading, deceptive, or does not adequately apprise the purchaser of the value of the product, he can issue regulations calling for a unit retail price based on one or more of the component ingredients of a product. In other words, the Secretary would be authorized to identify, for example, the one or more ingredients in a certain line of products that are responsible for the product's effectiveness. Assuming that the residue of the net contents was composed of a noneffective filler material, he could require the unit retail price to take into account the weight, volume, or measure of the active ingredient or ingredients only. Although this unique provision would not be useful for all products, where applicable it would insure that the consumer is made aware of the comparative value of the products.

It should be stressed that the provisions of this bill are not intended to burden retail establishments with additional labeling requirements. To prevent the imposition of any such onus, I have drafted into the legislation a provision allowing any retailer to request from the manufacturer of any consumer product, a statistical list giving the unit retail prices for that product which correspond to changes in the total retail price. Thus, as the price of any product increases or decreases, the retail grocer would merely refer to the list to determine its new unit retail price.

Concern for protection of the consumer has made significant strides since the days when caveat emptor, or let the buyer beware, ruled the marketplace. The onslaught of new products, and the sophistication of improved containerization methods, have resulted in a situation in which the consumer clearly needs help. Such help can best be provided by implementation of a unit retail price labeling system. It would not dictate to the consumer which product to buy or refrain from buying. But it would enable the consumer to recognize the comparative value of each product, so he can determine how much he is paying for a certain product, and learn exactly what he is receiving in exchange. This bill would arm the consumer with sufficient information to enable him to make his purchases in the most intelligent manner. There can certainly be no legitimate reason for denying him this opportunity.

Adoption of a unit retail pricing system would add clarity and uniformity to the packaging and labeling of consumer goods, as well as making the 1966 act considerably more fair for all buyers. I urge my colleagues to give their full measure of support to this vitally needed legislation.

ATTLEBORO INDUSTRY WORKS TO END WATER POLLUTION

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to inspect the antipollution control equipment installed by a manufacturer in my district, the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts, Swank, Inc., of Attleboro, Mass., is well known as one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of men's costume jewelry. It was also a pacemaker in complying with Massachusetts' strict water pollution control regulations. It was the first major industry in this area to install water pollution abatement equipment, a costly but necessary responsibility of industry today to assist in improving the quality of the Nation's environment. Swank, Inc., built and put its $150,000 water pollution control system into operation last fall. I was impressed by my inspection of the system but, more particularly, by the desire and willingness of this company to take the lead in meeting its obligations to the community. I commend Swank, Inc., for its response.

Ten Mile River, which flows through the Attleboros and is a source of public water supplies, was sadly polluted by industrial wastes. I have previously inserted in the RECORD some accounts of how other industries in the Attleboros, large and small, have subsequently worked together to clean up the river. Swank, Inc., set the pace.

I believe that the industries of the Attleboros have complied a remarkable record of civic responsibility in seeking to eliminate water pollution. They provide an example for the Nation.

I think that an appropriate comment was made editorially by the Providence Evening Bulletin in saying that "Swank is not the first company to find that a major capital investment in pollution control can pay off in terms of dollars-and-cents."

There will be many benefits to industry generally as it joins the antipollution effort, I am sure—not the least of which will be a livable environment for its employees, and for future generations of Americans.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article from the Attleboro Sun, describing the unveiling last November of Swank's water pollution abatement system, and the editorial recognition of Swank's achievement.

The text of these articles follows:

SWANK COMPLETES WORK ON ANTI-POLLUTION SYSTEM

There are 80 factories—large and small—that must eliminate all pollution from their effluent being discharged into the Ten Mile River or its tributaries in the government's anti-pollution campaign.

In an all-out effort to comply with the regulation Swank Inc., of Attleboro, one of the city's largest jewelry firms, has completed one of the most intricate systems to purify its effluent—200 gallons per minute into Thacher Brook—yet installed.

The system was inspected yesterday afternoon by Mayor Thomas A. Piggott and City of Attleboro Health Agent Henry Brousseau, and explained by the two men most responsible for the installation—Edward G. Amesbury, Swank's chief chemist, and Edison F. Fuller, superintendent of engineering.

Senior Vice President Samuel M. Stone, Jr., said that the entire system was constructed at a cost of $150,000, $25,000 of which was for tanks and equipment, also engineering, which was begun some time ago. Actual construction was started in February of this year and the system was operating in September. Normally Swank's busy season, the entire installation, which included enlargement and rearrangement of the plating room, was constructed without interruption of production schedules.

INTERIOR INSTALLATION

The pollution in the effluent from Swank's was not different than that from any other jewelry plant but as Amesbury explained, "There are many avenues one may choose to follow in the elimination of pollution from metal finishing wastes. Each installation will therefore differ in one way or another. Here at Swank due to the fact that very little area is available for lagoon or sludge filter beds the equipment is different than would be found in an industrial park type installation."

And that is what makes the Swank installation different; it is all contained in a limited interior area.

Swank has been producing men's jewelry since 1897 and the manufacture of its items requires the use of electroplating solutions such as gold, silver, cyanide, rhoduim, nickel, plating bright dip solutions for copper and brass alloys, and the usual acid and alkali pre-plate solutions and rinse waters.

DRAGOUT

Dragout on the work and work carriers as well as the discharge of spent solutions in-

troduces these solutions into the rinse waters, causing contamination of the effluent.

It was this contaminant that the state Water Resources Commission, Division of Water Pollution, ordered manufacturers nearly two years ago to eliminate. This meant that every piece of equipment in Swank's plating department would have to be relocated while the firm was experiencing its busiest year ever.

After viewing what had been accomplished yesterday, Mayor Piggott commented the management of Swank for its "tremendous accompilshment," branding it "a great system which complied fully with the guidelines set forth."

"We are on the right road in Attleboro", the mayor added.

FACTORY TOUR

Amesbury directed the tour of the plating room and the new treatment plant and explained its intricate details.

First step was to add to the assembly line tanks of recirculating chemical washes. Plated jewelry is dipped into these tanks, where the toxic plating materials are rinsed. The washes then drain into tanks on the floors below, where the pollutants are neutralized and the rejuvenated solutions are pumped back to the plating room to be used again. Solid wastes are filtered out of the pumped out periodically and the sludge is dumped as inert fill. Highly sophisticated automatic controls, some of which were made in Europe, regulate the acidity of the treated effluent that goes into the brook.

Chief Chemist Amesbury further indicated that the control system had brought some benefits, too. A better method of recovering precious metals, one of the goals of all jewelry manufacturers, may be developed; cleaning of plated metal in a recirculating wash instead of running water is producing a better quality product, and less water will be required. Swank is now using 67 million gallons a year.

Superintendent Fuller explained one of the difficulties in installing the system was obtaining competent experts and workmen and he said great assistance came for the Allan Gross company of this city.

STREAM CLASSIFICATION

The Ten Mile River which the federal and state governments have classified, eventually flows into the Providence water supply reservoir. The Bungay and Seven Mile rivers are classified A, as public water supplies. Even the northern reaches of the Ten Mile are Classified A, but the stream quickly deteriorates to Class B, C, and D as it hits the Attleboros. It is the aim of the division of water pollution to attain Class B rating for the stream. The water now being discharged by Swank meets the Class B requirement, Supt. Fuller stated. Such cleanliness is sufficient to maintain aquatic life.

While Swank is the first major industry to comply with the river pollution control regulations, several smaller firms have nearly completed installations or have obtained extensions of time to do so from the state division.

SWANK SIDE BENEFITS

One of the nation's largest manufacturers of men's jewelry has become the first of more than 75 industries on Ten Mile River to install water pollution control machinery on what is a major source of water for the City of East Providence. Providentially, the investment in public health has brought at least two beneficial side effects for the company itself.

Swank, Inc., of Attleboro was among the firms under orders to build water treatment plants for elimination of chemical pollution. It's reasonably certain that none of the firms looked forward with pleasure to the need for installation of expensive treatment plants, particularly since some of them, at least, have used the river for years as an open waste disposal unit.

But Swank pushed ahead fast. It invested $150,000 in a plant which removes polluting chemicals from the plant's internal system before the effluent is allowed to run into the river. Since the company is big, its contribution to the elimination of pollution from the river necessarily is matchingly large.

But operation of the system produced two benefits. Gold and silver particles, once flushed into the river, now are being recovered from waste waters. Further, it has been found that cleaning of plated jewelry in a recirculated wash, instead of running water, produces a product of better quality and, presumably, of higher value.

Swank is not the first company to find that a major capital investment in pollution control can pay off in terms of dollars-and-cents. For Swank, its readiness to comply speedily and effectively with the law in the public interest reflects the responsibility of its management; the side benefits ought to please its "thriftiest" stockholders.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND CONSUMER CONTACT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the subject of industry and business is raised many consumers frequently react negatively and we are told of the indifferent attitude of the retailer toward the buying public. Companies are now beginning to do something about this. One such organization is the Direct Selling Association with headquarters in Washington whose membership reflects the proud tradition of our free enterprise system. This association is reacting positively to counteract the increasing negativism among today's shoppers and at the same time taking steps to correct existing abuses and assure customer satisfaction from member companies.

The Direct Selling Association roster includes such well-known companies as Stanley Home Products, Field Enterprises, West Bend, Avon, Rubbermaid, and Sarah Coventry. Many of the association's member companies in fact have been serving their customers for over half a century—some even have celebrated their 100th aniversary in operation.

I applaud the activities of this association on behalf of the consuming public and call attention to the following news article that appeared recently in the Evening Star and describes the association's determined efforts to quickly and effectively resolve consumer problems.

The article follows:

CONSUMER CONTACT: NEW CODE FOR DOOR-TO-DOOR SALESMEN

(By Arthur E. Rowse)

The "good guys" are catching up to the "bad guys" in the business of selling products from door to door.

The Direct Selling Association, an organization that represents most of the large companies selling from door to door, has just set up a stiff code of ethics and the means of enforcing it.

This in itself is no guarantee of progress, for many ethical codes are not worth the paper they are written on. But all signs indicate that this one is different and the association really means business.

The fact is that few industries need policing more than this one. The difference is that the larger firms that control the association have come to realize that strict enforcement of ethical standards is not only "The Right Thing to Do," the title of an association flyer, but the most profitable thing to do in the long run.

Consumers also stand to profit from what the industry is doing to purge itself of the worst actors. A little knowledge of the association and its plans can help consumers to get their money's worth—and also to get satisfaction in disputed cases.

Under the procedure set up by the association, a single complaint against a member firm can set in motion a whole series of investigations and hearings. The organization cannot prosecute, of course, but it can recommend such action, and it can use the power of publicity.

In effect, the association has thus set itself up as a service to assist consumers as well as members resolve matters in dispute. It does not mean that complainants will always get what they want, but it means that their cases will at least get considered seriously. That is more than most customer complaints get now.

For the worst cases, where outright fraud is suspected, the organization to call, of course, is the police. And the association itself would do the same, according to its president, J. Robert Brouse.

Consumers have another thing going for them. It is the growing acceptance of a three-day cooling-off period. The Direct Selling Association has approved the idea for all buyers and sellers. Its directors have even agreed not to oppose a proposed law that would apply the concept only to their industry.

In fact, some door-to-door firms already include a cooling-off period in their sales contract. Field Enterprises, publishers of the World Book, have a four-day arrangement before the sale becomes final.

Here again is an idea that has proved to be good rather than bad, as originally feared, for business. Companies that use it have experienced fewer cancellations, less need to "resell" and increased goodwill.

Under the Truth-in-Lending law, a three-day cooling-off period is required whenever a credit purchase is secured by a home mortgage. Some 20 States now also allow some sort of period in which a buyer can cancel a deal for any reason without obligation.

Consumers can help the industry to raise its own standards by dealing with firms that are working to raise them through their own association. Consumers can also test the sincerity and effectiveness of the association by sending inquiries and complaints to it. The address is 1730 M St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

VETO OF POLITICAL BROADCASTING BILL EMBARRASSES HOUSE REPUBLICANS

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the Political Broadcasting Act could best be described as an inexplicable, partisan political maneuver of the first magnitude. It also would seem to be a repudiation by the President of the leadership of his

own party in the House of Representatives, who supported the bill down the line, and who now have been left high and dry by the President's action.

We all know that there has been an astonishing lack of coordination between the White House and the Congress. By this veto the President has struck down a measure seen as beneficial to the Nation by such Republican leaders as GERALD R. FORD, House minority leader, who supported the legislation both on the vote for final passage and on subsequent adoption of the House-Senate conference report, and the Republican whip, Congressman ARENDS, who also voted in favor of adoption of the Conference Report. Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON, the Republican National Committee chairman, voted for the passage of the bill. Also voting for the bill were Chairman JOHN ANDERSON, Vice Chairman WILLIAM CRAMER, and Secretary RICHARD POFF, of the House Republican Leadership Conference.

Other important House Republicans have also been abandoned by the White House action. The ranking minority member of the House Commerce Committee was vigorous in his support of the legislation during House debate. All the Republicans on the Communications Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, cosponsored the bill as they had helped write the bill. The bill was reported out of the subcommittee unanimously and out of the full committee with only one voting in the negative.

The President's apparent indifference to the wishes of his Republican leadership in the House raises difficult questions. Who provided the pressure on the President to veto the bill? What arguments could have prevailed to cause the President to hand such a rebuke to the hard-working and responsible Republicans in Congress who supported the measure?

In floor debate, the ranking Republican of the committee in answer to a question indicated he knew of no opposition to the bill except "the radio and TV stations and ownership thereof." But he correctly noted that the bill had struck a moderate position with regard to broadcasters; there have been many who urge that stations be required to give free time for campaign messages, he observed.

One speculation is that Mr. Nixon has vetoed the bill because it contained the repeal of section 315 of the so-called equal time provision, which the networks have urged for a long time. The suspension of that section in 1960 made possible the great Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960. As one who traveled with President Kennedy on the 1960 campaign, and personally saw the direct effect of the debates on the public all over the country, I could understand some reluctance on Mr. Nixon's part to engage in other debates. Ironically, the bill as passed does not require debates. But in the public interest it would make them possible, or at the least provide for separate appearance of the major presidential candidates on free prime time donated by the networks. Incidentally, the networks support these debates willingly, in the public interest. Should the titular leader of this country shy away from providing full television exposure of the candidates who control the very lives of the American public?

Other questions suggest themselves. I have read that the White House and many of the top-level advisers of the Nixon Administration is staffed with a large number of ex-broadcasting and advertising industry members. Of course, how they stand on this bill is unknown. But after reading Joe McGinness' "The Selling of a President" one wonders.

It should be noted that the official administration spokesman at the Federal Communications Commission, Chairman Dean Burch, supported the basic goals of the bill in testimony before the Subcommittee on Communications. It is also obvious that Mr. Burch's credentials as a Republican political figure are impeccable. In his testimony he stressed "the importance of the need for legislation in the area of political broadcasting" along the lines of the bill before the subcommittee.

The preponderance of former advertising and broadcasting personnel around Mr. Nixon raises the possibility that concern for former and future employers outweighed the public interest in the President's inner councils. How else explain the decision in favor of higher broadcasting and advertising packaging profits against the position of practically the entire Republican leadership and their rank and file in the House of Representatives?

The number and fine caliber of the House Republicans who have been so left out on a limb argues forcibly that the House will override the President's veto. He has once again thrown down the gauntlet, not only to the majority, but to his own minority members. His congressional relations, which have not earned high marks with either party, must now sink to an alltime low. We have for a precedent that Hill-Burton veto, a veto of another public interest bill. I believe that to make a partisan measure out of a public interest bill is a grave mistake. This bill merely protects the public's "right to know." It is a bill which would provide that the candidate be elected after a first-hand look at their merits—not an accounting of their financial assets. Government service should not be turned into a rich man's game.

The bill he vetoed was a bill for good government and against the special interests—those who would buy elections with runaway spending on saturation TV campaigns. With his veto, I believe, he has misjudged the legitimate concern of the American people and their elected representatives of both parties.

C. F. KLEINKNECHT, SR.—A GIANT PILLAR OF SCOTTISH RITE MASONRY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 1970, there occurred the death of one of the giant pillars of Scottish Rite Masonry, Southern Jurisdiction, C. F. Kleinknecht, Sr. A native of Evansville, Ind., where he was born April 25, 1889, he was a victim of cerebral hemorrhage. He had already accepted, from his long-time friend, Maurice H. Thatcher, an invitation to attend—as an honored guest—the celebration of the latter's centenary, August 15, 1970, under the auspices of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C. He was looking forward with pleasurable anticipation to this event, but his attendance was prevented by the final summons.

Brother Kleinknecht came into the Blue Lodge of Masonry in 1927, in a Maryland Lodge, which membership he held throughout the remainder of his life. He became a 32d Degree Scottish Rite Mason in April 19, 1921 and was progressively advanced until he became a 33d Degree member in 1933. In 1969, he was invested with the rank of Dignity of Grand Cross of the Court of Honour and was made Assistant Grand Secretary General—a position that he held until the time of his death. His son, C. F. Kleinknecht, Jr., is now the Grand Secretary General.

Thus, C. F. Kleinknecht, Sr. served in important capacities, the cause of Scottish Rite Masonry, and was known, not only throughout the United States, but in many lands of foreign nations with contacts in the Scottish Rite. Not only was he thus famed and beloved, but he also achieved literary distinction because of his monumental work of 28 volumes of the greatly treasured "Kleinknecht Gems of Thought Encyclopedia," bringing up to date famous quotations from ancient and modern writings.

Under lease previously granted, I include, as a part of these remarks, a sketch of the life and deeds of this distinguished Scottish Rite Mason, now subjoined:

The name C. F. Kleinknecht Sr. has held the ring of familiarity in the House of the Temple for more than a half-century. Mr. Kleinknecht's personal service to Masonry began with a simple want ad in "The Washington Post" on March 25, 1919. Beginning as a clerk-bookkeeper young Chris, fresh from Evansville, Indiana, worked conscientiously for The Supreme Council. Proving his ability to learn every aspect of the Fraternity's work, promotions through recognition of service moved him from post to post within the Council. Few men had the vision and industry he demonstrated in these positions, especially in his office as Acting Grand Secretary General which he held for over 14 years.

In 1919 Mr. Kleinknecht was Entered, Passed and Raised in Washington Centennial Lodge No. 14, F.A.A.M. and he affiliated with Silver Spring Lodge No. 215, A.F. & A.M. of Silver Spring, Maryland in 1927, where he remained a member until his passing. Mr. Kleinknecht was a devoted Mason, for he had in abundance, and in proper combination, all the elements of character which lead men to the altar and bind them to the principles, customs and traditions of the Fraternity. Having received the Thirty-second Degree in April 1921, he was honored with the rank and decoration of Knight Commander of the Court of Honour in October 1931, was Coronated an Inspector General Honorary of the Thirty-third Degree in 1933 and in 1969 was selected for Investiture with the Dignity of Grand Cross of the Court of Honour. On October 29, 1957 the Sovereign Grand Commander, with the complete approval of The

Supreme Council, designated him officially as Assistant Grand Secretary-General. Mr. Kleinknecht served under five Grand Commanders and six Grand Secretaries General.

A conscientious official, an astute scholar, a devoted parent, Mr. Kleinknecht was probably best known as simply a good friend. His sense of comradeship and personal regard for everyone he knew endeared him to the hearts of thousands. He took a deep and true concern in each individual. His warm smile and hearty handshake had that certain something which perhaps is best phrased as sincerity. A real man with real ideals, he was dedicated to making those ideals a part of the workaday world. As a Bible School teacher, he sought by precept and example to exemplify and enforce the pure doctrines and divine truths of the Son of God.

Chris Kleinknecht pursued a great task which had been inspired by his Masonic training and enlightenment. It began as a simple thing, a hobby of collecting bits and scraps of wisdom that he read in Masonic books and in his extensive general reading. The jewels of wisdom soon grew to a formidable number and Mr. Kleinknecht began to file and catalogue them by subjects. A treasurehouse of the best of the world's wisdom was compiled and published; and so was the birth of Mr. Kleinknecht's great opus, "The Kleinknecht Gems of Thought Encyclopedia." In 1970 his last of 28 volumes was published and today his Collection of "Gems of Thought" are his living monument. They will exist as an inspiration long after marble mausoleums have yielded to the inevitable law of decay.

Mr. Kleinknecht leaves a living heritage to Masonry in the form of his three sons; Kenneth, C. Fred, Jr., and Robert. Each has worked diligently for the benefit of the Fraternity in his own accomplishments. Happiness and pride flowed in abundance when C. Fred Kleinknecht, Jr. was elected Sovereign Grand Inspector General at Large and Grand Secretary General of The Supreme Council, 33°.

Chris Kleinknecht was a man of commanding ability. He was in the true sense of the term a gentleman, guided by right instincts, directed and controlled by the high motives of justice, truth and honor. He was an ornament of human life and an example in all the walks and relations of life. "None knew him but to love; none named him but to praise."

DOWNSTATE ILLINOIS NEEDS MORE DOCTORS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the citizens living in the 13 counties which I represent in Congress are faced with a severe shortage of physicians and other medical personnel to minister to their medical needs. According to the Illinois State Medical Society, 23 communities in west-central Illinois are actively seeking additional doctors.

Among those reporting a serious problem are: Golden, Liberty, Mendon, Quincy, Brussels, Kampsville, Beardstown, Virginia, White Hall, Carthage, Nauvoo, Plymouth, Jerseyville, Bushnell, Macomb, Chapin, Franklin, Hull, Auburn, Illiopolis, Divernon, Rushville, and Bluffs.

In Liberty, the last time the community had a resident doctor was in 1958. For those who live in Nauvoo, the nearest doctor is 12 miles away. If there is an emergency in one of these communities, the consequences can be serious. Some hospitals are unable to keep a physician on duty full time. In these circumstances, whenever a critically ill patient is brought in by ambulance, a doctor must be located by phone, informed of the emergency, and rushed to the hospital to treat the patient.

These facts from downstate Illinois are part of a nationwide shortage of trained and practicing physicians. Thousands of additional doctors are needed across the country. However, the shortage is most critical in rural and small town America. In fact, many suburban areas surrounding major cities often have adequate and convenient access to numerous physicians. What is urgently required, then, is to encourage new doctors graduating from medical schools and finishing their internships to locate in the areas of greatest need. Instead of joining the rush to suburbia, they need incentive to locate in the friendly atmosphere of our small towns, to practice medicine among those who deseparately need and want them to join their community.

The bill which I am introducing today is designed to give recent medical school graduates that encouragement. Many medical students build up a substantial indebtedness in educational loans while in medical school. Many thousands of dollars are required to attend medical school, and for those whose financial resources are limited, long term loans are the only answer. As a consequence, a young doctor, who may have a family, is often understandably anxious to earn enough money to pay off his loan as quickly as possible. In many cases, financial reward is greater in suburban areas, and this incentive may overcome the natural desire of some new doctors to practice in small towns and rural areas.

My bill provides for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assume a new physician's indebtedness for medical education where he agrees to practice medicine for a 5-year period in any area determined to have a shortage of doctors. Only indebtedness for professional level training would be assumed by the government.

Such a program, which would cost very little, would permit new doctors who spent their childhood in small towns to return tnere to practice medicine without worrying about paying off heavy educational loans. In addition, it would encourage other new medical doctors to experience the warmth and friendliness of small-town America and to make it their home.

Already this measure has received the support of 150 Members of Congress. It is my hope that the new Congress will consider the bill and pass it at an early date. West-central Illinois desperately needs the new physicians which this bill can make possible.

Text of bill follows:

A BILL TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO ENCOURAGE PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND OTHER MEDICAL PERSONNEL TO PRACTICE IN AREAS WHERE SHORTAGES OF SUCH PERSONNEL EXIST, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Section 741(f) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294a(f)) is amended by striking the second sentence thereof.

(b) Section 741 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Any physician, dentist, or optometrist who practices his profession—

"(1) in an area in a State determined by the appropriate State health authority, pursuant to regulations provided by the Secretary, to have a shortage of and need for physicians or dentists; and

"(2) who signs a contract with the Secretary or his designee agreeing to practice in said area for a period of not less than five years;

then the Secretary shall pay in full the principal and interest on any outstanding educational loan incurred by that physician, or dentist during his professional-level training, including: tuition, fees, books, supplies, and other related costs as determined in accordance with regulations provided by the Secretary. As such need is established, the Secretary may add new categories of medical personnel to those incorporated in this subsection. This subsection applies to loans from both public and private sources."

HELPING AVERAGE AND BRIGHT CHILDREN WHO DO NOT LEARN

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent cooperative community effort program on behalf of children with specific learning disabilities which can be a model for communities across the Nation, I am proud to say, is now under way in Montgomery County, Md. The program is under the direction of the Montgomery County Association for Children with Learning Disabilities—a non-profit organization composed of parents, teachers, and professional personnel interested in these children. It is conducted with the enthusiastic support of the Jewish Community Center in Rockville, Md., and with the dedicated assistance of students of Montgomery College and young people from Montgomery County public high schools. Together, they are conducting a unique physical education and development program for children with learning disabilities. The help being given these children—children with normal intelligence who have learning disabilities of a perceptual, conceptual, or coordinative nature or related problems—seeks to remove the fierce competition of the playground with which the children cannot cope. It is a joint cooperative effort of the community seeking to help its own "hurt" children and is being undertaken without any Federal funding.

The program is described in a recent article in the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory News entitled "Average and Bright Children Who Don't Learn."

I commend this article's description of this splendid community effort to the attention of my colleagues:

MORRISON'S CHALLENGE: AVERAGE AND BRIGHT CHILDREN WHO DON'T LEARN

Intelligent children slated to be drop-outs before they finish kindergarten—articulate,

energetic children who just can't make it in school because they "simply will not pay attention." Youngsters who won't sit still—others who do well in one or two subjects and flunk the others.

These are some of the millions of bright or very ordinary children with learning disabilities who until recently were put aside, misunderstood, or written off by parents and teachers with a kind of cruel stupidity or indifference.

Today they are the subject of much attention and concern by psychologists, medical groups, associations and citizens like APL's James Morrison. Jim is a member of the Montgomery County Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (MCACLD) and vice president of the Maryland ACLD.

Jim, an electronics engineer in BID, is interested because so many disabled lives have been salvaged by dedicated professionals and laymen. He is also interested because one of his children was a slow learner, a bright boy who once couldn't learn to hit a baseball. Now Jim's son is competing among the good students in a local junior high school.

"Children with learning disabilities have only recently begun to receive the attention they deserve from parent groups and public schools," explains Dr. Samuel Kirk, University of Illinois. Dr. Kirk told a congressional education subcommittee that the reason for the neglect is the complexity of the problem and the diverse disabilities. Society is quicker to support people with obvious disabilities. There were schools for the deaf and blind in this country as early as 1832.

Even today, young people fail in school because their problem has never been detected. Morrison's Association for Children with Learning Disabilities describes these "handicapped" as "children with normal and potentially normal intelligence who have learning disabilities of a perceptual, conceptual, or a coordinative nature or related problems."

They do not fit into the traditional categories of the blind, crippled, or deaf, the gifted, mentally retarded, or those with special health problems.

"It is not too uncommon to find a child with an IQ of 130 in school for several years but who has not learned to read," Morrison quoted from one of the numerous reports that fill almost a wall at home.

Today, many enlightened school boards provide for such children with special classes. Montgomery County Public Schools have such programs, depending upon the will of the principal, Morrison explains.

Remediation programs are bringing many of these children back to normal lives. Many notables once fell into this hard-to-learn category including: Winston Churchill, Gen. George Patton, Thomas A. Edison, and other greats.

Morrison works with one of the remediation programs conducted each Sunday at the Greater Washington Jewish Community Center on Montrose Road in Rockville.

"With enthusiastic support from the JCC, we provide a proper setting with professional guidance and backup—the volunteer buddies really carry it off."

More than 75 children attend "enthusiastically." There are trampolines, basketball courts, heated swimming pool and athletic paraphernalia that would ordinarily turn them off. But with no longer facing the prospect of "failing" in the gym, these children rapidly begin to look forward to Sunday nights. Here for two hours a week the world is turned their way. These often drop-outs of the sandlot leagues now can play ball just for fun. Shattered egos start to mend. The stern competition of the playground has been removed.

Volunteers are young people from the Jewish Community Center, CYO, public high schools, church youth groups, Montgomery College, and youngsters from the families with a learning disabled child.

Morrison has no grief for the young people in the program. They are progressing. But there are others.

Experts say that five to ten percent of America's school children suffer from such disabilities—in varying degrees. Some are never detected.

(Morrison's home phone, 593-8616.)

TVA SHOULD PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO SMALL COAL MINE OWNERS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which it is hoped will be helpful in easing the coal shortage and reducing electric power rates in the Tennessee Valley.

During recent hearings by the House Small Business Committee into the national power and fuel crisis, a number of recommendations were made with respect to purchasing activities by TVA in securing its coal supplies.

Many of these recommendations centered around the basic theme that small coal mine owners need special help and assistance from TVA in competing with big coal companies.

The bill which I have introduced today will enable TVA to provide assistance to small business, including small coal mine operators.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place in the RECORD herewith my news release explaining the bill and its importance and my recent newsletter on this matter:

EVINS INTRODUCES BILL TO REQUIRE TVA TO ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS COAL MINE PARTICIPATION IN SALES TO TVA

Representative Joe L. Evins (D-Tenn.) today introduced a bill which he said is designed to assist Tennessee Valley Authority in easing the coal shortage in Tennessee and "hopefully will help to create a competitive coal market which could reduce the increased electric power rates."

Evins said recent hearings held at his direction by the House Small Business Committee, which he serves as Chairman, showed that "there is an abundance of coal in the TVA area—the problem lies in the mining and transporting of the coal to TVA steam plants."

The bill which Evins introduced would require TVA to place a "fair proportion of the purchases and contracts made by TVA with small business concerns."

Testimony at the hearings indicated small coal miners have been forced to compete with major coal companies in sales to TVA and that many small coal mines with limited financial resources have been forced out of business by the larger companies.

The bill which Evins introduced would direct TVA to "adopt and implement such measures and procedures as will assure that small business concerns are given a reasonable opportunity to participate equitably and proportionately in such purchases and contracts and otherwise provide small business concerns with such assistance as may be necessary or appropriate in obtaining such purchases and contracts."

TVA Board Chairman Aubrey Wagner testified that coal prices have increased from $4.40 to $8.80 per ton within one year, and that this factor plus increased interest rates on TVA bonds contributed to costs that led to the recent 23 percent increase in electric power rates. He also said some big coal producers are deliberately holding coal off the market, creating shortages and inflating prices.

Mayor A. K. Bissell of Oak Ridge, who testified at Chairman Evins' request, said at the hearings:

"Gentlemen, in my area, we are sitting on one of the greatest coal reserves in the United States of America—and we are right next door to the steamplants where it is needed."

Dexter Raines, General Manager of Tennessee Land and Mining Company, Clinton, Tennessee, testified that his company has in excess of 240 million tons of recoverable coal in land it owns within 40 miles of two of the largest steam plants in the Country, Bull Run Steam Plant and Kingston Steam Plant.

He said 50 percent of the small coal mines in Tennessee have been forced out of business in the last ten years—and that one of the major problems was the contract requirements of utilities, including TVA.

He called for a program of assistance to small mine operators by TVA to assist the small mines in securing contracts.

Jack Walls, President, Walls and Coker Coal Sales Inc., Oliver Springs, Tennessee, testified that the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act contributed to the problem of small mines.

Evins said that a number of Federal agencies and Departments have statutory authority to set aside contracts for small business, and that such agencies as the Department of Defense and General Services Administration have vigorous programs of contract and procurement assistance to aid small businessmen in competing for contracts for Federal goods and services.

"We must make the coal market more competitive," Evins said "especially in view of the fact that testimony indicated a large proportion of the coal companies have been acquired directly or indirectly by big oil combines. We must counter this trend to monopoly and concentration—reduce coal prices and reduce the increased electric rates to the public".

CAPITOL COMMENTS BY JOE L. EVINS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE PROBES POWER AND FUEL SHORTAGES

The House Small Business Committee, during searching and productive hearings into the national power crisis this week, pinpointed many basic problems involved in the fuel and power shortage in Tennessee and throughout many areas of the Nation and received many helpful recommendations.

Testimony indicated that the Committee, by dramatizing the concern of Congress and the Nation over the power and fuel crisis, had achieved some results before the hearings ended. Major oil companies announced during the hearings that additional fuel oil will be made available this winter to domestic users.

Testimony underlined the increasing trend toward monopoly and concentration in the power and fuel industries—with the major oil corporations and mineral companies acquiring coal, gas and uranium supply sources. This in turn raised the question of whether prices are being artificially manipulated by monopolies through collusion and conspiracy to profiteer at the expense of consumers.

Testimony disclosed that price increases and shortages followed these mergers, acquisitions and concentrations. Chairman Aubrey Wagner of the Tennessee Valley Authority said eight of ten major coal companies in the TVA area have been acquired by oil companies. Your Representative, who is honored to serve as Chairman of the Small Business Committee, during the week called on Chairman Miles W. Kirkpatrick of

the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report on "the monopolistic concentration of ownership in these vital and important areas of our economy."

Chairman Wagner of TVA blamed the power rate increases on the high cost of coal and high interest rates on the sale of TVA bonds in the market. The hearings confirmed that there is an abundance of unmined coal available in the TVA area and elsewhere in the Nation. The TVA Chairman said some large coal companies had told him they were holding coal off the market for a further price increase.

TVA was urged to broaden its base in the coal market to help open up coal mines and provide additional employment for our people. Suggestions and recommendations were made that TVA roll back the electric power increases. I urged Chairman Wagner by aggressive administration action to "break the bottleneck" which is blocking production and delivery from abundant coal fields. Witnesses other than Chairman Wagner who testified concerning the Nation's fuel crisis include: Chairman John N. Nassikas of the Federal Power Commission; Mr. Hollis M. Dole, Assistant Secretary—Mineral Resources, Department of Interior; General George Lincoln, Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness; Mayor A. K. Bissell of Oak Ridge; Mr. Dexter Raines, Tennessee Land and Mining Company, LaFollette; and Mr. Jack Walls, Walls and Coker Coal Sales, Oliver Springs.

These initial hearings were informative and productive. Other hearings will be held later to stimulate further progress in this critical area of the needs of the Nation.

MILITARY ABSENTEE BALLOTS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of our young men enter the military service and forfeit their right to vote because they are unfamiliar with the procedure for obtaining an absentee ballot.

As a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania and Philadelphia, I think it is important to direct attention to the fact that any qualified elector in the military service may vote by absentee military ballot in the November 3, 1970, general election.

Any qualified elector in the military service may vote by absentee military ballot at the November 3, 1970, General Election.

A qualified elector is any person who will have reached his 21st birthday on or before November 4, 1970, and who will have resided in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for 90 days preceding the election and for 60 days preceding the election in the election district wherein his vote will be cast. A residence, once established, continues while a person is in military service.

Any such qualified elector who is in the military service does not have to be registered in order to vote by absentee military ballot.

In order to vote by absentee military ballot the serviceman, or an adult member of his immediate family, should obtain an application form from the Federal Government, secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or the county board of elections for the county wherein he resides. All Federal Government military installations carry such forms.

The application form should be completely filled out in all particulars. While the completed application may be filed with the elector's county board of elections at any time before the election, it should be filed early enough to allow sufficient time for processing and mailing so that the elector can receive the official ballot, cast his vote, and return the ballot to the county board of elections by 5 p.m. on the Friday preceding the election. Ballots received after 5 p.m. of the Friday preceding the election may not be counted.

The office address for the Philadelphia County Board of Elections is Room 138–D, City Hall, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.

ARE THEY BLIND?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography has created a great stir with their recommendation that there should be no prohibition of the sale and distribution of sexual materials to adults.

I cannot, and neither can the majority of Congressmen, go along with the legislative recommendations of this liberal commission.

In a recent issue of the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal there appeared an excellent editorial statement on this report.

Under permission previously granted, I place in the RECORD this article from the Friday, October 2, Journal:

ARE THEY BLIND?

The Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography Wednesday dropped the other shoe (the first one having been released by the U.S. Supreme Court) and recommended that federal, state and local legislation prohibiting the sale, exhibition or distribution of sexual material to consenting adults should be repealed.

It recommended adoption by the states of legislation prohibiting the commercial distribution or display for sale of pictoral sexual material to young persons.

Thus, if the commission's recommendations were followed, the only illegality in the whole field of obscenity and pornography would be sale of pictorial sexual material to youngsters. (The commission did not recommend prohibition of such pictorial material, merely the "commercial distribution" of it to young people.)

On top of this the group urged massive sex education so Americans can frankly and openly deal with sexual matters on an informed basis.

The reason for this opening of the floodgates on obscenity and pornography?

According to the commission, "extensive empirical investigation" by itself and other groups provides no evidence that exposure to or use of explicit sexual material plays a significant role in the causation of social or individual harms such as criminal delinquency, sexual or nonsexual deviancy or severe emotional disturbances.

But three dissenting members, including President Nixon's only appointee, sharply disagreed with the majority's report. They accused the majority of recommending moral anarchy and slanting its report in favor of the pornography business.

Adding force to the minority viewpoint are two major indicators of social disorder, both of which have mushroomed to alarming proportions during the years since Supreme Court rulings "liberalized" legal attempts to curb obscenity and pornography. One is the rising incidence of venereal disease, concerning which Dr. James S. McKenzie-Pollock, director of the American Social Health Association, recently said that "national emergency action" must be taken to halt the rapid rise in cases of syphilis.

Another indicator is the rapid rise in the nation's crime rate, including sex-related crimes.

True, the rigid codes of logic prohibit attribution of causation to coincidence. But there also is a glaring lack of evidence that the suggestive and stimulative qualities of pornography do NOT cause moral decay and crimes against society. There is also a glaring lack of evidence of any constructive value of pornography.

"Empirical" evidence is that which can be observed. Perhaps the problem with the commission majority was that its vision was so clouded by ideology that its members were blinded to some rather serious social circumstances.

WELFARE OVERHAUL IMPERATIVE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the need for public welfare reform, and the problem in Utah has reached critical proportions as it has in other States around the country.

Governors are caught in the dilemma of possible welfare cutbacks because of relaxed assistance qualifications, mounting costs, and the numerous other ills besetting the existing system.

It is time to reform the anachronistic welfare system and lay the foundations for placing recipients back on the road to self-sufficiency. I submit for the RECORD an editorial on this subject that appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune of October 7, 1970:

WELFARE AT THE CROSSROADS

There isn't much consolation in it, but Utah's current welfare problems are shared by other states throughout the nation. A sudden public assistance cost spiral has caught local officials fiscally unprepared.

Welfare recipients notified this month in Utah that their regular grants have been cut 10 percent because of insufficient state funds, were at the same time told by Gov. Rampton the deduction might be eased in February. That is if sales tax collections continue to exceed forecast and the legislature cooperates with money transfer possibilities.

This is more than many states in similar difficulty can count on. From Texas to Pennsylvania public welfare costs are soaring out of sight. Mounting unemployment, relaxed assistance qualifications, expanded medical benefits and increasing family break-ups are all major parts to the explanation.

Without unlimited welfare fund sources, there is no quick, easy answer. Most states have used Utah's expediency: Cutting back payments, then effecting administrative economies. Ironically, reducing welfare department personnel or salaries often adds to recipient rolls as overworked staffers neglect full eligibility investigations. Recipi-

ents, recently strengthened by new organizations and court decrees, are fighting the cutbacks.

Caught in the middle, state governors are advocating complete federalization of public welfare. Federal money now covers over 50 percent of the program, but making that 100 percent won't be an ultimate solution.

The medicaid rider to the medicaid law needs revamping. Job training for the unskilled must be intensified. Supplemental income subsidies for workers below the poverty level can help preserve families and prevent chronic public assistance. In short, starting with President Nixon's reform proposals, the welfare program is due for a full overhaul. Until then, neither taxpayer nor receipient, state or federal governments will get anything like a fair return on the public investment in restoring self-sufficiency.

A SALUTE TO REV. THEOPHILUS CAVINESS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am always proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the activities and achievements of those citizens in my congressional district who provide leadership and inspiration in the struggle to give true meaning to our lives. I am, therefore, particularly proud today to salute a man who has devoted his life to the pursuit of happiness through Christian fellowship, good works and faith in God.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Reverend Theophilus Caviness, pastor of the Greater Abyssinia Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio, and an acknowledged leader in the spiritual, social and cultural affairs of our city. Reverend Caviness is a graduate of Bishop College in Dallas, Tex., where he received his bachelor of arts degree and Eden Theological Seminary in Webster Groves, Mo., where he earned his bachelor of divinity degree.

During his 9 energetic years as pastor of this great congregation, Reverend Caviness has had to deal with the myriad of practical problems faced by all pastors. Here, too, he has excelled. Since becoming pastor, he has paid off the church's mortgage of over $70,000, air-conditioned the entire building, purchased additional property for church purposes, and amassed savings of over $150,000 toward the educational building fund.

Reverend Caviness has approached his duties with such competence that he has been chosen a member of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Cleveland, historiographer of the National Baptist Convention, and president of the Federal Credit Union of the Greater Abyssinia Baptist Church. He is also chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals of Cleveland.

On Sunday, October 18, 1970, the many members of Greater Abyssinia will gather to express their appreciation to Reverend Caviness for his dedication and achievement. I am certain that my colleagues join me in commending this truly remarkable man for a job well done.

NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS MUST BE PRESERVED

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is now hearing argument in a case which will be a landmark decision for public education in America.

That case, Swann against Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, should go far to resolve the question of whether the Federal Government may require massive forced busing in order to achieve racial balance within a school system.

I want to say at the outset that I agree with the position of the plaintiffs in this case. I think the Charlotte-Mecklenburg board of education made every good faith effort to eliminate de jure segregation in its school system. And I think the court-ordered attendance plan forced onto the school system by Judge James McMillan is an unreasonable scheme which can only harm the children of Mecklenburg County.

The children—they are the first casualty in the battle over forced busing. Under the pupil attendance plan handed down by Judge McMillan, more than 19,000 children would be singled out and transported up to 15 miles from their homes every morning. The school board has estimated the cost of this forced busing at $2.4 million the first year and $284,000 each year thereafter.

And for those like myself who think this money would be better used for education than for bus rides, the Federal court suggested an "economy plan." According to the court, the busing cost could be cut by two-thirds if the county staggered its school opening times. Yet if it do so, many children would be forced to leave home at 6:30 a.m. and would not return until 5 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is an unreasonable demand which does nothing to advance the cause of education.

The plain fact is that because of residential patterns in many of our cities, it is often impractical and unjust to require that every school in a district be uniform in its racial composition.

I was recently impressed by a sentence from the brief which Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. filed as amicus curiae in the Mecklenburg school case. Coming at the end of a deep discussion of the facts in the Mecklenburg situation, the sentence summarizes what I believe is the central argument in the national school controversy. I quote:

> The Equal Protection Clause does not impair in any way the power of a public school board to create fairly drawn geographic attendance districts or zones, and to assign all students without regard to their race to neighborhood schools in the respective districts or zones in which they reside even though such action may result in some racial imbalances in the schools serving areas predominantly inhabited by members of one race.

I concur with that statement. And I think that Senator ERVIN's brief—a brief which he filed as a private attorney representing the local classroom teachers' association—will endure as one of the deepest and soberest documents in this chaotic period.

As I understand it, Senator ERVIN spent days of his own time pouring through the record in the Mecklenburg case and weighing the lower court decision against the facts which allegedly sustained it.

Senator ERVIN stated, as I have affirmed, that the prohibition against forced busing contained in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is both absolute and clear. I also infer, from studying the Senator's brief, that he agrees that the equal protection clause of the Constitution is not a weapon which empowers the Federal courts to set arbitrary, inflexible, and unreasonable standards which work against the good of all.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can move in a different direction from the one advocated by Judge McMillan in the Mecklenburg case. I would hope that while we are all committed to eliminating the effects of segregation in the public schools, and while we stand ready to infuse all necessary funds into formerly black schools, we can still retain local control.

As we all know, the movement of America's largest cities is toward self-determination and decentralization in the school system. I say to you today that a busing order such as the one handed down in the Mecklenburg case is the antithesis of self-determination. It imposes upon the public a set of arbitrary requirements which may dissatisfy all—both black and white.

I think it is time for the Congress to quit defaulting to the Federal courts and to set a firm national school policy so that arbitrary decrees of this kind will no longer be made.

If the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is so full of ambiguity that the Federal courts can find room for interpretation in its anti-busing provision, then it is up to the Congress to enact a new law which is so plain that no Federal judge can mistake it.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER), and I have sought to draft such a law. We have introduced two bills, H.R. 16484 and H.R. 16491, which define a national policy on school desegregation.

These two bills have had hearings before the committees of both chambers, and their provisions are plain.

First. The bills forbid any legal or official action to segregate or discriminate because of race in the public schools.

Second. The bills provide that children will be assigned to their neighborhood schools. But any child would have the uncontested right to transfer from a school where his race is in the majority to a school where his race is in the minority.

Third. School boards are ordered to insure that no student is denied equal educational opportunity—in equipment, policies, facilities, or finances—because he attends a school along with a concentration of others of the same race.

And last, the bills define a unitary school system in such a way that the local school boards keep the power to develop their own solutions to the problems confronting each individual district.

I hope this bill can be considered by the full Congress before the end of this year. It is past time when the Congress should take independent action to set its own priorities on the schools.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously doubt that the Mecklenburg case will resolve nearly all of the questions now concerning the public schools. Our experience with past school decisions has been otherwise.

So I think it is imperative that the Congress take action. We must get beyond this problem and confront the awesome challenges of improving all education in this country. And if we do not take action, if we continue to abdicate our responsibilities to the Federal courts, then the present confusion may continue for years.

A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has been described as the "peoples branch" of the Federal Government. Each of us has a constitutional responsibility to represent his people, to speak for them in Federal Legislature.

Inherent in this responsibility is an obligation to report back to the people. One effective method of making such reports is by newsletter.

I submit for the RECORD my current report to my constituency:

NEWSLETTER BY REPRESENTATIVE JOSHUA EILBERG

OCTOBER 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: As the 91st Congress moves toward adjournment I would like to take this opportunity to discuss with you some of our activities, achievements, and continuing problems.

Rising Prices . . . without a doubt, the major problem facing our country today is how to make ends meet. I'm sure all of us in the past year have stared in disbelief at our bill at a supermarket checkout counter. In fact, consumer prices have reached their highest level in about 20 years.

Shrinking Paychecks . . . Coupled with these high prices, we are now suffering the highest unemployment rate, 5½ percent, we have in years. Equally significant is the fact that high unemployment is accompanied by reduced paychecks for those who continue to work. For example, one out of five families, about 21 percent, have lost a portion of their income this year—some through layoffs, but many through overtime cuts or work-week reductions.

Congress Acts . . . During the past year, I have supported measures to give the President new authority to control interest rates and establish price, wage, and rent stability. Such controls, if used, could control inflation without sacrificing jobs and productivity. I also have sponsored legislation which would require major industries like big steel and auto, to report to the President their intentions 60 days before they announce a major price increase. This would give the President the chance to move to block another, major inflationary price increase.

Crisis in the Classroom . . . I voted twice in the last year to override the President's veto of Federal funds for education. The President vetoed the most recent education appropriations bill, because he considered it inflationary. I did not believe we should make our schoolchildren the first casualties in the battle on inflation. Our own public and parochial school systems in Philadelphia are in crisis. And the reason is quite simple. They need more money. I believe more, not less, of this assistance must come from the Federal government.

Aid to Parochial Schools . . . The Federal government has been providing assistance to parochial schools throughout the Nation and in Philadelphia. Parochial schools benefit under Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and under other Federal programs. As we increase aid to public schools, we must also increase aid to parochial schools. The recent tuition increase from $70 to $130 for students at Catholic high schools is an indication that the financial plight of our Catholic school system has become chronic and serious. More than 150,000 Philadelphia schoolchildren are in Catholic schools. We cannot and must not forget them.

Sharing the Tax Dollar . . . With each year, local tax revenues are less capable of meeting increasing demands for public service. With the assistance of a grant from the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, a study of our city's economic prospects and problems was recently completed. One of its findings was ominous. The study predicted that, at present tax levels, the deficit of the city and school board would approximate $153,000,000 by the fiscal year 1976. I am more convinced than ever that the Federal government must embark on a new program of sharing tax revenues with cities like Philadelphia. I have sponsored Federal tax sharing legislation and will continue to support all steps to implement this program.

Health Care . . . As anyone who has had to pay a hospital bill recently will tell you, something must be done about the high cost and availability of medical care. Average costs of a day in a hospital have climbed from about $45 in 1966 to an estimated $75 this year. Cancer alone kills 900 Americans per day, or 330,000 per year—40,000 more than were killed in all of the Second World War. I was troubled by the President's veto of the Hill-Burton Act extension, which provides Federal assistance for the construction and modernization of hospitals. I voted to override that veto. Throughout the 91st Congress, I voted for emergency health funds and extension and improvement of our basic health programs.

Our Friendly Skies . . Fears have been raised that large passenger jets will be introduced at North Philadelphia Airport. I have taken the problem to the Federal Aviation Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board. I have asked the FAA to study the safety implications of large passenger jets at North Philadelphia, as well as the hazards from air and noise pollution and disruption of community life. I have told CAB that we in the community oppose the introduction of large jets at the airport and have requested that the community be granted a hearing to express our opposition. I also have been assured by city officials that no large passenger jets will be introduced at the airport. North Philadelphia is a community, small-plane facility and should remain that way.

Our Disappearing Mailboxes . . . In recent months, scores of our neighbors have complained that their corner mailboxes, in the same spot for 20 years and longer, have been disappearing overnight. I have taken this problem to the Postmaster General of the United States. In some cases, mailboxes have been returned. The Post Office has argued that it is dismantling these mailboxes as an economy. While I encourage economy—the Federal bureaucracy is much too wasteful—I am particularly dismayed that its actions have been taken without any attempt to consult and inform the concerned residents and communities. Because of my complaints and the complaints of others, a Congressional hearing will be held on the problem on October 23rd in our city.

Drug Abuse . . . The House of Representatives has passed the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act. Briefly, the bill provides for tougher sentences for those who peddle hard drugs while providing a comprehensive program for treatment and rehabilitation of drug users who want to return to society, as useful, contributing ctizens. I supported this legislation and, of course, voted for it.

Israel and the Middle East . . . Despite the death of Egypt's President Nasser and the unrest in Jordan, the basic problem, Israel's survival in a sea of hostile neighbors, remains virtually unchanged. As I write this, our government has finally taken a hard line on Russian and Egyptian violations in the ceasefire zone along the Suez Canal. But if peace comes to the area, as we all hope it does, it will only endure if the Arabs clearly understand that Israel is capable of defending herself on the battlefield. We in Congress have passed legislation which will permit our government to transfer arms to Israel. This should help make Israel's military deterrent credible.

Irish and Italian Immigration . . . Much of the work of Congress is performed by its committees. I am an active member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee. Our subcommittee has discovered that under current immigration law, as applied, inequities have arisen in United States policy towards those wishing to emigrate from many parts of Europe, particularly Ireland and Italy. I have introduced legislation to correct those inequities and our subcommittee is now working to amend the law to ease the way to America for many from Ireland and Italy.

Where You Can Reach Me . . . Some people have asked where they can reach me. I keep an office right in the heart of the Northeast. The office is on the second floor of the First Federal Savings and Loan Building at Castor and Cottman Avenues. It is open six days a week and all weekday nights. Depending on the calendar in Congress, I am usually there on Fridays and Saturdays. If I am not there someone on my staff, Russ Krawczuk, Mary Dunne, Agnes Lyons, Jessie Shore, or Bea Marks, will help you. Our number is RA 2–1717. In Washington, my office is at 1130 Longworth House Office Building (225–4661) and if you get to the Capitol, stop in and say hello.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES BY JAPANESE AMERICANS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a warm greeting to the newly appointed Ambassador to the United States from Japan—the Honorable Nobuhiko Ushiba. Ambassador Ushiba arrived in this country on September 5, 1970.

I am confident that Ambassador Ushiba will enjoy his tour in our country and I am equally confident that the ties of friendship and good will between our two nations will continue to flourish.

Ambassador Ushiba will find many similarities between his country, Japan, and our country. In 1960, there were almost half a million Americans of Japa-

nese ancestry. Yet, numbers do not tell the whole story, for the United States has continually benefited by the many contributions of Japanese Americans. Our Nation has been enriched culturally, economically, and technologically by persons of Japanese descent by a far greater amount than the half a million indicates.

Commentators on the progress of Japanese Americans in America, among them Bill Hosokawa, in his book published last year, have remarked that their journey through our land has been not unlike that of Horatio Alger—but on an ethnic scale, and I think that the comparison is an apt one, to say the least. It is to the Nisei, the second generation in the United States, that we commonly refer when we speak of Japanese Americans, but it would be a grave mistake to overlook completely the contributions, or the sacrifices, of the Issei, the first generation of Japanese immigrants to our shores.

As historian Bradford Smith observed of them:

> The Issei contribution to America was not in great men, but in the anonymous men who made the desert spaces green with the labor of their hands; who kept the track even, so that Americans could ride comfortably across the land; who tended the comfort of the well-to-do; and grew vegetables the poor could afford to buy; who sacrificed for the welfare of their children.

It is true that there were, among the Issei, no Japan-born Andrew Carnegies; no John D. Rockefellers in oil; no Henry Fords to turn out automobiles. Yet there were Japanese immigrants who left an outstanding mark, especially in the State of California.

There was George Shima, who showed that the Sacramento delta lands could be reclaimed and made to yield a huge bounty of crops. There was Kosaku Sawada, a hybridizer and grower of camellias, who, before his death in 1968, at age 85, had fostered thousands of new varieties of that flower. There was Kyutaro Abiko, who took enormous financial and social risks to found the Central California Land Co., a community for Japanese Americans near Livingston. This was almost uniformly a farming community, incidentally, for Abiko urged his Japanese settlers not to compete for nonfarming jobs with native residents of the town, because to do so would create the conditions which had made for bad relations in another town nearby. The experiment worked. As a local commentator in the 1930's has written of it:

> [I]n Livingston, grown boys and girls go on camping trips together with chaperones. The Japanese hold 20 percent of the stock in the local bank, they are asked to address meetings of the Merchants' Association and the Boosters' Club, and they play in the town band . . . Livingston is really a laboratory experiment in race relations: as intelligent an experiment as has been made anywhere in the world, and, comparatively speaking, a very successful one . . .

When Abiko died in 1936, as Bill Hosokawa has commented:

> If there were no giants among the Japanese, he at least qualified as a miniature one.

But he was not the only "miniature giant," nor the only Issei to rise to fame and prosperity in this country. There were so many others that to name any of them is to omit a host of others who are equally deserving of praise.

Japanese Americans in southern California have achieved great success. For instance, there was the great actor, Sessue Hayakawa, who joined the Issei amateur group that staged "The Typhoon." Of Hayakawa, we have the word of Bob Okazaki, the well-known Nisei chronicler of the Hollywood scene, who said:

> Film producer Thomas Ince saw the play, made a motion picture of it, with most of the original cast. It turned out to be, and is still regarded as, a history-making film . . . Within a year Hayakawa's salary skyrocketed to $3,500 a week when he appeared in Cecil B. DeMille's *The Cheat* in 1915. That film gave the cinema a new sense of proportion. Hayakawa zoomed to fame, and a $5,000 a week salary.

On the Hollywood scene of the time, there were also other famous Japanese Americans who were involved in the motion picture industry. There was Henry Kotani, who became a top cameraman, whose assistant at the time was James Wong Howe; Yutaka Jack Abe, actor, writer, and director, who returned to Japan to become a movie producer after starring in such American hits as "Lotus Land" and "Tale of Two Countries"; Henry Okawa, a classmate of Gary Cooper at Paramount's Institute of Drama, who returned to Japan to star in more than 50 films before becoming a director; and the great Kamiyama Sojin, who played Shylock, Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and also the first Charlie Chan. All of these were great actors, supremely talented members of the American film industry.

But Japanese Americans around the Los Angeles area made profound contributions to the arts in America in other directions, too. A group of Nisei of Los Angeles banded together in the early thirties and founded a quarterly literary magazine. They were called the Nisei Writers Group and named their quarterly Leaves. Yasuo Sasaki and the late Carl Kondo were its editors. Some of the well-known contributors were Chiye Mori, Toyo Suyemoto, and Lucille Morimoto who wrote poetry, and Eiji Tanabe, Ambrose Uchiyamada, Larry Tajiri, Mary Oyama, Bunichi Kagawa, Edo Mita, Kondo, and Sasaki. The writings were mainly romantic, reflecting the Nisei reactions to problems facing the young. Sasaki went on to earn an M.D. as well as a Ph. D. in biochemistry, and now practices medicine successfully in Cincinnati, Ohio. From these examples, it may safely be said that Japanese Americans have had a significant impact on cultural endeavors in the southern California area.

Other examples of Japanese-American achievement in this country are the sagas of Masajiro Furuya, banker, merchant, and manufacturer, and of Harry Sotaro Kawabe. Furuya was born in Japan and emigrated to this country in 1890 to open a tailor shop in Seattle. Success followed upon success, and in 2 years he launched a general mercantile business that eventually occupied a six-story building in downtown Seattle. He opened branches in Portland, Yokohama, Tacoma, Kobe, and Vancouver, B.C. He organized the Japanese Commercial Bank, and 6 years later he purchased control of the Oriental American Bank.

While Furuya built his fortune trading largely with other Japanese Americans, Kawabe headed for the Alaskan frontier. He too, settled in Seattle but fortuitous circumstances took him to the snowy outpost of Port Graham in the wilds close to Yukon country. He moved to Cordova to cook for the Copper River Railroad; he saved his money, and, in 1916, he moved to Seward and bought a steam laundry. This proved to be the cornerstone of the famous Kawabe enterprises, including an Alaska fur store, a gift shop, a hardware store, hotel, restaurant, bar and liquor store, a gold mining operation, and an investment firm. Aside from making a great fortune, Kawabe and his wife, childless themselves, raised and educated some 15 boys—Indian, Eskimo, and white.

One could go on and on about the legions of successful Issei. Their Nisei sons and daughters have made their own successes on a different order, reflecting a changed time. Whereas their fathers may have been individual rich men during the teens and the twenties, the Nisei have enjoyed something in the nature of a group success, joining the large mass of American citizenry and paying more attention to the welfare of the group than to the success of the individual. We find lawyers, doctors, professors, and college presidents among successful Nisei.

The great success of the Nisei should show the new Japanese Ambassador that America has welcomed its Japanese-American citizens to full civic and economic participation.

BOYS CORPS RECEIVES NATIONAL AWARD

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues a singular deed performed by an individual or an organization which does much toward improving the lives of their friends and neighbors. This is particularly true when the parties responsible for such community endeavors is a young peoples' group. Much of what young people do and say today comes under severe criticism from their elders, but far too often the elders ignore the tremendous good done by our youth.

Recently I had the privilege of presenting a national award to a group of young people—the Boys Corps of the Five Boroughs Junior Chamber of Commerce, which is located within my 20th Congressional District. It was the National Youth Group Achievement Award sponsored by Parents magazine and it was given the Boys Corps for an area beautification project carried out on May 18 of this year.

Thirty-two members of the corps, working in cooperation with officials and interested adults in the borough of Whitaker, undertook to paint, plant, clean-up and repair a war memorial. Their project was visible evidence the Nation's youth do, indeed, care for their community and their country. It blends in perfectly with what should be a national dedication for the conservation of our environment and the Boys Corps of the Five Boroughs Jaycees should be commended for their initiative.

Mr. Speaker, there are others who share in the receipt of the national award: the Jaycees, for undertaking an interest in the community's youth; Edward Grety, the mayor of Whitaker, for his cooperation in furnishing equipment to assist in the clean-up program; and the Mothers of Democracy, which had been responsible in past years for beautifying the memorial and obtaining flags for the memorial site. Leaders of the Boys Corps include Joseph Coccaro, president, who accepted the Parents magazine award; Charles E. Eichler, Ronald A. Hohowski, Albert E. Thomka, Sylvester J. Lacey, and Paul Domen.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nation celebrated Columbus Day, the birth date of a most remarkable man. Although we have now learned that the Vikings were the first to set foot in the New World, this does not in any way negate the historic significance of the voyage of Christopher Columbus.

By his journey into the vast uncharted, untraveled seas, Columbus began a new era for all mankind. For through his "discovery," Columbus opened the doors to the future of the Western Hemisphere and paved the way for the development of a great nation. Here was built a land of opportunity, a land of freedom, a land of belief in man's inherent rights and privileges.

I believe we Americans have much to learn from the courage, adventure, and pioneering of this Italian navigator. Columbus believed strongly enough to place his faith, reputation, and life on the unknown. It is this spirit of determination that is needed once again in our country. We must, as Americans, maintain the courage of Columbus. We must rededicate ourselves to the ideals of peace, justice, and democracy.

I think it most fitting that beginning next year Columbus Day will be a legal public holiday. It should be a source of pride that in the spirit of unity of our Nation all Americans can join together and honor the heroic Italian.

At the same time, Columbus Day serves to remind us that we are a Nation of immigrants. On this day we recall with pride and appreciation the contributions and the invaluable role Americans of Italian ancestry have made to the growth and development of the United States.

THE NEW AMERICAN BIBLE

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Joseph B. Collins, of Catholic University, Washington, D.C., was kind enough to forward a copy of the address of Bishop Greco of Alexandria, La., delivered at a dinner in Washington, D.C. This dinner was in celebration of the publication of the newest English version of the Bible from the original languages.

I am sure all the Members will be most interested in reading Bishop Greco's remarks on the publication of the New American Bible by a group of Scripture scholars representing the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths.

I include Bishop Greco's address in my remarks:

THE NEW AMERICAN BIBLE AND THE CCD

(By Most Reverend Charles P. Greco, D.D.)

There is a familiar saying: "Completion of a task crowns the work"—Finis coronat opus. We are this evening celebrating the end of a project that had its beginnings almost 35 years ago. The formal publication of The New American Bible is truly an epochal event in the history of the Church in this country. It has attracted national and even international attention. This is a cause for rejoicing not only on the part of the members of the editorial committee who are receiving papal honors, but there must also be a deep sense of satisfaction on the part of those devoted biblical scholars who contributed to what is a supremely capable translation. It is at the same time the only Catholic version of the entire Bible in English taken directly from the original languages.

The bestowal of special awards from the Holy Father on our scripture scholars this evening is eloquent testimony of the honor and respect that the Church holds for them and their most exacting work. We have here also an expression of her faith and dependence on their labors in making the Word of God more generally accessible and more understood and loved. To the Church has been entrusted the active ministry of preaching and explaining the message of the Kingdom of God; it is a message that derives from a tradition that is continuous and living, not static; and therefore the truths of the scriptures must derive from springs of Christian thought and the never-ending study and reexamination of sources. Not the least important in biblical scholarship is the skill and expertise of the scholar to translate the sacred message in words that are faithful to the original and pastorally beneficial to the people for whom in final analysis the written Word of God is transmitted.

It is for these reasons among others which you have heard today, that I offer my congratulations to the bible experts who have so commendably completed this great project, and also to all who have helped so essentially in making the American Bible possible. I wish to mention in particular the staff of the late beloved Father John Forest at St. Anthony's Guild. They have valiantly and lovingly carried out this work in all its vicissitudes from the very beginning. I speak words of congratulation and thanks also to the publishers, who in true ecumenical spirit have gladly undertaken to make The New American Bible available to the English-speaking world.

As a member of the Bishops' Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and later its chairman for 18 years, I wish to emphasize the right and privilege of the Confraternity to share in our happiness and joy over the publication of The New American Bible. With early history of the CCD in mind—having witnessed its beginnings—I feel safe in declaring that without the CCD there would have been no New American Bible today. And I further state that were it not for the late Archbishop Edwin O'Hara, there would not have been a CCD on a vast national scale such as we have it today. From 1922, when the then Father O'Hara, pastor at Eugene, Oregon, organized the first religious vacation schools under the CCD, until his death in 1956, as chairman of the Bishops' Committee of the CCD he was an untiring and resourceful leader of the CCD in this country. The National Center was established in 1935 by the American bishops. The headquarters church of the CCD during the early years was the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception—where most fittingly the liturgy was celebrated today.

Bishop O'Hara, as ordinary of Great Falls, Montana, saw the need of a modern English text of the scriptures as early as 1932 when he was inaugurating a study of the Life of Christ for some 400 CCD discussion clubs. Characteristically, he proceeded gradually.

First, preliminary discussions with a few scripture professors, then a formal meeting of 15 experts in biblical studies at the Sulpician Seminary (now Theological College) in Washington, D.C. on January 18, 1936. After numerous meetings, a committee of scholars set about to make a new revision of the Douay-Rheims text of the New Testament. At the same time work was begun on a new translation of the Old Testament. The scholars began their version first from the Vulgate edition and later, after the Encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* of Pius XII (1943), a new beginning was made to translate the Bible from the original languages as was specifically approved by the document, without the limitations laid down by the Council of Trent. It is the grateful fulfillment of this enduring enterprise that we celebrate today.

From the nucleus of bible translators in 1936, the Catholic Biblical Association was formed at the invitation of Bishop O'Hara. He promised it the approval and sponsorship of the American bishops and of the CCD that it has enjoyed to the mutual benefit of each to the present time. The following is a gracious tribute paid to Archbishop O'Hara by the Catholic Biblical Association just two years before his death in 1956.

"Archbishop O'Hara brought the Association into existence. For the past 17 years he has watched over its growth and has been its constant champion and advocate among the hierarchy of our country.

"It was through his efforts as chairman of the Bishops Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine that the revision of the Challoner-Rheims New Testament was begun and completed and that the present work of translating the entire Bible from the original languages or their oldest extant form into modern English, was undertaken and is now nearing completion."

His biographer adjoins this gentle observation: "Of the many monuments he left behind him, this surely must be one of those he held closest to his heart" (J. G. Shaw, *Edwin V. O'Hara*, p. 196).

We take this occasion to honor the memory of Archbishop O'Hara on the completion of the great project to which he and the scripture scholars of his time and ours have given the fullest measure of devotion and labor. The long years of patient planning and unstinting work in preparing The New American Bible for publication are now thankfully past. It remains for all of us—bible scholars, directors of religious education programs, catechists, and those engaged in pastoral areas to take up the task of putting the new Bible to work. The gracious letter of

the Holy Father for this auspicious occasion contains these salutary words:

"We are gratified to find in this new translation of the scriptures a new opportunity for men to give themselves to frequent reading of, and meditation on, the living World of God."

The Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation tells us that "the ministry of pastoral preaching, catechetical instruction, and all forms of imparting Christian teaching take their nourishment from the Word of Scripture" (No. 25). Indeed thhe Council document spells out our duties in this regard. The bishops are told to give the faithful suitable instruction in the right use of the divine books, especially the New Testament through translations of the sacred texts; bible experts are instructed "to prepare suitable commentaries and adequate explanations so that the people of God can safely and profitably grow familiar with the Holy Scriptures and be penetrated with their spirit" (ibid.).

It is my own earnest wish that our excellently trained scripture scholars will proceed to produce commentaries and exegetical studies on The New American Bible, especially on the various readings of the official Lectionary used in our Eucharistic liturgy. It would, I am sure, be a rich boon to homilists, both clerical and lay, whose knowledge of the Bible is neither competent nor up to date. Leaders in religious education for adults and parents as well as school administrators everywhere are exhorted by the Council to cultivate the scriptures and to learn by frequent reading and study of "the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 3:8). "Ignorance of the scriptures," we are told, "is ignorance of Christ." I agree fully with Father Bruce Vawter, well-known biblical expert, in his recent protest that many of our teachers and writers in the field of religious education are deficient in scripture studies. "I don't want them to be biblical scholars," he declared, "but they should be at least thoroughly familiar with the bible and biblical theology."

The Bible, in fine, is more than a teaching aid; it is the divine Teacher informing and forming His learners in His own words and through the sacred events in which God has intervened in salvation history. The Bible makes God present as a living Person. Biblical vocabulary, images, figures of speech, events and saying are colorful and concrete. They contain rich doctrine and spiritual wealth. Truly, here is "God's plenty."

THE CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL: QUESTIONS RAISED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there has been much comment concerning President Nixon's recent proposal for a standstill cease-fire in South Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

Certainly we all want to achieve an early and honorable settlement to the war in Southeast Asia—we all want to end this unfortunate conflict as soon as possible, with honor.

In this connection the Washington Post in a recent editorial provides an interesting commentary on the President's proposal.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the editorial in the RECORD herewith:

THE CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL: TRIUMPH OF AMBIGUITY

Newscaster: "Fourteen Senators are reported to have sent a note to President Nixon proposing a standstill cease-fire . . . what is the feeling here about such a proposal?"

Vice President Agnew: ". . . generally, I would point out that proposals for a cease-fire have been made. They're on the table in Paris. They've been made by the President in his public remarks. They've been made by President Thieu. I don't see anything particularly new about this situation."

—From NBC Nightly News, Sept. 1, 1970.

Thus Mr. Agnew gave the back of his hand more than a month ago to a proposal for a standstill cease-fire which was no different, on its face, from the proposal for a standstill cease-fire which became "a major new initiative for peace" when President Nixon advanced it on Wednesday night. You could say that it is all a question of who is doing the proposing, and conclude from this that the President's carefully timed, meticulously prepared, widely touted new approach to peace is not only old hat, but politically inspired; that the President was seeking to influence the outcome of next month's congressional elections by a bold gesture for peace, and nothing more; and that little will come of it because the administration is still not ready to risk anything in reaching for a Vietnam settlement. And you might, of course, be right. There was nothing very subtle about the buildup; first in Europe, and then in Washington; Mr. Nixon even did an advance commercial for his own performance; this is not a "gimmick," he hastened to assure us, before anybody could suggest that it was.

But you might also be quite wrong because if there is one clearly outstanding feature of the President's "new" proposal it is its ambiguity. It could be new, or old; real or illusory; promising or not. As we have argued before in this space, in this matter of a Vietnam cease-fire everything depends on how you define the term.

The President's definition was fine—as far as it went. He proposed that "all armed forces throughout Indochina cease firing their weapons and remain in the positions they now hold." He called this a "cease-fire-in-place" and specifically extended it to cover "the full range of actions that have typified this war, including bombings and acts of terror." Conceding the difficulty of enforcing a cessation of unconventional warfare, he suggested, without elaboration, the need for "an unconventional truce." So far, so good; with this sort of cease-fire, it is probably safe to say, the government in Saigon could have no quarrel for the simple reason that there is nothing on the face of it which would challenge the authority, or constrict the writ, of Thieu and Ky. Presumably, they too would stand still in place while negotiations proceeded for a final settlement.

And that, of course, is the rub, not only with the North Vietnamese, but also with the leading proponents of a "standstill cease-fire." What they have been putting forth—men such as Cyrus Vance, for example—is a genuinely new and far-reaching approach which would also call for a cessation of hostilities, and a freeze in positions, but which would concede to the enemy authority over those areas where they now exercise military control—large hunks of South Vietnam, even larger hunks of Cambodia and Laos. This is, in fact, the central point of their proposal: by initiating talks on a cease-fire, they would force both sides to face up to the realities on the ground; they would be beginning, in short, the process of shaping a final settlement; and, quite consciously, they would also be beginning a process which would lead inexorably to some sharing of power—call it a coalition, or something else—in the central government. This is the bullet Mr. Nixon doesn't bite and this is where the ambiguity sets in. On the one hand the President claims the concurrence of the Saigon government; on the other hand, some of the leading proponents were pointing yesterday to purportedly pregnant passages of the President's speech and claiming that he was really talking about *their* kind of cease-fire.

Item: "A fair political solution should reflect the existing relationship of political forces in South Vietnam."

Item: "We have no intention of seeking any settlement at the conference table other than one which meets the reasonable concern of both sides. We know that when the conflict ends, the other side will still be there. The only kind of settlement that will endure is one both sides have an interest in preserving."

So there is something for everybody here—something for Republican congressional candidates, something for Saigon, something for the President's own public position, for it was a masterful performance politically—and perhaps even something for peace, for there are hints in the President's proposal which might, when translated into serious discussions, prove interesting to Hanoi. The fact of the matter is that we won't know until the President is obliged, if that point is reached, to remove the crucial ambiguity.

CAMPBELL SOUP CO. PLANT IN PARIS, TEX.: A MODEL POLLUTION CONTROL SYSTEM

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the October issue of the very fine Soil Conservation magazine, published by the Soil Conservation Service, contains an excellent article on the innovative and highly successful pollution control system established by the Campbell Soup Co. at its plant in Paris, Tex. This waste water treatment process, which uses nature's own purification method, produces an effluent of the highest quality, reclaims nutrients from the waste water, restores abused agricultural land, and produces a valuable byproduct—hay. This truly remarkable system was built with the able assistance of local Soil Conservation Service personnel and demonstrates once again the effectiveness of this wonderful Federal agency, combined with the imaginative foresight of the Campbell Soup Co. management, particularly its distinguished president, William B. (Bev) Murphy, who has so well and so wisely made use of the many advantages to be derived by locating his industries in rural America.

For the benefit of all who are interested in conserving our resources and protecting the environment, the complete text of the Soil Conservation article follows:

LAND AND PLANT COVER SOLVE WASTE PROBLEM

(By Marshall H. Nichols, district conservationist, SCS, Paris, Tex.)

A soup canning company in Paris, Tex., has used soil and plant cover to solve an out-sized pollution problem.

The company processes up to 3.6 million gallons of waste water a day through a system which combines perennial vegetation, diversion terraces, grassed waterways, grade-stabilization structures, and overhead irrigation sprinklers.

The water that flows from the treatment area, the company reports, is clean and clear.

In 1960 the Campbell Soup Company bought 600 acres at the edge of the city for a plant site. A factor in the location was suitability of the site for an industrial waste-disposal system. The city's treatment facilities could not handle the volume of waste water the plant would produce from washing vegetables.

The Lamar County Chamber of Commerce asked the Soil Conservation Service for help in locating possible sites where soil permeability rates were greatest. Soils of all possible sites were evaluated by SCS soil scientists. But other factors—nearness to railroads, accessibility, and drainage—limited possible sites to soils with slow permeability rates.

Soils at the site selected by the company rated very low in permeability—0.05 inch an hour. This made it impossible to filter the waste water by soil percolation. This factor also causes soils to be more susceptible to erosion during heavy rains. The addition of waste water daily would surely intensify the erosion hazard and produce tons of sediment and pollution in the main streams of the watershed if something wasn't done.

The site was mostly old eroded cropland with soils low in fertility. Low-quality grasses, native shrubs, and small post oaks had taken over the open field areas. Gullies were still active 20 to 30 years after cultivation was stopped and were too deep to cross.

A study was made of adapted plants first. The vegetation planned had to provide a cover suitable for filtering the large volume of waste water, while handling 44 inches of annual rainfall on soils which could soak up only 0.05 inch an hour. And the cover had to work the year around.

Land clearing, land smoothing, revegetation, waterways, shaping, terraces, and mechanical structures were planned to stabilize gullies and control erosion.

In September 1960, contractors began preparing the land for purifying waste water by allowing the water to flow over grass. This is the "overland flow method." Land was cleared, gullies filled, waterways and drop structures installed, and slopes carefully landplaned. The slopes were smoothed to assure uniform flow of water at a rate that would allow waste particles to be filtered out by vegetation. The terraces were laid out in 1963 to intercept the water after it had been filtered, then to conduct it to the grassed waterways, and divert it from other filter strip areas below.

The area was seeded to reed canarygrass, redtop bentgrass, and tall fescue, all northern species requiring high fertility. Bermudagrass was rejected because of its long winter dormancy. Some bermudagrass was used, however, to sod plant the waterways and was then overseeded with the northern grasses more tolerant to water.

In periods of dry weather before the spray system was used, the grasses were maintained by supplemental irrigation. Complete commercial fertilizers were applied. In the area where the subsoil was exposed, however, the cool-season northern species died; hardier native vegetation replaced them.

Waterways and grade-stabilization structures were designed by SCS engineers who also recommended size and spacing of diversion terraces.

When the processing plant began operation in the fall of 1964, the spray area had a good stand of fescue and reed canarygrass. In handy areas, a strong stand of bermudagrass was noted. Under tests with heavy application of waste water in winter 1964 and spring 1965, the bermudagrass deteriorated and turned black. By April it appeared to be dead, but 2 weeks after the tests stopped, new growth appeared. Waste-water applications were resumed and continued throughout 1965 without detrimental effects to the bermudagrass.

Near the end of fall 1965, cool weather slowed the growth of native plants, and the cool-season northern species began to flourish.

After extremely wet seasons in the winter and spring of 1968 and 1969, it was evident that native grasses cannot compete with reed canarygrass when plant nutrients are supplied in quantity from the decomposing organic matter in the waste water.

Louis C. Guilde, director of environmental engineering for the company, described the system to the 42d. annual conference of the Water Pollution Control Federation in October 1969. He said that in 1960, "the magnitude of the undertaking represented an unprecedented effort in soil reclamation and conservation, but experience indicated that the eventual land use efficiency would have been improved if the effort had been bolder."

The company won top national honors at the annual Sports Foundation. Inc., awards program in 1970 "for achievement in the control of water pollution."

Allyn C. Bennett, SCS engineering specialist, observed the system in operation in November 1969 and said, "it is apparent that this overland-flow method of waste disposal is highly successful." He believes that better land use could be achieved by a system of parallel terraces instead of the semiparallel diversion terraces. This would provide a uniform trickle-flow distance through vegetation. He predicted that principles of waste disposal learned from this operation will be used to improve the design of other waste-disposal systems.

"For example, the uniform trickle flow through vegetation is probably more beneficial than sprinkler spraying, which means that a gravity-flow system with more solids in the water would also work very well," Bennett said.

In the system, vegetable solids and grease are trapped or strained from the waste water, which is then run through an automatic sprinkler-irrigation system onto vegetated and terraced fields. Sprinkler laterals are below, or on the lower side, of each terrace. The sprinklers spray the wash water onto the land. Then it trickles through the vegetation down to the next terrace, then into a system of vegetated waterways. Grade-stabilization structures are located at the outlet of each of the two main waterways leaving the farm. The trickle-flow distance needed to adequately lower BOD (bio-chemical oxygen demand) at this plant is 200 feet or less. Uniform slopes with a minimum of ponded areas are more efficient.

Good-quality hay is harvested from the spray area. And regular removal of excess vegetation appears to boost efficiency of the disposal area. Guilde reported that, "the process also reclaims a high percentage of plant nutrients. These nutrients fertilize the grasses, and analysis of the hay showed the mineral content to be nearly double that found in other good-quality hay with high nutritional value ranging up to 23 percent crude protein. In feeding tests, cattle showed a definite preference for hay grown on the disposal sites."

There is a continuous streamflow downstream from the spray-area fields without the unsightly aquatic vegetation which would be expected from most waste-disposal areas.

An advantage of the system is its ability to function in all types of severe weather conditions without reduced efficiency.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, The Ukraine is the largest county in Eastern Europe, and its inhabitants constitute the most numerous of all ethnic groups in that region, today numbering more than 45 million. In many ways it is the most productive agricultural region of Eastern Europe, and not infrequently has been referred to as the breakbasket of the whole area. Its hardworking and rugged inhabitants, the solid core of the whole Eastern Europe's once free peasantry, have tilled their fertile soil ceaselessly not only for their own well-being but also for the good of their neighbors, and presently for their heartless Soviet taskmasters. The very fact that the fair land of the Ukraine is fertile and rich in natural resources seems to have been a cause of the misery and misfortune of the Ukrainian people. The riches of the land roused the envy and jealousy of its ruthless and power-hungry neighbors and occasioned its conquest by alien tyrants.

For more than 300 years the country has been submerged in the Russian continent, and during all that time autocratic czars and today's Communists have done their worst to suppress and eradicate what we in the West regard as the best Ukrainian national traits; their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their readiness to sacrifice for the attainment of their national goal. Only once in the course of their long subjugation to alien rulers did they have the chance of attaining that goal; that was in 1918. When the czar's decrepit autocracy was overthrown and Austria no longer ruled over western Ukraine, Ukrainian leaders saw their chance, seized upon the opportunity and proclaimed their national independence. That was done on January 22, 1918, the day on which the Ukrainian National Republic came into being, and it looked as if a new era had been ushered in for the Ukrainian people.

That memorable day has become a landmark in the recent history of the Ukraine, and remains as a bright moment in the struggle of the Ukrainians for their national independence. However, the Ukrainians enjoyed their hard-won freedom for only a short time. Soon events cast a dark cloud over the country. The newly created state, weak and unaided, and surrounded by implacable foes, did not survive the impending onslaught. Early in 1920, Communist Russia treacherously attacked and overran the country, and it came to be incorporated into the Soviet Union.

To this day the Ukraine remains a part of the Soviet Union. For 50 years the liberty-loving Ukrainians have been living in a vast prison camp in their historic homeland, separated from the free world by the Iron Curtain and surrounded by Soviet secret agents. There they do not and cannot enjoy any of the freedoms which we in the free world regard as our birthright. Under such trying circumstances they are not permitted to celebrate their Independence Day. Fortunately, however, hundreds of thousands of Ukranians who live in the free world celebrate it, and Ukrainian Americans solemnly observe this memorable day in appropriate ceremonies. I am wholeheartedly for House Resolution 979 and Senate Resolution 455 calling for a Presidential proclamation

whereby Ukrainian Independence Day observance may be celebrated annually in all communities throughout the country.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, National Business Women's Week, honoring the contributions of America's Business and Professional Women to our country, will soon be observed. Though the contributions of America's working women have been obvious throughout this Nation's long history of industrial, economic, and social advancement, I think it is especially appropriate that a period of time be set aside to credit women in business and professional roles who not only play a vital part in keeping economic progress foremost in America's future, but are also a commendable, responsible force in this Nation's drive to eradicate our social problems as well.

From October 18 through 24, the Lancaster, Ohio, Business and Professional Women's Club, in conjunction with nationwide observance of National Business Women's Week, will honor working women of Lancaster and Fairfield County.

In recognition of the valuable services and community projects the Lancaster Business and Professional Women's Club affords the city and Fairfield County, I submit the following article authored by Mrs. Jack Blazer, of Lancaster, for entry into the RECORD at this time:

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB

The Lancaster Ohio Business and Professional Women's Club is a part of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club whose membership represents hundreds of career fields. Women become members of the B.P.W. for these main reasons: Fellowship, personal improvement and community concern. Members report greater community involvement as a result of joining B.P.W. The B.P.W. Emblem, the Nike or Winged Victory of Samothrace, symbolizing progress, communication, learning, commerce and wisdom, is worn both on the person and in the heart of each member who tries very hard to live its meaning—respect for individual oneness and common mutuality.

The Fiftieth Year of B.P.W. (1920-1970) features the theme "Era of Responsibility"—Your Responsibility—Enrich—Renew—Act.

Each year The Lancaster B.P.W. has been setting up its program to involve every Club member. It has been guided by the objectives of The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. To elevate the standards of women in business and in the professions; to promote the interests of business and professional women; to bring about a spirit of cooperation among business and professional women of the United States; to extend opportunities to business and professional women through education along lines of industrial, scientific and vocational activities.

Activities of The Lancaster B.P.W. have been many and varied as follows:

Sponsoring boys from the Fairfield School for Boys who participated in the Soap Box Derby; members going to Veterans' Hospital in Chillicothe, Ohio for spring picnics, featuring food, prizes for games and conversation; sponsoring Cancer "Tag Day"; sponsoring the Diabetic Clinic; participating in the Fairfield County Kidney Foundation Project to provide an artificial kidney machine for the community; increasing membership in the Nike Club (an organization for young girls interested in entering the business world after graduation); awarding a $500 scholarship to a worthy girl recipient and sponsoring two girls to Girls' State each year; acting as intermediary in the sale of decorative, useful refuge containers to Lancaster merchants; giving $1000 to the Ohio University Lancaster Branch toward the erection of the new building; emphasizing discussion of legislative issues; meetings to give information about the misuse of drugs, about crime and sex roles around the world.

The Lancaster Business and Professional Women's Club will honor its working women in the community October 18 thru the 24th, as part of a nationwide observance of National Business Women's Week, calling attention to the many contributions of America's working women who represent better than one-third of the total labor force.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., which initiated National Business Women's Week in 1928, was founded in 1919. There are 3,800 B.P.W. clubs and their 250,000 membership extends to all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

REPRESENTATIVE DADDARIO RECEIVES AWARD

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Connecticut, EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, was presented with the Aloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma. This award, presented by the Aloy Alfaro Foundation of the Republic of Panama, pays tribute to Representative DADDARIO for his outstanding public service and his contributions to the cause of international peace.

The following remarks were delivered by Dr. Herman A. Bayern upon presentation of the award:

PRESENTATION SPEECH OF DR. HERMAN A. BAYERN, AMERICAN PROVOST, THE ALOY ALFARO INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA, ON THE OCCASION WHEN THE HONORABLE EMILIO QUINCY DADDARIO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, RECEIVED THE HIGHEST AWARD OF THIS FOUNDATION WHICH WAS CONFERRED ON HIM BY DR. BAYERN, DR. RENE SHAPSHAK, MR. ROBERT L. SCALLY, AND MR. WALLY PAGE, ALL DEPUTY AMERICAN PROVOSTS, AT BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Reverend clergy, Congressman Daddario, Dr. Shapshak, Mr. Robert Scally, Mr. Page, distinguished guests and fellow Americans:

We are assembled here at Bridgeport, Connecticut, to honor a very outstanding and distinguished public official of renown, an educator who has efficiently and ably served as a member of the House of Representatives in the 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th, 90th and 91st sessions of the House, and as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, chairman of the special subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions, chairman of the subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, and a member of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee. He has been honored by many colleges and nations, and he served in the U.S. Army both in World War II and Korea, being honorably discharged with the rank of Major.

It is now my proud privilege and honor to tell the world that you have been voted the highest honor of the Aloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, "in recognition of your outstanding service to your beloved country, both in peace and war, and service to mankind in the field of public service as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives for six terms, as a judicial officer, as an educator, and for our efforts in bringing about the establishment of international peace. In further recognition of your achievements in behalf of humanitarian causes through religious, fraternal, civic, educational, and patriotic organizations, all in keeping with the aim, ideals, principles and purposes of this foundation."

We are here today to honor you in testimony; first, of our faith in the ideals in American democracy; secondly, in our devotion to the cause of universal education as the bulwark of these ideals; and thirdly, because of our confidence in the cooperation of all the peoples of the western hemisphere in the preservation of human freedom and peace of all the people of the world.

Such was the pattern of the life of our standard bearer, the immortal Aloy Alfaro, the great democrat of Ecuador. As President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, he expanded and furthered educational institutions of his own country. He appealed to the Spanish monarch to establish peace, and to grant the people of Cuba the freedom for which they yearned and bled. Now, those people of Cuba pray once more that somehow, perhaps by divine guidance, they will again see their freedom restored—the freedom which Dr. Castro and the Soviet Union wrested from them in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The Aloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama gathers and encourages the permanent political and moral values of the Americas. Aloy Alfaro was the outstanding Ecuadorian in the Western hemisphere. The action and thought which he placed at the service of his country were instruments and agencies of the highest aspiration of half the globe. He worked for a broad land; he strove to raise the social level of the Indian; to spread education among his countrymen; to banish the exploitation of man to man; to act for the defense of liberty, regardless of frontier; to create American public laws; and to free the flesh and the spirit from their chains.

The A.A.I.F. has neither political nor lucrative purposes. The finality is to pay tribute to the memory of Aloy Alfaro, and make available all knowledge of his life and works, as a statesman and liberator. What Alfaro undertook and accomplished in half a century, constitutes the essential transformation of normal people.

Our guest of honor was awarded the Aloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma in recognition of his distinguished contribution to culture and humanity, and his accomplishments in the field of public service, education, in his work for worthwhile endeavors, and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

Aloy Alfaro was a citizen, not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice and friendship among nations; the self-control and self sacrifice that marked about one quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellow man, extended way beyond the confines of his own country Ecuador.

He was a rebel and a conspirator but his rebellion and conspiracy were directed

against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people.

Whenever there was a threat to the peace of the Western hemisphere, Aloy Alfaro was the dynamic leader who brought about the settlement of such disputes.

General Alfaro sowed the seeds of Pan-American cooperation and understanding. In 1907, he called a peace conference in Mexico City, in which the U.S. government participated, for welding all the Americas together, and to preserve for the Western hemisphere, the Pan-American unity of freedom loving people. This love of freedom served as the perpetual harbinger against the attempt of any form of despotism to plant the tyrant's heel on even the tiniest portion of the soil of our Pan-American nations. Were General Alfaro alive today, he would be a zealous supporter of the United Nations, and all other organizations created by the U.S. Government to keep the peace throughout the world. This great Ecuadorian statesman and dedicated leader would have left no stone unturned to assure all the peoples of the world the hope, peace, and good will, that is our common heritage from our common Creator.

It is most fitting, therefore, for us today that we of this foundation have selected to receive this highest award a great American public official, humanitarian and educator. None can ever doubt the limitless faith of our guest of honor in the ideals of democracy; in the belief of our guest of honor that it was not from human hands, but from the great Creator that every man, woman and child inherits the rights of life, human liberty, happiness and equal opportunity; and in learning, which has been the life work of our guest of honor.

It is fortunate that these vital factors in the life of our guest of honor are recorded for all the world to see as an outstanding public official, educator, and private citizen, in his community and throughout the state and nation. We know of no one who by his service to mankind and to the cause of international peace has more fully and brilliantly earned this high honor.

The philosophy of General Alfaro, who is known as the Abraham Lincoln of South America, was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause of international peace. The public and private activities of our guest of honor come within the framework of this kind of service to mankind. In recognition of this fact, the ruling body of this foundation grants him the Aloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

Congressman Daddario joins a very select and elite group of Americans who have been honored similarly in the past. They include former Presidents John F. Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Lyndon B. Johnson, President Richard Nixon, former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, former General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover; Senators Ribicoff, Mansfield, Scott, and Javits; Congressmen Celler, Ford, and Albert; former U.S. Commissioners of Education Howe and James Allen, Jr.; the Honorable Stanley Fuld, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, Ambassador Averill Harriman, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, and the Honorable John Bailey, all of whom typify the caliber of individuals who have been recipients of this high honor.

It now gives me great pleasure and it is an honor and a privilege for me to call upon that distinguished outstanding sculptor, Dr. Rene Shapshak, to carry out the determination to invest you, Congressman Daddario, with the Aloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HEARINGS PRODUCTIVE ON FUEL AND POWER CRISIS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recent hearings by the House Small Business Committee on the fuel and power crisis elicited much useful and helpful information concerning the reasons for current shortages and threats of more blackouts and brownouts.

In this connection Miss Elaine Shannon, Washington correspondent for the Nashville Tennessean, in her Sunday column includes an excellent summary of our hearings.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the article in the RECORD herewith:

COMPETITION CAN'T SOLVE FUEL CRISIS

(By Elaine Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—One important point brought out by a House investigation on the power situation last week is that there is, at present, neither a national energy policy nor a national energy agency.

There seems to be an urgent need for both, as witness after witness has testified that a nationwide energy crisis does, in fact, exist, in the midst of bountiful energy resources.

"In my view, we have got ourselves into our present fuel difficulties," said a former Federal Power Commission chairman, "because of piecemeal policy decisions made within the context of specific commodity problems rather than within the context of the energy field as a whole."

PRIORITIES NEEDED

"Priorities need to be developed which may create industry resistance, but energy is too important to the American economy to allow its growth to continue in a haphazard fashion," said Joseph Swidler, past FPC head, now New York State Public Service Commission chairman.

"We are now paying the price for waiting too long to bring sense to our energy policies."

Mayor John Lindsay of New York City told of the frustrations he had encountered when trying to deal with a maze of federal bureaucracies on New York's power storage.

"When one turns to the federal government," Lindsay told the subcommittee, "one finds that no one agency is responsible for or conceives of a national 'clean energy' policy."

"The chairman and members of the FPC are responsible for regulating natural gas and public utilities. The secretary of the interior is responsible, meantime, for the extraction of natural gas and oil and administers the oil import quota program.

HOW MUCH OIL?

"The decision as to how much oil is available at any given time in the U.S. is primarily made by the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the secretary of the interior, state regulatory bodies in Texas and Louisiana and the oil industry itself.

"This is hardly a machine for the rational ordering of a fuel policy for the nation. It is even less appropriate to developing a national clean fuel policy since the agency previously responsible for air pollution control, HEW, plays no formal role in the decision making process and the same is likely to be true of its successor, the newly-created Environmental Protection Agency.

"There is no single federal agency," said current FPC head John Nassikas, "to attain a balanced national objective of efficient and productive utilization of our total energy resources—oil, coal, gas, water, nuclear energy."

"In addition to multiple responsibilities at the federal level, the problem is further compounded by the reality of a state-federal system of economic regulation and resource preservation. . . . Various committees of Congress are also concerned with energy policy."

Last week, the administration, in response to the increasingly serious fuel situation, established a joint board consisting of the heads of the FPC, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the secretaries of interior and commerce, and the chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Council on Environmental Quality.

The administration also enacted certain relaxations and alterations in the import quota system.

But these actions—both the formation of the board and the quota adjustments—were criticized as "minor" and "short run" moves by witnesses at the small business subcommittee hearings.

"SMALL RESULTS"

"In the face of a mounting crisis, actions announced in the statement are timid and promise small results at best," commented Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association.

"The administration, simply stated, says: 'The way to get adequate fuel supplies is to pay higher prices,' the public power spokesman said.

"Or, considering the fact that the McCracken-Lincoln statement (the administration statement) also advocates a voluntary 10% reduction in fuel use this winter, the administration policy seems to advocate 'less fuel at higher prices'—a policy which is in sharp contrast with the 'more power at lower cost' philosophy which has guided the public power industry for many years."

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Administration officials who testified indicated a general administration policy of letting the economics of the situation take care of the supply and demand for fuel and power.

This policy was stated clearly in the administration statement made last week:

"Basically, we rely upon the proven adapability of the American economic system which must respond to the present and prospective demands for fuel by converting to the production of what is most needed and its delivery where it is most needed."

The administration policy statement also indicated that the increased demand would be supplied at a higher price:

"The increased national requirements and the changes in the price structure that arise from them provide a powerful incentive to this adjustment of supply, which is in fact already taking place."

MEANS MONEY

The "powerful incentive" referred to is, of course, money.

The hearings disclosed that tight fuel supplies loosened considerably as the price went up: after the price of heavy fuel oil went up more than 50% over last year, several major U.S. oil companies announced they could supply the winter demand.

But the economic system of supply and demand works only if there is competition, and some witnesses, and subcommittee members, did not seem to feel there is true inter-energy competition in America today.

Pointing out that oil companies control a considerable amount of the nation's coal, natural gas and uranium, Chairman Aubrey Wagner of the Tennessee Valley Authority said:

"It is important to know, before it is too late, whether competition between a few large raw energy companies will serve the nation as well."

Former FPC head Joseph Swidler stated categorically that the free enterprise system will not be sufficient to regulate the energy situation.

WILL BE EXTINCT

"At the moment, competition in the energy market is fast waning, and soon will be extinct if the present trend continues," he said.

A strong federal agency must be created, he said "to protect the U.S. energy position both short-term and long term, rather than to foster the interests of special energy groups."

Coal prices, fuel oil prices, electric rates, natural gas prices all are rising swiftly, and power problems seem to be multiplying even as resources blossom.

The power crisis, in addition to the general inflation, hasn't been lost in Congress. Hopefully, the power crisis will force the establishment of a national energy policy agency and a comprehensive national policy to meet the increasingly complex energy situation.

The experience of Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., seems to support this hope:

Ten years ago, Randolph introduced a bill to establish a national commission on fuels and energy. He found he could get no support and the measure failed.

Today the measure has 60 co-sponsors—a comfortable majority of the Senate.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A SYSTEM FOR THE SHARING OF CERTAIN FEDERAL TAX REVENUES WITH THE STATES

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, our local governing units are in desperate financial straits. Cities can no longer rely on help from the States and both entities are increasingly dependent upon continuation of grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. But Federal grants are inadequate to meet the public needs since such grants usually apply only to specific projects and hamstring the dispersal of funds on a priority basis.

It is essential that we depart from specific purpose funding and give our States and cities the necessary authority to fund those programs essential to their localities.

The need for a program of direct aid to the State and local governments, based on some formula for revenue sharing, is as critical as it is apparent. Our local officials know the problems of their communities and under tax sharing could employ the revenues to the best advantage.

A huge bureaucracy, centralized in the Nation's Capital, cannot possibly familiarize itself with the unique and varying problems of our local communities. And because such a colossus can be neither efficiently nor democratically controlled, the concentration of authority has promoted public apathy, stifled local initiative, consumed potential tax resources, and demoralized local government to the point where State and local programs are devised and legislated in anticipation of Federal action.

We must recognize the fact that the Federal Government is not geared to dispense services. We have witnessed the demise of potentially effective programs because concentration of authority in Washington eventually undermined local and State authority and the people involved became disillusioned and disgusted.

Revenue-sharing would initiate a new approach to intergovernmental relations by shifting the balance of power from Washington back to the people. This dynamic and refreshing approach would allow city and State officials leeway in meeting their individual community's problems and permit experimentation with new policies and programs.

Government on all levels would become more responsive to the needs of its citizens and the people would regain confidence in the performance ability of government. Local and State officials would determine priorities instead of having to accept Washington's dictates.

I have reviewed the various revenue-sharing proposals and today I am introducing my own measure which I believe insures a more equitable system of tax sharing. The revenue-sharing systems which have been proposed are based solely on taxable income or revenue effort and population. In order to fairly distribute the funds it is, of course, essential to know the tax resources and population of the States. But I do not believe these factors alone are indicative of the financial needs of our States and local communities.

I have, therefore, incorporated into my bill—and weighted proportionately—four factors: taxable income, 40 percent; unemployment, 30 percent; population, 20 percent; and medicare, 10 percent.

This legislation emphasizes the fact that our States are simply not able to meet their financial obligations and that many are suffering huge deficits.

It is imperative that hearings be held on revenue-sharing bills in this session of Congress. Anyone who considers the tax sharing proposals cannot help but agree that while instilling new vigor and initiative in our State and local governments, revenue sharing would at the same time relieve the financial crises of these governing entities.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the bill to be printed in full at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 19724

A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax revenues with the States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Tax Sharing Act of 1970".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "fiscal year" means the fiscal year of the Federal Government of the United States;

(2) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of each State or his delegate;

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate;

(4) the term "State" means the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia;

(5) the term "individual income taxes" means the proceeds of taxes collected from individuals under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the taxes collected under chapter 24 of such Code, as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary; and

(6) the term "trust fund" means the Tax-Sharing Trust Fund established by section 3.

TAX-SHARING TRUST FUND

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Tax-Sharing Trust Fund". The trust fund shall consist of the amounts appropriated to it by subsection (b) and any amounts appropriated to it under subsection (d).

(b) There is hereby appropriated to the trust fund for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount, as determined by the Secretary, equal to the percentage provided in subsection (c) of this section multiplied by the total taxable income reported on Federal individual income tax returns for the latest calendar year for which published statistical data are available from the Department of the Treasury at the beginning of such fiscal year.

(c) For the purposes of subsection (b), the applicable percentage is—

(1) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, one-fourth of 1 percent;

(2) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, three-eighths of 1 percent;

(3) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972, one-half of 1 percent;

(4) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, three-fourths of 1 percent;

(5) for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1974, seven-eighths of 1 percent;

(6) for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1975, 1 percent.

(d) In addition to the amounts appropriated by subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund for each fiscal year such additional amounts as may be desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(e) The Secretary shall, during each fiscal year, determine the amount described in subsection (b), and transfer the amount so determined from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund. Such transfer may be made on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary. Proper adjustment shall be made, as soon as possible after the close of each fiscal year, to the extent the amount transferred was in excess of or less than the amount which should have been transferred, by the transfer of additional amounts from the general fund to the trust fund or by the transfer of amounts from the trust fund to the general fund.

METHOD OF PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. (a) Each State shall be entitled to payments out of the trust fund during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and during each fiscal year thereafter, as provided in this section. Such payments shall be made to the Governor.

(b) The total amount of payments to each State during each fiscal year shall be the amount determined under section 5. Payments shall be made by the Secretary not less often than quarterly. Payments to any State made during the first and second quarters of any fiscal year may, to the extent necessary, be made on the basis of estimates by the Secretary in determining the amounts under section 5. Proper adjustment shall be made in the payments to any State during the third and fourth quarters of any fiscal year to the extent that payments in the first and second quarters were in excess of or less than the amounts which should have been paid.

AMOUNTS OF PAYMENTS TO THE STATES

SEC. 5. (a) GENERAL RULE.—The total amount of payments to each State for each fiscal year is an amount (computed by the

Secretary) equal to the sum of the four portions computed for such State under subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e). For the purposes of this section, the term "the appropriated amount" means the amount appropriated to the trust fund for the fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year during which payments to each State are to be made, as computed according to subsection (c) of section 3.

(b) INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PORTION.—The individual income tax portion shall be computed by multiplying 40 percent of the appropriated amount by a fraction the numerator of which is the total amount of Federal individual income taxes collected from residents of the State during the most recent calendar year for which there is income tax data available from the Department of the Treasury and the denominator of which is the total amount of Federal individual income taxes collected from residents of all the States during such year.

(c) UNEMPLOYMENT PORTION.—The unemployment portion shall be computed by multiplying 30 percent of the appropriated amount by a fraction the numerator of which is the total average number of unemployed people residing in such State as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the most recent calendar year ending before the beginning of the fiscal year during which payment is to be made and the denominator of which is the total average number of unemployed people residing in all the States as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for such year.

(d) POPULATION PORTION.—The population portion shall be computed by multiplying 20 percent of the appropriated amount by a fraction the numerator of which is the total number of people residing in such State as reported in the most recent decennial census and the denominator of which is the total number of people residing in all the States as reported in the most recent decennial census.

(e) MEDICARE PAYMENTS PORTION.—The medicare payments portion shall be computed by multiplying 10 percent of the appropriated amount by a fraction the numerator of which is the total number of people residing in such State who are receiving payments under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (medicare payments) as reported by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the most recent calendar year ending before the beginning of the fiscal year during which payment is to be made and the denominator of which is the total number of people residing in all the States who are receiving such payments as reported by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for such year.

(f) APPROPRIATE CALCULATIONS.—For the purposes of calculating the payments due each State under this section, the Secretary is authorized to make appropriate calculations and such calculations shall be final.

HUNGATE SUPPORTS TVA SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee recently concluded hearings on the fuel and energy crisis. The Tennessee Valley Authority testified during the course of the hearings that they had a coal shortage, and yet other witnesses stressed the fact that many small coal operators in the area had an abundant supply of coal.

The chairman of the Small Business Committee, Hon. JOE L. EVINS, has introduced a bill designed to reconcile this situation. I think, the solution, which is to provide for small business set-asides by TVA, is an excellent idea. Such set-asides have been required of many other Federal agencies, and it is entirely appropriate that TVA be included among them.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, I have been proud and honored to serve with Chairman EVINS. He is a highly respected and a beloved representative from Tennessee. He is known throughout the country as a champion advocate of the interests of our Nation's small businessmen. His district, the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee, is indeed fortunate to have such an outstanding and dedicated Congressman. The small businessmen of the country are also very fortunate to have Chairman EVINS' very able and strong leadership on behalf of small business.

Therefore, I would like to go on record in support of Chairman EVINS' bill, and commend it to my colleagues for their swift approval. It is this type of legislation that our Nation so sorely needs at a time when small business faces so many crises.

STATUS OF 100 MAJOR ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the office of the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), has prepared a summary of the status of 100 major Nixon requests in the 91st Congress.

The fact that less than half of these urgent items have been finally acted upon is an eloquent testimonial to the need for a Republican Congress.

The tabulation referred to follows:

STATUS OF 100 MAJOR ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS, 91ST CONG. (CONGRESSIONAL ACTION COMPLETED BEFORE 1970 ELECTION RECESS)

	Presidential message(s) or statement(s)	Legislation sent up	Legislation completed or public laws
1. Interest equalization tax	Jan. 13, 1969	June 9, 1969	Public Law 91-128.
2. Export control	Jan. 15, 1969	May 28, 1969	Public Law 91-184.
3. Reorganization authority	Jan. 30, 1969		Public Law 91-5.
4. District of Columbia crime bills	Jan. 31, 1969	July 11, 1969, Sept. 26, 1969	Public Law 91-358.
5. Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty	Feb. 3, 1969	Feb. 3, 1969	Ratified by Senate.
6. OEO extension	Feb. 19, 1969, June 2, 1969		Public Law 91-177.
7. Debt increase	Feb. 24, 1969		Public Law 91-8.
8. Coal mine safety	Mar. 3, 1969	Mar. 3, 1969	Public Law 91-173.
9. Military procurement (ABM)	Mar. 14, 1969	Apr. 15, 1969	Public Law 91-121.
10. Surtax extension	Mar. 21, 1969		Public Law 91-53.
11. Social security	Apr. 14, 1969, Sept. 25, 1969	Sept. 30, 1969	Public Law 91-172.
12. Tax reform	Apr. 21, 1969	Jan. 30, 1969	
13. Nonvoting District of Columbia delegate	Apr. 28, 1969	May 13, 1969	Public Law 91-405.
14. Voting rights	Apr 29, 1969	June 30, 1969	Public Law 91-285.
15. Food stamps authorization	May 6, 1969	June 6, 1969	Public Law 91-116.
16. Draft reform	May 13, 1969, Sept. 13, 1969	May 13, 1969, Sept. 19, 1969	Public Law 91-124.
17. Burger nomination	May 21, 1969		Confirmed by Senate, June 9, 1969.
18. Postal reform	May 27, 1969	May 28, 1969	Public Law 91-375.
19. Foreign aid authorization	May 28, 1969	do	Public Law 91-175.
20. Airport-airways	June 16, 1969	June 16, 1969	Public Law 91-258.
21. Unemployment insurance	July 8, 1969	July 18, 1969	Public Law 91-373.
22. Population growth	July 18, 1969	July 18, 1969	Public Law 91-213.
23. ICC reorganization	July 22, 1969	Reorganization plan	Effective Oct. 11, 1969.
24. Haynsworth nomination	Aug. 18, 1969		Rejected by Senate Nov. 21, 1969.
25. SST	Sept. 23, 1969		Public Law 91-168.
26. National Foundation on Arts and Humanities	Dec. 9, 1969	Feb. 19, 1970	Public Law 91-346.
27. Carswell nomination	Jan. 19, 1970		Rejected by Senate, Apr. 8, 1970.
28. Rail dispute	Mar. 3, 1970	Mar. 3, 1970	Public Law 91-226.
29. Public broadcasting	do	Mar. 5, 1970	Public Law 91-437.
30. Postal and other pay increases	Apr. 3, 1970		Public Law 91-231.
31. Emergency Home Finance Act	Apr. 24, 1970	Apr. 7, 1970	Public Law 91-351.

ITEMS REPRESENTED BY THE WHITE HOUSE AS BEING GENERALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH OR CONSISTENT WITH ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

32. IDA			Public Law 91-14.
33. Older americans			Public Law 91-69.
34. Maritime authorization			Public Law 91-85.
35. Student loans			Public Law 91-95.
36. Water pollution		Jan. 16, 1969	Public Law 91-224.
37. Education (ESEA)		June 16, 1969	Public Law 91-230.
38. Housing		July 12, 1969	Public Law 91-152.
39. Vietnam resolution		Introduced Nov. 4, 1969	Passed by House.
40. HEW amendments of 1969			Public Law 91-151.
41. Environmental Quality Act			Public Law 91-190.
42. White House, embassies protection			Public Law 91-217.

STATUS OF ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS, 91ST CONG.

	Presidential message(s) or statement(s)	Draft legislation sent up	Status as of Oct 12, 1970
43. Electoral reform	Feb. 20, 1969, Sept. 30, 1969	Constitutional amendment	Passed House.
44. 1 bank holding company	Mar. 24, 1969	Mar. 24, 1969	Awaiting or in conference.
45. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	Apr. 14, 1969	Oct. 13, 1969	Passed by Senate.
46. Law enforcement assistance (LEAA)	do	Mar. 3, 1970, May 28, 1970	Passed by House.
47. Highway user	do	July 29, 1969	
48. Witness immunity	Apr. 23, 1969	May 12, 1969	Passed by Senate.
49. Illegal gambling	do	Apr. 29, 1969	Do.
50. Organized crime	do	May 8, 1969	Awaiting or in conference.
51. Wagering tax amendment	do	Jan. 3, 1969, Mar. 20, 1969	
52. Grant consolidation	Apr. 30, 1969	May 1, 1969, May 7, 1969	
53. Obscenity	May 2, 1969	May 7, 1969	Passed by House.
54. Prurient advertising	do	do	Do.
55. Food stamps	May 6, 1969	June 12, 1969, June 17, 1969	Passed by the Senate.
56. Drug control	July 14, 1969	July 15, 1969	Awaiting or in conference.
57. Family planning	July 18, 1969	December 8, 1969, December 9, 1969	Passed by Senate.
58. Occupational safety [1]	August 6, 1969	August 6, 1969	
59. Mass transit	August 7, 1969	August 11, 1969	Awaiting or in conference.
60. Welfare reform	August 11, 1969	October 2, 1969	Passed by House.
61. Manpower training [1]	August 12, 1969	August 12, 1969	Passed by Senate.
62. Revenue sharing	August 13, 1969	September 23, 1969	
63. Social security	September 25, 1969	September 30, 1969	Passed by House.
64. Maritime program	October 23, 1969	December 22, 1969	Awaiting or in conference.
65. Consumer Protection Act [1]	October 30, 1969	November 20, 1969	
66. Consumer Representation Act	do	November 12, 1969	
67. Consumer Product Testing Act	do	Dec. 20, 1969	
68. Latin American program	Oct. 31, 1969	Jan. 28, 1970	
69. Trade Act	Nov. 18, 1969	Nov. 19, 1969	
70. Solid waste	Feb. 10, 1970	Feb. 10, 1970, Feb. 18, 1970	Awaiting or in conference.
71. Clean air	do	do	Do.
72. Parklands	do	Feb. 16, 1970, Feb. 18, 1970	Do.
73. Water Pollution Control Act	do	do	
74. Waste treatment facilities	do	do	
75. Environmental Financing Authority	do	do	
76. Asian Development Bank	Feb. 25, 1970	Mar. 4, 1970	Passed by House.
77. Emergency public interest protection	Feb. 27, 1970	Feb. 28, 1970, Mar. 2, 1970	
78. Economy Act	do	Feb. 28, 1970	
79. Education Institute	Mar. 3, 1970	Mar. 5, 1970	
80. Employee benefits	Mar. 13, 1970	Mar. 13, 1970, Mar. 16, 1970	
81. SBA Extension	Mar. 19, 1970	Mar. 24, 1970 Apr. 9, 1970	Passed by Senate.
82. Higher Education Opportunity Act	do	Mar. 24, 1970	
83. Explosives legislation	Mar. 25, 1970	Mar. 26, 1970	Awaiting or in conference.
84. Estuarine resources	Apr. 13, 1970	Nov. 18, 1969, Nov. 25, 1969	
85. Great Lakes disposal	Apr. 15, 1970	Apr. 16, 1970	
86. Disaster assistance	Apr. 22, 1970	Apr. 23, 1970	
87. Selective service amendments	Apr. 23, 1970	do	
88. Radiotelephones	May 20, 1970	Feb. 18, 1969, Feb. 28, 1969	Passed by House.
89. Ports and waterways safety	do	May 20, 1970	
90. Emergency School Aid Act	May 21, 1970	May 21, 1970	
91. Emergency transportation assistance	June 16, 1970	June 16, 1970	
92. Indian affairs bills	July 8, 1970	July 21, 1970	

ITEMS REPRESENTED BY THE WHITE HOUSE AS BEING GENERALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH OR CONSISTENT WITH ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

93. Foreign military sales		July 15, 1969, Feb. 10, 1970	Awaiting or in conference.
94. Rail passenger bill [1]		Aug. 6, 1969	Passed by Senate.
95. Military procurement authorization		Feb. 2, 1970	Awaiting or in conference.
96. Military construction authorization		Mar. 11, 1970	Do.
97. Housing and Urban Development Act		Mar. 25, 1970	Passed by Senate.
98. Fire research and safety		Mar. 18, 1970, Apr. 27, 1970	Do.
99. Federal Aid Highway Act [1]		June 10, 1970	Do.
100. Farm bill		July 21, 1970	Awaiting or in conference

[1] May be acted upon by House or Senate on Oct. 13 or 14.

TABULATIONS AND ANSWERS TO BIENNIAL OPINION POLL

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on August 24 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the questions which I sent to my constituents in the First District of Arizona in my biennial opinion poll. I have just received the tabulations of the answers and am pleased to place them in the RECORD, as I promised. I was particularly gratified by the unusually large response to the poll this year—a total of 45,192—which further proves to me that my constituents are interested and knowledgeable in the problems which we face individually and nationally, and are anxious to offer their help and suggestions in the effort to solve them.

Following are the results of my poll. Although tabulations were made in a number of categories, I am including only those which I believe would be of the most interest: First, male, by age group and overall total; second, female, by age group and overall total; and third, the overall total of all responses.

The tabulations follow:

CONSTITUTENT RESPONSE BY AGE—MALE (22,285 RESPONDENTS)

	18 to 21	Percent	22 to 44	Percent	45 to 64	Percent	65 or over	Percent
1. Do you favor cutting off Federal loans and grants to students convicted of campus disorders?								
Yes	236	63.4	8,065	87.1	8,119	94.6	3,510	95.4
No	94	25.3	919	9.9	283	3.3	65	1.8
Undecided	20	5.4	205	2.2	73	.9	27	.7
No response	22	5.9	72	.8	109	1.3	76	2.1
Total	372		9,261		8,584		3,678	

CONSTITUTENT RESPONSE BY AGE—MALE (22,285 RESPONDENTS)—Continued

	18 to 21	Percent	22 to 44	Percent	45 to 64	Percent	65 or over	Percent
2. When students stage a strike on a college campus, do you think the nonstriking students have a right to continue attending classes?								
Yes	337	90.6	8,991	96.9	8,324	96.9	3,509	95.6
No	12	3.2	146	1.6	145	1.7	84	2.3
Undecided	5	1.3	72	.8	34	.4	12	.3
No response	18	4.8	65	.7	87	1.0	66	1.8
Total	372		9,274		8,590		3,671	
3. Do you agree with recent proposals to have a volunteer Army with more career incentives, and abolition of the draft except in time of war?								
Yes	288	77.4	6,416	69.2	6,157	71.7	2,472	67.4
No	47	12.6	1,993	21.5	1,684	19.6	715	19.5
Undecided	18	4.8	777	8.4	623	7.3	355	9.7
No response	19	5.1	87	.9	129	1.5	124	3.4
Total	372		9,273		8,593		3,666	
4. In general, do you favor the way President Nixon has conducted his administration?								
Yes	179	48.5	5,769	62.2	5,720	66.5	2,817	76.7
No	119	32.2	2,217	23.9	1,720	20.0	431	11.7
Undecided	53	14.4	1,202	13.0	1,026	11.9	337	9.2
No response	18	4.9	92	1.0	131	1.5	90	2.4
Total	369		9,280		8,597		3,675	
5. Should balancing the Federal budget to reduce the cost of living be given priority over greater spending on Government programs?								
Yes	233	26.8	6,824	73.6	6,991	81.4	3,170	86.3
No	70	18.9	1,362	14.7	836	9.7	178	4.8
Undecided	45	12.1	932	10.0	572	6.7	200	5.4
No response	23	6.2	158	1.7	192	2.2	124	3.4
Total	371		9,276		8,591		3,672	
6. Do you think strikes should be outlawed, and a labor court established to be the final voice in labor-management disputes?—								
Yes	113	30.6	3,404	36.7	4,289	50.0	2,537	69.0
No	202	54.7	4,478	48.3	3,057	35.6	684	18.6
Undecided	34	9.2	1,266	13.7	1,092	12.7	340	9.2
No response	20	5.4	115	1.2	140	1.6	115	3.1
Total	369		9,263		8,578		3,676	
7. Do you think the United States should try to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing military equipment to Israel when necessary?								
Yes	176	47.4	5,816	62.8	5,405	62.9	2,445	66.6
No	123	33.2	2,216	23.9	1,981	23.1	643	17.5
Undecided	49	13.2	1,117	12.1	1,069	12.4	460	12.5
No response	23	6.2	113	1.2	138	1.6	125	3.4
Total	371		9,262		8,593		3,673	
8A. Do you favor legislation that would allow police officers with a warrant to enter private premises without knocking if they think evidence would otherwise be destroyed or their lives endangered?								
Yes	158	42.6	5,264	56.9	5,906	68.7	2,911	79.2
No	174	46.9	3,351	36.2	2,032	23.6	472	12.8
Undecided	18	4.9	524	5.7	492	5.7	168	4.6
No response	21	5.7	118	1.3	169	2.0	125	3.4
Total	371		9,257		8,599		3,676	
8B. Do you favor legislation that would permit a criminal defendant to be kept in preventive detention if his record indicates that he may commit another crime if he were set free on bond?								
Yes	249	67.1	7,730	83.4	7,819	91.1	3,347	91.1
No	79	21.3	1,049	11.3	395	4.6	85	2.3
Undecided	16	4.3	306	3.3	115	1.3	27	.7
No response	27	7.3	185	2.0	255	3.0	216	5.9
Total	371		9,270		8,584		3,675	
9. What do you feel is the most important problem facing the United States today?								
Air and water pollution	85	31.0	1,605	25.4	607	13.2	149	10.0
Crime and violence	64	23.4	2,606	41.2	2,661	57.7	911	60.9
Vietnam war	75	27.4	1,264	20.0	701	15.2	152	10.2
Inflation (rise in cost of living)	12	4.4	450	7.1	249	5.4	99	6.6
Middle East crisis	4	1.5	51	.8	36	.8	9	.6
Other	13	4.7	184	2.9	93	2.0	13	.9
No response	21	7.7	163	2.6	265	5.7	164	11.0
Total	274		6,323		4,612		1,497	

ALL MALE RESPONSE (22,285 RESPONDENTS)

	Responses	Percent
1. Do you favor cutting off Federal loans and grants to students convicted of campus disorders?		
Yes	20,160	90.8
No	1,374	6.2
Undecided	325	1.5
No response	346	1.6
Total	22,205	

	Responses	Percent
2. When students stage a strike on a college campus, do you think the nonstriking students have a right to continue attending classes?		
Yes	21,370	96.2
No	401	1.8
Undecided	126	.6
No response	319	1.4
Total	22,216	

ALL MALE RESPONSE (22,285 RESPONDENTS)—Continued

	Responses	Percent
3. Do you agree with recent proposals to have a volunteer army with more career incentives, and abolition of the draft except in time of war?		
Yes	15,492	69.7
No	4,483	20.2
Undecided	1,788	8.0
No response	452	2.0
Total	22,215	
4. In general, do you favor the way President Nixon has conducted his administration?		
Yes	14,651	65.9
No	4,519	20.3
Undecided	2,631	11.8
No response	434	2.0
Total	22,235	
5. Should balancing the Federal budget to reduce the cost of living be given priority over greater spending on Government programs?		
Yes	17,391	78.3
No	2,462	11.1
Undecided	1,765	7.9
No response	603	2.7
Total	22,221	
6. Do you think strikes should be outlawed, and a labor court established to be the final voice in labor-management disputes?		
Yes	10,474	47.2
No	8,472	38.2
Undediced	2,751	12.4
No response	503	2.3
Total	22,200	
7. Do you think the United States should try to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing military equipment to Israel when necessary?		
Yes	13,963	62.9
No	5,006	22.5
Undecided	2,722	12.3
No response	521	2.3
Total	22,212	
8A. Do you favor legislation that would allow police officers with a warrant to enter private premises without knocking if they think evidence would otherwise be destroyed or their lives endangered?		
Yes	14,371	64.7
No	6,078	27.4
Undecided	1,210	5.4
No response	555	2.5
Total	22,214	
8B. Do you favor legislation that would permit a criminal defendant to be kept in preventive detention if his record indicates that he may commit another crime if he were set free on bond?		
Yes	19,306	86.9
No	1,620	7.3
Undecided	470	2.1
No response	814	3.7
Total	22,210	
9. What do you feel is the most important problem facing the United States today?		
Air and water pollution	2,468	19.1
Crime and violence	6,301	48.7
Vietnam war	2,205	17.0
Inflation (rise in cost of living)	824	6.4
Middle East crisis	98	.8
Other	302	2.3
No response	753	5.8
Total	12,951	

CONSTITUENT RESPONSE BY AGE—FEMALE (22,907 RESPONDENTS)

	18 to 21	Percent	22 to 44	Percent	45 to 64	Percent	65 or over	Percent
1. Do you favor cutting off Federal loans and grants to students convicted of campus disorders?								
Yes	482	75.7	8,567	88.1	8,270	94.6	3,148	95.1
No	125	19.6	809	8.3	252	2.9	52	1.6
Undecided	28	4.4	274	2.8	110	1.3	33	1.0
No response	2	.3	72	.7	107	1.2	76	2.3
Total	637		9,722		8,739		3,309	
2. When students stage a strike on a college campus, do you think the nonstriking students have a right to continue attending classes?								
Yes	620	96.6	9,468	97.4	8,518	97.3	3,153	95.0
No	16	2.5	134	1.4	110	1.3	72	2.2
Undecided	5	.8	59	.6	38	.4	9	.3
No response	1	.2	61	.6	90	1.0	85	2.6
Total	642		9,722		8,756		3,319	
3. Do you agree with recent proposals to have a volunteer Army with more career incentives, and abolition of the draft except in time of war?								
Yes	504	78.4	6,668	68.6	6,272	71.6	2,273	68.8
No	80	12.4	1,740	17.9	1,489	17.0	491	14.9
Undecided	54	8.4	1,206	12.4	820	9.4	383	11.6
No response	5	.8	109	1.1	174	2.0	159	4.8
Total	643		9,723		8,755		3,306	
4. In general, do you favor the way President Nixon has conducted his administration?								
Yes	327	50.9	5,780	59.4	5,860	67.0	2,508	75.7
No	192	29.9	2,174	22.4	1,526	17.4	350	10.6
Undecided	120	81.7	1,664	17.1	1,218	13.9	358	10.8
No response	3	.5	107	1.1	148	1.7	97	2.9
Total	642		9,725		8,752		3,313	
5. Should balancing the Federal budget to reduce the cost of living be given priority over greater spending on Government programs?								
Yes	442	69.0	7,199	74.1	7,099	81.1	2,768	83.5
No	97	15.1	1,113	11.5	690	7.9	168	5.1
Undecided	96	15.0	1,199	12.3	698	8.0	228	6.9
No response	6	.9	206	2.1	267	3.1	150	4.5
Total	641		9,717		8,754		3,314	
6. Do you think strikes should be outlawed, and a labor court established to be the final voice in labor-management disputes?								
Yes	243	37.9	3,923	40.4	4,897	56.0	2,327	70.3
No	278	43.3	3,768	38.8	2,278	26.1	453	13.7
Undecided	118	18.4	1,869	19.3	1,350	15.4	384	11.6
No response	3	.5	144	1.5	214	2.4	146	4.4
Total	642		9,704		8,739		3,310	

	18 to 21	Percent	22 to 44	Percent	45 to 64	Percent	65 or over	Percent
7. Do you think the United States should try to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing military equipment to Israel when necessary?								
Yes	278	43.6	4,985	51.4	4,762	54.5	1,987	59.9
No	224	35.1	2,675	27.6	2,138	42.5	618	18.6
Undecided	130	20.4	1,914	19.7	1,578	18.0	564	17.0
No response	6	.9	133	1.4	265	3.0	149	4.5
Total	683		9,707		8,743		3,318	
8A. Do you favor legislation that would allow police officers with a warrant to enter private premises without knocking if they think evidence would otherwise be destroyed or their lives endangered?								
Yes	293	45.7	5,611	57.7	5,810	66.4	2,516	76.0
No	301	47.0	3,216	33.1	2,016	23.1	440	13.3
Undecided	37	5.8	725	7.5	673	7.7	209	6.3
No response	10	1.6	168	1.7	245	2.8	147	4.4
Total	641		9,720		8,744		3,312	
8B. Do you favor legislation that would permit a criminal defendant to be kept in preventive detention if his record indicates that he may commit another crime if he were set free on bond?								
Yes	477	74.6	8,363	86.1	7,957	91.0	2,956	89.2
No	108	16.9	810	8.3	286	3.3	84	2.5
Undecided	32	5.0	331	3.4	151	1.7	37	1.1
No response	22	3.4	209	2.2	353	4.0	236	7.1
Total	639		9,713		8,747		3,313	
9. What do you feel is the most important problem facing the United States today?								
Air and water pollution	154	35.9	1,637	25.6	609	13.4	127	8.8
Crime and violence	128	29.8	2,638	41.3	2,555	56.3	811	56.2
Vietnam war	88	20.5	1,282	20.1	688	15.2	168	11.6
Inflation (rise and cost of living)	30	7.0	433	6.8	243	5.4	81	5.6
Middle East crisis	3	.7	44	.7	32	.7	11	.8
Other	11	2.6	163	2.6	65	1.4	20	1.4
No response	15	3.5	187	2.9	349	7.7	226	15.7
Total	429		6,384		4,541		1,444	

ALL FEMALE RESPONSE (22,907 RESPONDENTS)

	Responses	Percent
1. Do you favor cutting off Federal loans and grants to students convicted of campus disorders?		
Yes	20,779	91.0
No	1,259	5.5
Undecided	451	2.0
No response	340	1.5
Total	22,829	
2. When students stage a strike on a college campus, do you think the nonstriking students have a right to continue attending classes?		
Yes	22,079	96.6
No	340	1.5
Undecided	115	.5
No response	325	
Total	22,859	
3. Do you agree with recent proposals to have a volunteer army with more career incentives, and abolition of the draft except in time of war?		
Yes	15,937	69.8
No	3,856	16.9
Undecided	2,491	10.9
No response	561	2.5
Total	22,845	
4. In general, do you favor the way President Nixon has conducted his administration?		
Yes	14,683	64.3
No	4,298	18.8
Undecided	3,392	14.8
No response	476	2.1
Total	22,849	
5. Should balancing the Federal budget to reduce the cost of living be given priority over greater spending on Government programs?		
Yes	17,725	77.6
No	2,101	9.2
Undecided	2,247	9.8
No response	773	3.4
Total	22,846	
6. Do you think strikes should be outlawed, and a labor court established to be the final voice in labor-management disputes?		
Yes	11,562	50.7
No	6,857	30.1
Undecided	3,749	16.4
No response	647	2.8
Total	22,815	
7. Do you think the United States should try to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing military equipment to Israel when necessary?		
Yes	12,171	53.3
No	5,721	25.1
Undecided	4,245	18.6
No response	686	3.0
Total	22,823	
8A. Do you favor legislation that would allow police officers with a warrant to enter private premises without knocking if they think evidence would otherwise be destroyed or their lives endangered?		
Yes	14,432	63.2
No	6,034	26.4
Undecided	1,650	7.2
No response	716	3.1
Total	22,832	
8B. Do you favor legislation that would permit a criminal defendant to be kept in preventive detention if his record indicates that he may commit another crime if he were set free on bond?		
Yes	19,993	87.6
No	1,311	5.7
Undecided	558	2.4
No response	967	4.2
Total	22,829	
9. What do you feel is the most important problem facing the United States today?		
Air and water pollution	2,555	19.4
Crime and violence	6,202	47.1
Vietnam war	2,269	17.2
Inflation (rise in cost of living)	811	6.2
Middle East crisis	97	.7
Other	272	2.1
No response	965	7.3
Total	13,171	

ALL RESPONSES (45,192 RESPONDENTS)

	Responses	Percent
1. Do you favor cutting off Federal loans and grants to students convicted of campus disorders?		
Yes	40,939	90.9
No	2,633	5.8
Undecided	776	1.7
No response	686	1.5
Total	45,034	
2. When students stage a strike on a college campus, do you think the nonstriking students have a right to continue attending classes?		
Yes	43,449	96.4
No	741	1.6
Undecided	241	.5
No response	644	1.4
Total	45,075	
3. Do you agree with recent proposals to have a volunteer army with more career incentives, and abolition of the draft except in time of war?		
Yes	31,429	69.7
No	8,339	18.5
Undecided	4,279	9.5
No response	1,013	2.2
Total	45,060	
4. In general, do you favor the way President Nixon has conducted his administration?		
Yes	29,334	65.1
No	8,817	19.6
Undecided	6,023	13.4
No response	910	2.0
Total	45,084	
5. Should balancing the Federal budget to reduce the cost of living be given priority over greater spending on Government programs?		
Yes	35,116	77.9
No	4,563	10.1
Undecided	4,012	8.9
No response	1,376	3.1
Total	45,067	
6. Do you think strikes should be outlawed, and a labor court established to be the final voice in labor-management disputes?		
Yes	22,036	49.0
No	15,329	34.1
Undecided	6,500	14.4
No response	1,150	2.6
Total	45,015	
7. Do you think the United States should try to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing military equipment to Israel when necessary?		
Yes	26,134	58.0
No	10,727	23.8
Undecided	6,967	15.5
No response	1,207	2.7
Total	45,035	
8A. Do you favor legislation that would allow police officers with a warrant to enter private premises without knocking if they think evidence would otherwise be destroyed or their lives endangered?		
Yes	28,803	63.9
No	12,112	26.9
Undecided	2,860	6.3
No response	1,271	2.8
Total	45,046	
8B. Do you favor legislation that would permit a criminal defendant to be kept in preventive detention if his record indicates that he may commit another crime if he were set free on bond?		
Yes	39,299	87.3
No	2,931	6.5
Undecided	1,028	2.3
No response	1,781	4.0
Total	45,039	
9. What do you feel is the most important problem facing the United States today?		
Air and water pollution	5,023	19.2
Crime and violence	12,503	47.9
Vietnam War	4,474	17.1
Inflation (rise in cost of living)	1,635	6.3
Middle East crisis	195	.7
Other	574	2.2
No response	1,718	6.6
Total	26,122	

MILITARY AID TO GREECE

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, the freedom of the press is the cornerstone of democracy. When this freedom is being virtually denied in Greece, the cradle of democracy, then all of us should be seriously concerned.

On October 3, 1970, 25 Greek publishers, editors, and journalists living in exile, in this country and in Europe, representing a cross section of Greek political views prior to the military takeover in 1967, sent an open letter to President Nixon.

In this letter they detail in a forceful way the conditions prevailing today in Greece and denounce the reasoning behind our Government's recent decision to resume full military aid to the Greek junta.

The well-known conservative Greek publisher, Mrs. Helen George Vlachou, signs this letter as well as my good friend, Elias P. Demetracopoulos, distinguished journalist and a leader of the Greek resistance movement in America, who personally delivered this letter to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Mr. Rodger Davies.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and signatures be printed in the RECORD.

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

OPEN LETTER FROM THE UNDERSIGNED GREEK PUBLISHERS AND JOURNALISTS LIVING OUT OF GREECE

OCTOBER, 3, 1970.

To H. E. The President of the United States, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON.

MR. PRESIDENT: On the 22nd of September 1970, on the occasion of the decision to resume the shipment of heavy arms to Greece, the State Department's official spokesman Mr. Robert J. McCloskey, added to the announcement the following statement: "In Greece—the trend toward a constitutional order is established. Major sections of the Constitution have been implemented, and partial restoration of civil rights has been accomplished. The government of Greece has stated that it intends to establish parliamentary democracy . . ."

As Greek journalists living out of Greece because in our country we have been denied the freedom of expression, speaking for ourselves and also in the name of colleagues still working in Greece, we feel obliged to bring to your attention, that this decision, of such importance to our country, is based upon lies.

The truth, which every well-informed person of good faith already knows about the present situation in Greece, is as follows:

1. Greece is still under Martial Law, with all that implies in respect of the deprivation of basic individual liberties and human rights.

2. The military courts continue to take their daily toll of the liberty of any who happen to believe differently from those in power, handing out life sentences for the printing of "illegal literature."

3. Hundreds of political prisoners, holding views ranging from the extreme left to the extreme right, are still in prisons, concentration camps or in exile. They are useful hostages, available for release in periodic acts of clemency to impress public opinion.

4. A few 'freedoms' sporadically accorded in response to international pressure—the freedom to travel, to express mild criticism, to hold a meeting—are available in Greece today not by the rule of law, but at the whim of the dictators. They are given to some as a favor; as a punishment, they are denied to others who have no legal redress.

5. The Press is strangled by a draconian Press Law by which any expression of disagreement can be interepreted as a 'national crime'. One recent example: Our colleague Ioannis Kapsis, was sentenced to five years imprisonment because as editor of the newspaper 'Ethnos' he allowed the publication of an interview in which a former politician called for the formation of a coalition government.

6. The whole fabric of the State—the judiciary, the Civil Service, the Trades Unions, the schools, the universities and all the agencies of cultural life—continue to be permeated by the retrograde ideas of the rulers, and administered by a personnel harassed and demoralized by constant, thorough-going purges.

7. The so-called 'Constitution' the implementation of which appears to be Washington's ultimate test of the Greek regime's claim to respectability is in reality a formula for the perpetuation of military power in the

government of Greece. It comes as a shock to the free democratic world that Washington in 1970 can apply the term 'constitutional' to its authoritarian and illiberal provisions.

8. The Greek regime has not, to this day, after three and a half years in power, given the slightest proof that it ever intends to return to parliamentary democracy. On the contrary, it has repeatedly refused to name a date for the holding of elections, an event which one of its leaders has recently declared, would be 'catastrophic'.

Mr. President, we do not protest only for the act of support and encouragement to the present Greek regime, a protest already expressed by political leaders and responsible people all over the world.

As publishers, editors, and journalists, members of a profession whose duty it is to inform public opinion, we can not allow this blatant distortion of the truth about the situation in Greece to go unchallenged.

And in sending you this letter we are convinced that we are contributing to the survival of the democratic values which are under threat throughout the world.

Respectfully yours,

Andreas Arnakis, Frankfurt; Paul Bakoyannis, Munich; Nikos Delipetros, Paris; Elias Demetracopoulos, Washington; Antonis Drossopoulos, Vienna; Aris Fakinos, Paris; Spyros Giannatos, London; Spyros Granitsas, New York; Costas Hadjiandreou, Frankfort; George Katiforis, London; Ioannis Katris, Minneapolis; Michael Kostopoulos, London; Panayotis Lambrias, London; Ioannis Lampsas, Geneva; Anghelos Maropoulos, Bonn; Basil Mathiopoulos, Bonn; Basil Mavridis, Cologne; Costas Nikolaou, Cologne; Marios Ploritis, Paris; Evangelos Panteleskos, Rome; Asteris Stangos, Rome; Richard Someritis, Paris; George Yannopoulos, London; Helen Vlachos, London; George Voukelatos, Bonn.

MAJOR PROBLEMS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, former Indiana Gov. Matthew E. Welsh is a man of reason and probably the best scholar ever to serve as chief executive of our Hoosier State.

His remarks, which follow, were delivered in Indianapolis on September 23, 1970. They represent a calm and reflective statement of the loyal opposition position in America.

The address follows:

STATEMENT OF MATTHEW E. WELSH, SEPTEMBER 23, 1970

As we look ahead, the major problems before us as a nation are those created by the increase in population which demographers predict will, in the absence of acceptance by our people of effective population control measures, increase 50% from 200 million to 300 million, by the year 2000, with an even greater increase occurring in our major metropolitan areas.

This, in substance, means that *if we are to maintain our present standard of living,* we must increase our physical plant approximately 50% by the year 2000. In other words, in 30 years we must accomplish 50% of what our nation has built in its entire lifetime.

Look around at the streets, schools and universities, hospitals, sewers, public buildings and visualize the magnitude of a 50% increase in public facilities, not to mention the necessary additional plant of business in utilities, factories, transportation, shopping areas, etc, Thus, the task ahead is enormous—if we are to meet the challenge of furnishing our children with facilities and an environment equal to or better than ours. We dare not fail, for this would mean inferior health and education facilities, inadequate transportation, insufficient utility services, etc., and the strains and tensions which would in turn result from such a failure could tear the fabric of our society as we know it beyond recognition.

The big question is, I suppose, "Can we possibly do it?" I believe we can, if—but only if—the people of our country are *all* pulling together toward this objective, all groups having a feeling that they are making their own contribution—that they have a voice in this great work—that their opinions are heard, weighed, and respected by those in charge. There is enough work to be done here to keep us all busy for the remainder of this century—if we all are headed in the same direction and are pulling together.

But today we are not all headed in the same direction—nor are we pulling together! Let us examine some of the reasons.

When Candidate Nixon was seeking the GOP nomination in Miami in 1968, he found himself threatened at the last minute by Ronald Reagan, who had great appeal to the arch conservative—Goldwater wing—of the party. To assure his nomination, Nixon chose his "Southern Strategy" and made a deal with the spokesman of the Southern conservatives—Strom Thurmond of South Carolina—whose public record has been one of consistent and bitter opposition to all programs of equal opportunity for the Negro as well as the programs of interest to organized labor. Senator Thurmond delivered the South, Nixon was nominated, and thus became obligated to deliver upon his commitment when he was elected.

The terms of the deal soon became apparent in the nominations of first Haynesworth and then Carswell to the United States Supreme Court—both of them sharing the philosophy of Thurmond on racial and labor matters to such an extent that neither of them had had a single decision they authorized sustained on appeal to the Supreme Court. Fortunately, the United States Senate—led by our own Birch Bayh, I'm proud to say—refused to confirm either man.

Nixon then issued a statement that it was "now apparent a Southerner was not acceptable on the Court," thus attempting to salvage sectional partisan advantage from his badly bungled attempts to appoint men who

(a) were not nearly the best men in the South who were available

(b) were so distasteful that the GOP Senators from other areas defected in large numbers so that refusal to confirm ultimately was actually bi-partisan.

But the important point is that Nixon used this defeat as an occasion for trying to drive a wedge between the South and the rest of the country.

These attempted appointments had another sorry result—they totally alienated the black community of our country. A Wall Street Journal article commented this summer that a poll revealed a bare 3% of the Negroes in the United States felt they had a friend in the White House!

Another segment of our society has also been almost completely alienated by President Nixon—namely, our youth. The attitude of the administration is best portrayed by Nixon's unguarded reference to them as "bums," by Mrs. Mitchell's calling them "Communists" and now just last week by Attorney General Mitchell describing them as "stupid."

Is it any wonder that one Republican Senator agonized that the GOP is driving away an entire generation by its attitude. What makes this especially unfortunate is that these young people are the men and women of tomorrow whose job it will be to build and pay for the facilities so desperately needed—but their cooperation is not sought. They encounter hostility at the highest levels of government. They feel as though "nobody is listening" to what they have to say.

There is something desperately wrong about an administration which has lost confidence in our young people! And when it is recalled that the median age of our total population is 27.7 years of age, the importance of enlisting the help and concern of our young people becomes obvious. Insults are a dangerous luxury which not only displays the arrogance of those in power, but also aggravates the mood of unease and alienation.

Let me talk briefly about the management of our country's economy by the Nixon administration. We find today we have the incredible combination of continuing inflation, the highest interest rates since the Civil War, the highest unemployment since the last Republican Administration, all in the face of enormous unmet needs in housing, pollution, health facilities, etc., and all this while we are in the middle of a war! There are now 31 cities in the United States reported as having "substantial unemployment." And every time the Administration announces things are better, they get worse!

And we must also look at the State House, where we have a most unhappy family. If you want the best critique on the quality of the State Administration, just ask any Republican! They will tell you Indiana has an administration which is so busy fighting in its own ranks that it can't govern; that the head of the party has so lost control that he cannot elect the chairman of his choice; that its sense of values are so out of phase that we see the Governor, the Lt. Governor, the Attorney General, the Treasurer, and the Auditor of the State acting together openly to flout an order of the Appellate Court and carry it to the extent of a citation for contempt. Strange conduct indeed—and a very bad example for a "law and order" administration!

Our country today is more uneasy, more uncertain about its future than at any time in the memory of those here present—brought about in large measure by the divisions within. This division has been fostered by a calculated and cynical program of the Nixon Administration which has attempted to turn the South against the rest of the country, the city vs. the suburbs, the young vs. the old, which has almost totally alienated the Negro, and the young, has attempted to widen the generation gap and has unsuccessfully attempted to solve the problem of inflation by the cruelest method possible, i.e., by creating unemployment.

The best way to get back on the track, to regain our sense of purpose, is to elect a Democratic Congressional, State and County ticket, so that we can end the division and take up once more our pursuit of equal dignity and equal opportunity.

The real question posed by this election is what is to be the philosophy of those in charge of our government.

We cannot permit our government to remain in the hands: of a President who would cynically divide us; of a Senate candidate who is an open sponsor of John Birch causes; of a State Attorney General who finds the Manion Forum a good place to expound his philosophy of our state; of a Governor who gets his political counsel raw, straight, and unadulterated from the Indianapolis Star!

The following quotations, one by Sir Kenneth Clark and the other by an unknown author, serve to illustrate the contrast between the philosophies I have outlined:

From Clark: "I believe order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction. I prefer gentleness to violence, forgiveness to denunciation and vendetta. On the whole I think that knowledge is preferable to ignorance, and I am sure that human sympathy is more valuable than ideology. I believe that in spite of the recent triumphs of science, men haven't changed much in the last two thousand years; and in consequence we must still try to learn from history. History is ourselves. I believe in courtesy, the ritual by which we avoid hurting other people's feelings by satisfying our own egos. And I think we should remember that we are part of a great whole, which for convenience we call nature. All living things are our brothers and sisters. Above all, I believe in the God-given genius of certain individuals, and I value a society that makes their existence possible."

And from the unknown author:

"The unforgiven, fearful self does shun
His neighbor through suspicion;
And in his growing loneliness
Seeks others who are loving less and less—
No faith, no trust, no love, just hate.
A frightened soul becomes his fate.
Due process and the Bill of Rights
No longer seen along his sights,
Upon one belief he grimly leans;
'The ends indeed do justify the means'."

WORLD RALLY OF THE WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THURMOND

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), was recently the featured speaker in Tokyo at the World Rally of the World Anti-Communist League.

The World Anti-Communist League is a group comprised of members in all the free countries of the world which annually meets to review the Communist threat to freedom.

The rally in Tokyo was an outstanding success, with 25,000 people crowded into the magnificent new Nippon Budokan Hall and another 4,000 people listening to the address outside on loudspeakers.

In his statement, the Senator who is well known for his outstanding work on the Committee on Armed Services, called upon the Asian nations and Japan in particular to organize their military programs in a joint effort to protect themselves against the Soviet aims against that area of the world. The Senator's address shows a broad grasp of military and geopolitical principles. It is an important contribution to the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator THURMOND's address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Chairman Sasakawa, President Kuboki, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

This is an exciting time for the Free World, and I am happy to be here to talk to you about the future of the anti-Communist countries, particularly in Free Asia. In the past year, the fight for freedom has taken on some important new developments which have completely changed the prospects for this region.

In particular, I want to point to the revitalized role now being played by South Vietnam in its long fight against Communist aggression. Beset by internal problems and hobbled by the hesitancy of U.S. policy, Vietnam was unable to take the proper initiative on the battlefield.

Not until 1969 did the Vietnamese army get the training and the weapons which were befitting to its courage and tenacity. By the end of 1969, this program, labeled by President Nixon as "Vietnamization", was already beginning to show the positive results of this new trust and new kind of support. Today the Vietnamese troops have clearly proven that they are composed of tough fighting men led by officers of ability and character.

The tremendous improvement as a result of Vietnamization is shown in the fact that in December of 1968 only 76 percent of the people lived in secure areas; one year later, 93 percent lived in secure areas; and the figure continued to improve. A similiar improvement is shown in the decrease in the number of South Vietnamese civilians abducted by the Viet Cong. In the first quarter of 1969, 3,219 were kidnapped; in the last quarter of 1969, only 629. That is why the hope and trust of the people indisputably lies today with the government in Saigon.

Thus the propaganda of defeat has been clearly shown to be a tissue of falsification and distortion. Those who have continually maligned our Asian alies have had to turn to other deceptions and techniques. The propaganda battle is not yet won, but the thruth of our policies has been proved on the battlefield of war and in the hearts of our South Vietnamese allies.

Then in March of this year came President Nixon's courageous decision to open a counter-offensive in the border areas of Cambodia. I have taken note of the World anti-Communist League's wonderful resolution in support of that action, approved at your meeting in May, and I want you to know that this resolution is deeply appreciated in the United States among all those who believe in or are engaged in the fight for freedom.

The Communists have charged that South Vietnam and the United States violated the sovereignty of Cambodia in that action and extended the war. The fact is that the Communists violated Cambodia's sovereignty almost five years previously when they made Cambodian territory a base for war. For all practical purposes, Cambodia was not allowed to exercise its sovereignty in the war zone, until the victories of the South Vietnamese and U.S. troops returned control of the territory to the Cambodian government's hands.

The Cambodian operation demonstrated the success of the Vietnamization policy in two ways.

First, the Communists apparently chose to step up activity in Cambodia because they were losing ground in South Vietnam. Secondly, it showed that the South Vietnamese troops, properly armed and trained, had a fine capability not only for pacification, but also for offensive action against the enemy.

Moreover, the Cambodian operation also demonstrated the potential for cooperation between Cambodia and South Vietnam, a cooperation which the malignant critics had also said was impossible. Despite some inevitable minor problems, the two nations have worked together in a mutual system that has enabled a free Cambodia to survive in the face of intense military and subversive pressure. Again, the left-wing critics had said that the government of Premier Lon Nol couldn't last a month in the face of the Communist offensive; yet it has survived, and the capital remains free, providing an inspiration to freedom-loving nations throughout the world.

When one move in the right direction is successful, it makes it easier for another such move to follow. For this reason, we in the United States took great heart from the action of Indonesia's Foreign Minister Adam Malik in convening the free Asian nations at Jakarta. There are some people who said that the United States frowned upon such a conference because we did not participate in the planning or the sessions. On the contrary, we felt that the initiative of the free nations of Asia in acting alone was a commendable sign of assuming responsibility; and the more so since Indonesia is a nation which has only recently thrown off the Communist conspiracy. The sessions at Jakarta were described as tentative and general in tone; but the important point is that they were held at all. The beginning is the most difficult part. The Jakarta Conference set up a commission, consisting of the foreign ministers of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Japan, to work for peace in Cambodia. Thus Jakarta can be the seed of continuing cooperation, particularly the kind of cooperation to work for one another's mutual security. If peace comes to Cambodia, it will come only when Cambodia gets the mutual assistance it needs from its neighbors.

It is of particular significance that Japan was a participant in the Jakarta Conference, and that Japan elected to become a part of its continuing work on the Cambodian commission. This was viewed in America as a welcome sign that Japan is taking an increasingly wider view of its role among the free nations of Asia. Again, it would be wrong to suppose that the Jakarta Conference will necessarily be the ultimate vehicle for mutual cooperation. What impressed us in America was the spirit of the Conference, and Japan's role in participating in it. In the past some have felt that Japan was willing to let others share the burden; but more and more we notice signs of Japan's leadership, and we welcome that development.

Indeed, it appears that Japan's new spirit of leadership, and the new feeling of cooperation throughout Southeast Asia, is backed up by an increasing economic base. Japan's economy is now third in the free world. It must now be counted among the most developed nations of the world. Free China has enjoyed a truly amazing economic and social development. South Korea is enjoying a new prosperity, despite a new war having ravaged its territory. Indeed all the free nations of the region see new opportunity ahead. The potential that this opportunity presents is even greater when we think of the multiplying effect of a spirit of mutual cooperation and trust.

This fact in itself shows the superiority of the free system. The greatest progress in Asia has come to those nations which have chosen free economic systems, and which have allowed the creative force of individual enterprise come into play. The Communists believe that private property must be abolished, and that private freedom must be stamped out. They are willing to destroy, plunder, enslave, and murder in order to impose their form of society. Once in power, they believe that only rigid central direction and control can keep the economy going.

Yet the free system has not only proved to be more progressive; it has also shown that it allows greater development of the individual human personality. The free system preserves the virtues of the family, and the great religious traditions of the people. It fosters individual thought and ingenuity. It provides the freedom of choice in everyday life that befits the dignity of the human person.

The Communists cannot allow the free system to develop and prosper alongside of the failures of Communism. The ultimate

goal of the Communists is to dominate the world.

For this reason, the Communists have continually built up an aggressive military machine to support their conquests. After World War II, the United States quickly demobilized its troops and abandoned its military equipment; the Soviet Union did just the opposite and kept its army mobilized. The United States offered to share its atomic secrets with the world, provided no nations were allowed to develop arms in secrecy; the Soviet Union turned down the offer. After the signing of the cease fire, the United States worked to rebuild the occupied nations in freedom; the Soviet Union to this day still occupies East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia and keeps an iron hand on the other nations of the Warsaw Pact.

Red China also maintains its military apparatus, but at the present time the main threat is the Soviet Union. We must not suppose that the free nations of Asia are exempt from Soviet intentions. As South Vietnam knows so well, only the Soviet Union is capable of supplying revolutionaries with the quantity and quality of weapons for the conduct of conventional warfare today. There is nothing that the Soviet Union fears more than independent and free nations, capable of defending themselves against aggression.

For we must not imagine that economic and social progress in Free Asia can continue, right in the very face of Communism, without bringing on the jealous aggressive reaction of the Soviet Union. If free societies are to continue to prosper in peace, then the nations which enjoy such prosperity must be willing to defend their people.

As the economic giant among the nations of Free Asia, Japan must be willing to undertake a greater proportion of the leadership necessary to the defense of the region. But above all, there must be a greater mutuality and cooperation in all these defense matters. Japan cannot sit much longer under the umbrella of U.S. protection, without becoming more involved in the area defense. For one thing, of all the Free Asian nations, only Japan has the technological capacity and the capital to produce the defense materials needed. Through mutual planning, this production can be distributed and integrated into appropriate Asian countries with mutual economic benefits and development. The United States can continue to provide assistance and advice, but, in the long run, only a defense effort that grows out of local capacities and local willingness to sacrifice will provide a sound base of defense.

We are now in a different era than we were after World War II. The nations of Asia are in a more advanced stage of development and economic maturity. The attitudes of the former era are no longer appropriate. Japan is presently spending only less than one percent of its gross national product on self defense. But Japan's economic development cannot continue unless its free neighbors share in the development, support it, and in turn are supported in the defense of the common interest. The main thrust of Soviet policy today in Asia is not to dominate Japan immediately, but at first to neutralize Japan, and gradually to make her technology and economy dependent on the Soviet market and economic system. If such were to happen, Japan would become another Finland—courageous, but unable on a practical level to resist Soviet demands. This will never happen if the countries of this region continue to expand their mutual cooperation.

As for the United States, we pledge that we will hold to all of our commitments. When President Nixon came into office, it might have been politically expedient for him to liquidate the mistakes of the previous Administration, and forget about freedom in Asia. He did not do so. Instead, he enunciated the Guam Doctrine, which not only strengthens those commitments, but places greater trust in the capacities and growth of our allies. The three main points of the Guam Doctrine are as follows:

1. The United States will keep all its treaty commitments.

2. The United States will provide a nuclear shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us, or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security and the security of the region as a whole.

3. The United States, in cases involving other types of aggression, will furnish military and economic assistance when requested and as appropriate. But while the United States stands ready to provide this assistance, we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense.

We will keep those commitments. But those commitments will be more valuable if the nations of Free Asia form a permanent organization, perhaps growing out of the Jakarta Conference, or out of some similar cooperative arrangement.

Therefore, I say to Japan that many of us in the U.S. Senate will look kindly upon Japan's leadership efforts in the field of mutual defense. Such efforts will be not only reassuring to those of us in the Senate; they will increase Japan's reputation and promote better relations among her neighbors. Mutual defense arrangements and interdependent efforts will not be misunderstood by those who are fearful of the growth of excessive nationalism.

To Korea, I say that we are well aware of the peril which Korea faces to the north, and we will give the Communist regime of Kim Il Sung no reason to suspect that the time is ripe for adventures. I believe that any troop withdrawal from Korea must be carefully phased with stepped-up training of South Korean forces and increased assistance. The Nixon Doctrine has worked well in South Vietnam, and it can work as well in Korea. We know that the Koreans are men of strength and are dedicated to their country. But I have voiced strong reservations about a too-hasty program of withdrawal.

It is unfortunate that previous U.S. Presidents did not begin to place greater reliance on the Korean troops at an earlier date; but that is no reason to make a quick withdrawal now. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I shall continue to urge the President to consider carefully the present state of the Korean armed forces. I note with satisfaction that, within recent weeks, a new squadron of F-4 fighter planes has been sent to Korea, and I hope that this is a token of things to come.

To Free China, I say that not all of the U.S. Senators take the attitude that meaningful military assistance should be denied. China is a tremendous example to the world of the value of freedom as against Communism. It also lies in a strategic military position. I believe that China needs up-to-date military equipment and training in the latest machines, arms and technology. The spirit of the Chinese army is second to none, but I think it is a scandal that some forces in my country have worked to deny even token numbers of the proper kinds of equipment. Perhaps an Asian defense organization would provide a more politically viable framework for the support of Free China's forces.

I also believe that the members of our State Department who are working for improving relations with the Peiping regime are wasting their time. No small accommodations with the Communists will satisfy them as long as other nations remain free. It is freedom which rankles Communists most of all.

To Indonesia, I say that the United States appreciates the initiative which has been taken toward cooperation. We recognize your neutrality, but you are one of the first nations to realize that it is impossible to be neutral and pro-Communist at the same time. Nevertheless, in the long run Communism will not cease to threaten you, and your wisest course will be to join in the area defense.

To Cambodia, I say that the survival of your country is of great importance to the cause of freedom everywhere. It took great courage to throw off the Communist noose, just as it was descending upon your neck. The U.S. Vice President was correct when he said that the survival of your country was of great tactical importance to the struggle in Vietnam. You have shown the way to decisive action and cooperation in Free Asia, and it is now up to the other Free Asian nations in Free Asia, and it is now up to the other Free Asian nations to support your example.

Finally, to Vietnam, I say that the past year has been of immense significance in your struggle. I urge you to hold on for victory so that the struggle will not have been in vain. Vietnam has been a testing ground not only for your people, but for the whole world.

Ladies and Gentlemen, the struggle against Communism is a struggle which intimately involves all free nations. No part of freedom can be diminished without bringing tyranny that much closer to the rest of us. The forces of anti-Communism must remain resolute, even in the face of internal, as well as external subversion. It is significant that no nation in history has ever freely chosen a Communist government. Let us work together, then, so that our freedom is not undermined by complacence and inaction.

There are times when the future looks dark and uncertain. But, as the past year has shown, in such times, one nation, with right on its side, can constitute a majority. If the people of a nation have the courage and the fortitude to stand up for what they believe in, this alone can often turn the tide. Many nations are struggling today, but struggling people often develop a religious attitude—an attitude which is of great assistance to them in fighting a Godless and atheistic materialism.

The Free World, therefore, must stand together in this struggle. We must do what we can to encourage those nations in Eastern Europe, enslaved by Communism, to resist that tyranny. Nor must we forget the millions behind the bamboo curtain, trapped by an illegal regime which has set out to destroy an ancient culture and an ancient society. Before Communism can be destroyed, we must have the will to destroy Communism. We must never accommodate ourselves to ruthless imperialism dedicated to our own destruction. Free men must have the will to be free.

With mutual trust and cooperation, a realization of our obligations to each other, and a will to be free, Communism can and will be defeated. The victory will not come easy, but the benefits of a free society makes the battle worthwhile. Let us pledge today to stand united in this common struggle and resolve to continue the fight until the goal of a truly free world becomes a reality.

THE PHILADELPHIA NAVAL SHIPYARD IS PROPERLY HONORED

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Committee, in its recent

report on defense funds for fiscal year 1971, noted:

What this country needs is more defense for the dollar, not necessarily more dollars for defense.

This comment parallels longstanding Department of Defense concern over the need for efficiency and quality in military-industrial establishments.

The "zero defects" program, instituted several years ago by the Department of Defense, aims toward increasing quality consciousness, preventing defects, and eliminating the necessity for expensive correction of errors in defense facilities. In recognition of the importance to our national security of a superior naval fleet and an efficient shipbuilding industry to maintain such a fleet, the Naval Ships Systems Command established in 1969 a special program of awards for naval shipyards which effectively implement and sustain a zero defects program.

In March of this year, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard became the first of the Navy's 10 construction facilities to receive the zero defects Participation Award. To win the award, the shipyard's zero defects—ZD—program had to show evidence of active support and participation by employees as well as management in encouraging superior performance in the construction and repair of U.S. naval vessels.

Might I mention in passing, Mr. Speaker, that the ZD program at the naval facilities at Philadelphia had been revitalized in June of 1969 with the appointment of Mr. William M. Lewis as its first full-time administrator, the official primarily responsible for maintaining a high level of efficiency at the Navy's main east coast construction yard.

The effectiveness of the ZD approach at the Philadelphia yard was demonstrated by work performed on the U.S.S. *Sumter*. Subsequent work undertaken there maintained the high performance record necessary for receipt of the ZD award.

What benefits have accrued to the Philadelphia Naval Yard as a result of the Navy's recognition of its excellent work? To the individual worker, the chief benefit is pride in his own craftsmanship, but beyond that, pride in contributing to American naval preparedness. In a monthly pamphlet published by the ZD administration at Philadelphia, the shipyard commander described the basis of the pride to which I have just referred:

The civilian employees of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard are an important part of both the United States Navy and the nation's defense effort. You are part of the team with the man on the far-off beachhead, in a swampy jungle entanglement or guarding our most distant frontiers on the seas, in the air, or under the sea. The effectiveness of our forces in deterring aggression, the mobility of our defenses, the range of our protective air cover, the quality of our sea-going weapons systems are in direct proportion to the quality and quantity of the work of each of us and our fellow employees.

In a time when maintaining U.S. naval power allows no room for anything short of excellence in shipbuilding and repair, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard stands out as a leader in making the most timely and effective use of each defense dollar.

THE 91ST CONGRESS HAS PROUD RECORD

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has adjourned for election recess, and Members can go to their constituents with a proud record of achievements. There is still much work for the 91st Congress to do, but I confidently predict that on its return after the elections the record will be completed to mark this as one of the busiest and most productive sessions of Congress.

This record is more remarkable because of the uncooperative and politically motivated actions of the administration, whose credo in its relations with the Congress has been "politics first." Despite this, the Congress has taken the initiative in practically every instance of meaningful legislation.

When this Congress convened in 1969, the leadership recognized that the combination of a democratically controlled Congress and a new Republican administration would create a climate of intense political emphasis. To minimize this emphasis, the Democratic leadership of the 91st Congress decided at the outset to cooperate with the new administration when it felt the administration was right, oppose it when it was wrong, and seek compromise when there were differences. We found the cooperative spirit a one-sided condition. The White House has repeatedly sought partisan advantage, as exemplified by the televised veto of the first education appropriation.

The White House yardstick of approval or disapproval of legislation has been one of partisanship. The White House has been used as a partisan forum for intemperate attacks on the Congress, including regular forays by the Republican congressional leadership which, surprisingly, acted as the conveyor of the administration's opposition to measures initiated by the Congress—although that same Republican leadership most often reflected its true position by supporting much of that same legislation when it came to a vote.

The President's highly publicized vetoes of education, health, housing, veterans, and other measures can now be seen in their true political light. There were unfounded and politically motivated charges of excessive "congressional spending," as early as last year and the numerous Madison Avenue experts at the White House are clearly seeking to make this a national issue in the current campaign. Strangely, administration economists who a year ago were adamant in their insistence on a budget surplus today agree that a deficit in the Republican recession is not so bad. And well they might, since the first two fiscal years of this administration are shaping up as two of the largest successive deficit years in history, due principally to the administration's misguided economic policies. Estimates from respected sources now place the unified budget deficit for fiscal 1971 at $13 to $20 billion, coming on top of a $3 billion deficit for fiscal 1970. Put in real terms of the administrative budget, that is exclusive of the trust funds, this means a $13 billion deficit in fiscal 1970 and a real deficit of more than $20 billion in fiscal 1971 unless the policies of the administration are changed and the economy recovers from this current recession.

The condition of the economy, as reflected in the deficits and the lack of growth, is much more serious than the administration will admit. In fact, their continuing propaganda efforts are designed to downplay the seriousness of unemployment, which is now running at an excessive rate. The administration's tight money policy, which enriches only big banks and financial institutions at the cost of declining business in general, has brought on a recession characterized by a business slump, declining productivity, and ever-increasing joblessness.

Under these circumstances, the Congress has acted responsibly by trimming an expected $7 billion from the President's budget, allocating funds to high priority items, and voting the President standby authority to control wages and prices—an authority which has regrettably refused to use to combat runaway inflation.

This Congress has been one of the most productive in history in the field of anticrime legislation. The House has passed 14 anticrime measures including the Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act amendments, the most meaningful anticrime effort of the session. The bill provides direct assistance to the frontline fighters of crime—local police and courts. The bill provided $650 million for this purpose, far more than the administration's request of $480 million. A series of drug abuse and drug control acts, control of explosives and a comprehensive measure to control organized crime were also the product of congressional initiative.

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, yesterday's announcement of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Canada and the People's Republic of China was welcome news. While no one can foretell all the ramifications of such a step, I believe they will generally be positive and serve the cause of world peace.

The government of Prime Minister Trudeau is to be commended for formally recognizing China and helping to normalize that country's relations with the rest of the world. It is another step away from the earlier view of so much of the Western World that China with its 800 million people somehow should either be ignored altogether or reshaped in our own image: It is a step toward the pragmatic position that our task is rather to do those things that will encourage

China to behave as a responsible member of the world community of nations.

In dealing with nuclear powers in particular it is in the interest of all of us that as many avenues as possible be open for communications.

For these reasons and others I see this important initiative by the Canadian Government as perhaps a forerunner of things to come. Just as Great Britain and France have on occasion shown the way in dealing with difficult international problems in the Near East and Africa so may have Canada in artfully achieving this diplomatic arrangement in Asia.

Progress in international relations does not often come in leaps and bounds. The best we can usually hope for are measured steps, and we commonly must settle for merely halting ones. In this light Canadian independence in foreign policy is to be welcomed and not decried. Yet I do not underestimate the differences in the complexity of the problem of recognition of China for the United States as opposed to Canada.

We have as a nation a long and unbroken history—at least since the end of World War II—of unfaltering support of Nationalist China matched by equally unfaltering opposition to the government of mainland China. Furthermore we have solemn treaty and other formal obligations with the Taiwan Government which evolved out of—and at the same time reinforced—this special relationship. In addition we have to consider the sensitivity of the Soviet Union and others to present and possible future initiatives of the United States with respect to the People's Republic of China.

Still I feel we are making some progress ourselves toward reducing China's isolation by demonstrating more and more explicitly our willingness to improve United States-Chinese relationships. The efforts of the present administration—particularly those of Secretary of State William P. Rogers—are especially to be applauded. Last year Secretary Rogers speaking in New York placed the issue in good perspective when he said:

> The United States Government understands well that the Republic of China on the Island of Taiwan and Communist China on the mainland are both facts of life. We know that by virtue of its size, population and the talents of its people mainland China is bound to play an important role in East Asian and Pacific affairs.

Concrete actions followed. The reopening of our Warsaw meetings with the Chinese; the offer of exchange visits of educators and scientists and the validation of more than 300 passports of U.S. citizens seeking to travel to China; the removal of ceilings on the value of Chinese goods that can be brought into the United States by tourists; the offer to settle outstanding postal and telecommunication accounts; and the encouragement of trade in nonstrategic goods and certain pharmaceuticals all are hopeful steps in the right direction.

I would like to see the day when Sino-American relations had progressed to the point where something like my bill S. 3127 which passed the Senate last spring and provided for the exchange of visits of public officials in the United States and the U.S.S.R. might be extended to United States-China visits.

This type of thing may well be a long time in coming, but it is more likely because of the praiseworthy action of the Canadian Government yesterday. It is fervently to be hoped that we have passed the era of confrontation and have entered a period of negotiation with the major powers of the Communist world. I believe this is the backdrop against which we should commend Canada's initiative.

DANTE B. FASCELL, RECIPIENT OF 1970 LEGISLATIVE AWARD OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, 1970, the Association of Federal Investigators will award my close friend and colleague, DANTE B. FASCELL of Florida, its legislative award for 1970.

For the past year DANTE B. FASCELL has led a comprehensive inquiry into the adequacy of Federal investigative training programs. The House Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, recently issued a report based on the hearings and investigations of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee which DANTE chairs. The report titled "Unmet Training Needs of the Federal Investigator and the Consolidated Federal Law Enforcement Training Center" (H.R. 91-1429) recommended fundamental changes in Federal investigative training programs. This report portends great benefits to the taxpaying public as a result of an improved Federal investigative force and through its recommendations will provide the basis for future recognition of investigators as a new profession.

In addition, over the past few years DANTE FASCELL has been one of the more articulate and forceful proponents of a better coordinated effort against organized crime.

For these reasons I am particularly pleased to see him receive this recognition from the Association of Federal Investigators and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following article from the Federal Times of October 7, 1970, with my colleagues in Congress:

FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS MAKE AWARDS

WASHINGTON.—Six men and two organizations have been singled out for this year's fifth annual Association of Federal Investigators Awards scheduled for Oct. 17 at the Crystal Room of the Officers Club at the Washington, D.C. Navy Yard.

Recipients include:

Attorney General John N. Mitchell who will receive the association's legal award. Mitchell was praised for having made a determined effort to improve the efficiency of the federal drive against organized crime. His willingness to use all legal means in investigating and combating crime, including wiretapping, says AFI, is refreshing to all investigative and enforcement personnel.

Rep. Dante Fascell, D-Fla., who receives the legislative award. As chairman of the House subcommittee on legal and monetary affairs, Fascell has been instrumental in making the first comprehensive study of the need for federal investigators' training. This study was followed by hearings by the Government Operations Committee—and ultimately resulted in a report "Unmet Training Needs of the Federal Investigator and the Consolidated Federal Law Enforcement Training Center."

Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson, of Washington, D.C., receives the enforcement award. Wilson has been lauded for employing crowd-control methods that keep mass demonstrations from turning into ugly rampages. During a recent briefing of police forces around the country, the Justice Department distributed a detailed description of Wilson's "model" methods.

Judge Edward A. Tamm, circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, will receive the judiciary award. Judge Tamm was cited for distinguished service as a member of Appeals Court and for having won the respect and admiration of his colleagues. Judge Tamm compiled an outstanding record as a special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation prior to his appointment by President to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia. He was appointed to the Court of Appeals by President Johnson on Feb. 28, 1965.

John V. Moran, president of the Association of Federal Investigators, will receive the association's leadership award for "clearly demonstrating the leadership qualities that have revitalized AFI." He was lauded for "his enthusiastic visits to local chapters and his skill in presenting AFI's position before congressional committees and willingness to work with other professional associations to upgrade the status of the federal investigator." He also was hailed for his personal recruitment effort.

Louis T. Williams, special assistant to the President, receives the educational award—and has been hailed as a pioneer in AFI's efforts to promote education, training and career development for the federal investigator. Williams was instrumental in initiating and implementing a series of roundtable discussions for bettering the proficiency of federal investigator—and participated in the planning and programming of AFI's initial efforts to sponsor such seminars.

The AFI Public Service Award for 1970 will go to the Federal Times. The publication's "fair, accurate analysis in presenting of information on federal programs, policies and procedures including legislation," said AFI "has been of substantial benefit to every member in the federal government."

The St. Louis Chapter of AFI will receive the first annual chapter award ever presented at an AFI annual awards dinner.

DIRECTOR, CAB OFFICE OF INFORMATION, JACK YOHE, ADDRESSES 15TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AIRLINE EDITORS CONFERENCE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a meeting of editors of airline publications in Miami caught my attention last week, largely because of the remarks of one of the speakers who addressed that group.

To my mind, the remarks delivered by Mr. Jack Yohe, Director of the Office of Information of the Civil Aeronautics Board, conveyed two important ideas.

One is the scope and depth of the considerations which the Board must take

into account in its handling of air transportation matters in the public interest. The other is the solidly constructive outlook expressed by Mr. Yohe in the way his office deals with the public's right to know about their Government's activities.

I was particularly impressed with the latter, since I have known Mr. Yohe for many years and know him to be one of our outstanding civil servants. His dedication to the principle of freedom of information is known to all of us and I call the attention of my colleagues to his remarks at the meeting:

REMARKS OF JACK YOHE

Conference Chairman Martha Bagby, airline editors—I think my 20 years of newspapering and eight years as CAB information chief allow me to call you my fellow-editors—and friends; I am sincerely delighted to be with you for this meeting. Thank you for having me.

Putting first things first, let me point out, if you don't already know it, that your conference chairman, Mrs. Bagby, besides being a sharp and able editor of National's *National Reporter*, is also an extremely capable organizer.

I understand that she has been a prime mover in setting up and running this conference and she deserves our heartiest thanks.

It is also good to know there are editors of at least half a dozen foreign international airline publications attending. Your presence here can only broaden and deepen the purpose of this conference. To the welcomes I'm sure you've already been given, let me add my own.

I've been looking forward to being with you at this meeting ever since Chapin Leinback invited me in July.

I've known many of you professionally and personally for a number of years, and I think, on the whole, we have communicated well.

People work best together when they communicate well. That applies both to regulatory agencies and the industries they regulate.

And, because the CAB is charged with promoting as well as regulating air commerce, communication takes on added importance.

When you fail to keep in touch, things can get so out-of-proportion that after a while you have difficulty remembering your common ground and mutual goals.

By way of example, there were these two brothers who were especially close in childhood. But, on reaching adolescence, they went their separate ways. One ran away from home and enlisted in the Navy. The other turned to the cloth.

Neither saw or heard of the other for 30 years. Then, one cold and snowy night, chance found them sharing a waiting platform outside a railroad station.

The Navy man, now an Admiral, was in his dress uniform, aglitter with gold braid. The cleric, now an archbishop, was in his red-trimmed cassock.

Over the years, both men had added considerable weight and girth. And neither recognized the other.

Both paced the platform impatiently. Finally, the archbishop accosted the uniformed admiral and demanded, "I say, Porter, how much longer must I wait for this train?"

And the admiral, looking over the portly stranger's flowing robes, replied, "It's 40 minutes late, Madam . . . But I think that a woman in your condition wouldn't even venture out on a night like this."

There are a number of important matters in various stages of development before the CAB at any given time. In its promotional-regulatory role, the agency both reflects and helps to see the tone of the industry. And I need not tell any of you here that air transportation's great challenges and promises and rewards have made it one of the most exhilarating developments in man's history.

One group or another of you will be interested in several matters before the Board at any given time and, of course, clear communication is vital, especially so in the changing times in which we find ourselves.

The Board and its staff need to communicate individually and collectively with the members of the industry family. And the "family" needs to communicate with us.

Since he assumed the chairmanship of the CAB—which, incidentally, was exactly a year ago today—Secor D. Browne has given the highest priority to clear and frequent communications.

Indeed, to familiarize himself at first hand with industry problems, he has made first-hand visits to virtually all carriers at their home offices. He has kept in close contact with all segments of the industry, the financial community, consumer representatives and labor.

For the Board's first duty is to the public, and in serving the public we have the obligation to be open and candid—it is of the utmost importance to the public and to the Board to keep all channels open at all times. The only caveat is that, as a quasi-judicial agency, the Board must protect the integrity of the decisional process, just as the Board cannot allow outside or one-sided presentations to influence its decisions before they are made, so we obviously cannot reveal case decisions before they are issued.

The CAB, like any other agency of government at any level, needs to be able, in the public interest, to account for itself clearly whenever called upon. This does not mean irresponsible handling of proprietary carrier matters but open frankness in response to sincere quests for information about its regulatory role and actions.

Some of the more pleasant memories and feelings of accomplishment of my newspaper days were those spent in trying to turn reticent city halls, county row offices and state legislature cliques into goldfish bowls.

When I entered Government service—which, incidentally, I respect and esteem as one of the finest public service callings a man can answer—my philosophy about the public's right to know was reinforced.

I believe that we in the United States Federa Government are accountable to over 200 million "stockholders" and we must be able to report to them at a moment's notice. We have the same responsibility to the people who make the industry we regulate, the people for whom you write and edit your publications, from floor sweeper to president.

That is the basis on which we run the CAB Office of Information. Clear channels of communication mean accessibility. And accessibility means that we are or should be as near as your telephone, and never mind business hours.

Somewhere along the line someone suggested I give some time to the topic of "How to interpret CAB activities."

I'm afraid I must disappoint. There is no special formula for interpreting Board activities and the reason is that none is needed.

The best way, indeed the only way, to understand the work and aims of the CAB is to stay on top of the particular cases and developments you are interested in and to read studiously the decisions and opinions as they are issued. In short, maintain your lines of communication with us. You can be sure that we will do our part.

The beginning and ending of any major action, and any significant development between, is accompanied by a press release that attempts to distill the essence of the action. Press releases and speeches by Board Members are distributed free to subscribers for those services. So are the orders and opinions with which they deal and for which we receive specific requests.

These are times of great changes in the air transportation industry and we must all be aware of their significance.

The CAB recognizes and has committed itself to dealing with change—directly, thoroughly, promptly. More than ever, it will be the place where things are happening, the place to watch.

Some of the industry changes and happenings are important enough to affect commercial air transportation for years to come.

The Domestic Passenger Fare Investigation now going on is one of these. The capacity agreement recently put before the Board by three trunkline carriers is another. Certain kinds of intermodal acquisitions, the class rate subsidy formula, the growth of commuter air line service, and charter regulation amendments are a few more.

Hijacking, of course, affects everything we do and the cure of this epidemic will require bold and decisive moves. Reassuringly, they have already begun to be made, both in the area of aviation security and at the diplomatic level.

An air traffic control system able to continue to fill today's needs and to stay abreast, if not ahead, of the growth of air traffic as it reaches toward tomorrow is another compelling matter.

And speaking of tomorrow, the Board is grasping Time by the forelock in its scrutiny of certain cases.

The current investigation of the Local Service class subsidy rate deals with a present situation but is forward-looking as well.

The Board has conscientiously worked to lower the amount of Federal subsidy to air carriers and has succeeded in having reduced by half the $70 million paid out seven years ago largely by strengthening the route structures of the Locals.

While that was happening, however, obsolescence was taking a silent toll.

As the local carriers replaced their old piston aircraft with larger, more expensive jet equipment, the cost of money rose. So did wage costs. And then the rate of traffic growth slowed. The Board's route strengthening program has therefore not yet produced all the benefit expected of it. And the subsidy need increased instead of decreasing, as had been hoped.

In addition to the approximately $30 million it requested for the current fiscal year for Federal subsidy to air carriers, the Board recently informed Congress that the local service carriers will need an additional $28 million, or a total of $58 million if they are to provide the same level of service. The matter is presently before Congress.

If this is important to the local service people among you here today and to your companies' shareowners, it is even more important to the general public. Your carriers' economic health translates directly into service of the public convenience and necessity at smaller urban areas and into convenient connections between smaller urban areas and our large metropolitan centers.

In a July 31 order, the CAB reopened the existing Class IV–B Subsidy rate and instituted an investigation to determine a new final rate—Class Rate V—by which, the amount of subsidy paid to a carrier should be tied more closely to the service they provide to smaller, lower-traffic communities. As we are aware there has been a trend away from service to less-dense traffic areas.

However, in many of these areas, air taxis or commuter airlines have filled the service breach, easing the certificated carrier's subsidy woes and providing, under the conditions of the substitution, service at least equal to the service the community had known before.

As people responsible for your own carriers' internal communications, you needn't be reminded that the current economic plight of the local service industry and its individual carriers is not theirs exclusively, or that the industry in general has known better financial days than it is experiencing right now.

But I am certain that you are also confident that the industry has not yet seen its

best days. Both industry and government sources forecast a doubling of the 1969 domestic airline passenger traffic by 1975—and a tripling, or better, by 1980. And those predictions are based on a considerably slower growth rate for air travel than the industry has known for the past 30 years.

Commercial air traffic and aircraft manufacture have grown side by side and each has spurred the other during the past 30 years. In the mid-thirties, travelers wanted to fly the fast, new 21-seat DC–3 because, among other things, it was there, and it was a tremendous advance.

Today, much the same reasoning prompts some of our preference for the 747. Tomorrow, the same motivation will put us aboard the SST.

New design and capacity in aircraft have always met a present or anticipated need. And the response to them, in turn, has signaled a need for more aircraft pioneering.

Probably none of that would be true without a system of air routes to give order and purpose to our air transportation system.

Aircraft manufacturers and the public made the first two factors possible.

The CAB and its regulatory predecessors have been responsible for the development of the air route system.

There are some who feel that the domestic air route system in recent years has been "developed" more than was needed, that new route awards have authorized excessive competition in some markets and that this is a factor in the present economic state in which a number of carriers find themselves.

But if we examine this at closer range, we find that the markets having the greatest overcapacity—load factors in the low 40-percent area, for example—are primarily grandfather routes; the routes which were in existence and which the CAB certificated when it came into existence 32 years ago; or routes that were awarded in the 1940s or 1950s—not in the last few years.

These include the routes linking, on the one hand, such cities as Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Washington/Baltimore, and, on the other hand, Los Angeles and San Francisco. The Chicago pairings with east and west coast points also are among the grandfather certifications—although in each case the Board ordered an additional carrier in the 1950s.

The yield in a market like New York-Los Angeles—a 2,400 mile grandfather route (1929–AA, TWA and UAL)—I believe, approaches 5 cents per revenue passenger mile, with the break-even load factor around 40 percent.

By contrast, the 1,600-mile New York-San Juan market, to use an example of routes which the Board has significantly amended over the years, the yield approximates 4 cents, the break-even load factor about 55 percent.

In the current cost-watching climate, the carriers, it must be said, have taken various measures to effect economies. One of these has attracted considerable attention and interest.

Three trunkline competitors—American, TWA and United—have filed an agreement with the Board which would limit capacity in 15 long-haul markets. Its filing has raised some controversial issues and widespread interest and has generated considerable comment, pro and con, and it is currently under consideration by the Board.

In the matter of grants of route authority, it should be noted that in the last 12 to 15 months there have been virtually no major new route awards by the CAB. Those that were made recently are the results of cases that were started several years earlier in a different economic climate. So that this period has been one of "digestion" of earlier awards, particularly among the trunk lines.

There have been expansions of local service authority but in terms of diversion from the trunks this impact is relatively small.

The basic current problem with the airline industry, in other words, is a reflection of the problem with the general economy—higher costs and a reduced rate of growth for traffic and therefore revenues. Also, significant but special additional costs have been experienced by reason of air traffic control delays.

Were we to graph the Gross National Product against air traffic, we would find that traffic lags behind the GNP movement. Moreover, there is a certain leverage in the relationship. A relatively small variation in the GNP is amplified in terms of air travel.

Non-business travel is normally first to be affected. In recent months, however, business travel appears to have been curtailed also.

The slowdown will have been a brake against inflation. When the economy catches up to its full potential, another expansion of income can be expected. And air transportation historically has boomed when incomes rise.

In the meantime, however, there are airline industry economic ills that need attention. Two fare increases within the past year have been something less than a panacea. Actually, the "real fares"—the fare divided by the consumer price index—didn't rise at all in 1969 but leveled out.

One of the biggest undertakings in the history of the CAB is now dealing with fares, their level and structure in the scheduled services of the domestic trunks and local service carriers.

Unlike the General Passenger Fare Investigation decided in 1961 after four years of proceedings, the current Domestic Passenger Fare Investigation is deeper and farther-ranging.

Rulemakings will cover aircraft depreciation, leased aircraft and treatment of deferred Federal Income Taxes. The hearing phases cover joint fares, discount fares, load factor and seating configuration, fare level, rate of return, and fare structure.

In the earlier case, fare structure, joint fares, and discount fares were not a specific issue. The 1961 case record did not permit the establishment of load factor standards. The rate of return, which most carriers have never attained since it was set in the earlier case, is getting a fresh look in the current proceeding.

In the earlier case, several interim increases were needed before the four-year investigation was concluded. The Board has assigned manpower to the current case on an unprecedented scale so that the case can be concluded while the application of its conclusions are still current.

Of course, important as the scheduled service is, it is not the whole of this great industry. Charter travel has grown in importance in the overall industry picture.

Because of increasingly attractive air travel price tags, particularly over the North Atlantic, vacationers in recent years have changed their vacation plans. Many, who were formerly content to spend two weeks at the seashore or in the mountains within three hours' ride from home, are now visiting European points of interest.

This is a trend the Board encourages and favors. However, low-cost group transportation on charter planes is permitted only in accordance with certain rules of the Board which are designed to maintain the distinction between charter travel and individually-ticketed scheduled services.

Up to the discussion of charters, all my remarks were directed to the Board's and the industry's domestic concerns. But the CAB's responsibilities and field of interest are world-wide.

For example, 21 U.S. carriers currently provide scheduled services to some 119 foreign countries and territories. And, nearly 150 foreign airlines, representing more than 50 countries, operate air services to the United States.

Most of the authority for U.S. carrier international operations comes through bilateral agreements negotiated by the State Department with advice and consultation provided by the CAB.

The United States is a party to 70 such agreements. Because of their complexity and number, they require frequent and consistent maintenance meetings and negotiations between the countries involved. As aircraft grow in capacity and range and as international travel increases, the number of such meetings and discussions grows.

During fiscal 1970 the United States held 29 such consultations and negotiations with foreign governments. Even more are expected during the current fiscal year.

I hope I have given you some idea of both the quality and the quantity of work of the Civil Aeronautics Board. If your problems in this dynamic industry are great and many, so are ours, because the Board both mirrors and tries to anticipate the needs of the industry in its regulatory and promotional mission. Sound and lasting solutions to your problems are a product, at least in part, of your inputs—the clarity with which you communicate your needs to us.

I am reminded of a thought which Member Robert Murphy once left with an audience, which I believe is no less apt before this group, and which I will attempt to paraphrase to the best of my recollection:

Now abideth Faith, Hope and Charity, these three. Faith in ourselves as editors and in our respective managements; Hope in the future of our great industry; and Charity for the CAB and other Government agencies in our efforts to promote the greatest good in the public interest.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DOS PASSOS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Richmond News Leader and other newspapers of Wednesday, October 7, contained a column by William F. Buckley, Jr., paying tribute to the eminent writer John Dos Passos.

Mr. Dos Passos lived for many years in Virginia. While I did not know him well, I had the privilege of being with him on several occasions.

Mr. Dos Passos was a kind and gentle man, one for whom I had great admiration.

I ask unanimous consent that the column by William F. Buckley, Jr., published in the Richmond News Leader, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT MAN WHO TRIED EXPLAINING AMERICA TO THE WORLD

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—I have come back from the funeral of John Dos Passos. It was in a way typical of him to die a few minutes after Nasser, who, of course, swamped the obituary headlines, so much so that Dos Passos's own young stepson, away at law school, who reads the papers lackadaisically and listens not at all to the radio or TV, was not aware of the death until a few hours before the funeral, to which he hastened, registering the grief felt universally by everyone who had known Dos Passos, let alone been brought up by him. There was no way to keep his death off the front page (geniuses have a

pre-emptive right to die on the front page), but the reader felt that the editorial handling was somehow harassed. Nasser had died, and the chancelleries of the world were in turmoil, and the death of mere literary giants doesn't substantially occupy the front page (nor should it): front pages are correctly devoted to news of immediate and transitory significance. (Never mind that few people can now remember who reigned over England and Spain during the week that Shakespeare and Cervantes died.)

On the other hand, it is worth noting the Dos Passos did not suffer the pains that torture those artists who cry over the neglect of them by their contemporaries. The only reason why he did not treat the literary press with the total aloofness of, say, an Edmund Wilson, or a Charles Lindbergh, is that he was too good natured. He could not bring himself to say no to the tenacious literary reporter who wanted to interview him and write a profile of him.

Mr. Dan Wakefield, a most conscientious journalist and novelist, wrote a considerable profile of Dos Passos a few years ago, and I remember asking him what his opinion of it was, to which he replied with a shyness which neither he—nor David Garrick—could have feigned, that in fact he hadn't read it. "I find," he said, with a self-effacing giggle that his friends knew as his conversational signature, "that when I start reading those things"—by which he meant profiles of himself, or reviews of his books—"my eyes just dribble off the page, so I just don't look at them."

Did this mean that he had no self-esteem? No, that would be inaccurate. It means that he was a genuine artist, who did the very best he could every time he sat down to write a novel, or a book of history; but that since he had absolutely nothing to contribute to the improvement of a book after it was published, what was the point in reading reviews of his books? Or—for heaven's sakes—reviews of himself, as author of said books? "If I had to describe him in a single sentence," his next door neighbor told me after the funeral, "I would say that he was a modest man; the most modest man I ever met."

We are talking about someone who stupefied the literary generation of the 1920s. Critics as disparate as Jean Paul Sartre and Whittaker Chambers were to remark matter-of-factly that he was the greatest novelist in America. The formal tributes did not, all of them, come in. It was an open secret that he was scorned by the Nobel Prize committee because of his political sympathies. He began his career as an ardent sympathizer of left-wing political movements. After the Spanish Civil War, he identified the Communists as the great evildoers of his time, an insight that caused him to do that which pained him most, namely to break a friendship: in this case, with Ernest Hemingway. But he pursued his conviction, that man was best off untrammeled by political authority, and of course when he died, the obituarists merely repeated what had been said about him so often before, namely that his literary work was at the service of political reactionaries.

[Translation: JDP was a political conservative, and the rules of the game being that no one can simultaneously be a literary genius and a political conservative, you must draw your own conclusions about Dos Passos. In the event that you are slow at doing that kind of thing, here is the key: JDP was a genius during his left-wing period. After that, he was pedestrian, a time-server. Never mind the two dozen books he wrote, the extraordinary histories of Jefferson, of Brazil, of Portugal; the novel "Mid-Century." Forget them, if you can.]

The answer is that no one can forget Dos Passos, and the working press, somehow, sensed it. The reporters and the television people were at his funeral. I was accosted by one, who asked me to assess the literary work of JDP. I was at that moment in the company of John Chamberlain, whom William Lyon Phelps once called the principal literary critic of his generation, and to open my voice on Dos Passos in Chamberlain's presence would have been doubly to profane the situation inasmuch as what I wanted to say was simply that I would have been present, here at the Episcopal Church of Towson, Maryland, as sorrowfully if JDP had never written a word, because I knew him primarily as a friend; but if literary taxonomy was what the press wanted, why didn't they ask Chamberlain? The widow, firm, tall, beautiful, moved serenely through the vague confusion, the result of an uneasy apprehension that the death of this modest man who came closest to explaining America to the world, might just turn out to be a historical event the neglect of which would above all proclaim the philistinism of the country he loved so very much more than his literary detractors love it.

It was all so very hard to sort out, because the historical meaning of the occasion was clearly secondary to all who were there except the press. I traveled to Baltimore with an extraordinarily self-disciplined attorney (it was his 70th birthday) who had known JDP for 50 years, and on three occasions, my traveling companion had to turn away from a conversation, overcome by tears at the awful prospect of facing life without the friendship of John Dos Passos. If C. D. Batchelor were active, he'd have done a drawing of the Statute of Liberty weeping over this loss; this irreparable loss.

SECRETARY LAIRD SPEAKS BEFORE CHAMBER

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and pleased to have the opportunity to insert in the RECORD the fine speech which was delivered by the distinguished Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird in San Antonio, Tex., on October 9, at the Chamber of Commerce luncheon.

REMARKS OF HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

Mr. Mayor, Congressman Fisher, Commanding General, General Critz of the Fourth Army, General Simler, distinguished men in uniform who are guests of the luncheon committee this noon.

I first want to express to you my deep regret in having to cancel out on my originally scheduled appearance with your Military Affairs Committee. It was originally scheduled and then our Commander-in-Chief, President Nixon, had some other ideas about the Secretary of State and myself taking the trip with him to Europe, and for that reason the dinner was postponed until today.

And I apologize for the inconvenience to your committee and to all of you that had something to do with making those arrangements, I know how difficult it is to make those kinds of changes.

This is not my first visit to San Antonio. I have visited here before, but as a Member of Congress. I visited here on several occasions and have been a guest at each of the military installations along with the Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, George Mahon. The last visit as a Member of Congress was in 1967. And prior to that we had visited the installations along with Congressman Fisher in 1965 and before that with Congressman Shepherd of California, the Chairman of the Military Construction Committee, as we looked over some of the military construction requests.

For nine terms in the Congress I served on the Defense Appropriations Committee and on the Military Construction Committee, along with the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations subcommittee, and I know something about the development of the Army and the Air Force in this region, and the manner in which this community has opened their arms and has welcomed each succeeding group of enlisted men and officers that have been assigned to these important bases.

My visit to San Antonio is a most rewarding one for me because it is my first visit here as Secretary of Defense. I was invited to your Armed Forces Dinner and could not be present and my high school classmate and now the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Robert Froehlke, substituted for me at that time.

But I assured you at that time that I would come to San Antonio on my first opportunity.

This opportunity gives me the chance to inspect the pilot project of our program work with civilian health officials in applying the lessons we have learned in Vietnam, to the medical emergencies we face in the United States.

As you may know, the laregst killer in the United States of people of 37 years of age and under, the largest killer is highway accidents. That is why, as a Member of Congress, I urged that we seek means to delivery timely medical assistance to trauma victims on our highways.

I suggested then, while serving in the Legislative Branch of our government, that we expand the use of helicopters as an ambulance to reach accident scenes in the crucial early minutes following an accident, particularly when the site is located some distance from a hospital. When I became Secretary of Defense, I appointed a group to work with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a test program. This culminated in Project MAST, which was referred to in the introduction—Military Assistance for Safety in Traffic, and we initiated that program right here in San Antonio last July. Since then we have extended the test program to serve other areas throughout the United States, and, as of 11 o'clock this morning, October 8, 1970, the five MAST test sites throughout the United States have carried out a total of 93 missions, moved 139 patients and have 138 flying hours that have been utilized in this important program.

We have extended the test program to these five areas and we are going to continue it this year on a pilot basis. I look forward this afternoon to meeting with our helicopter rescue groups, most of whom have served in Vietnam, and to receive an updated report of the results of this test program which has looked so promising thus far.

Today we meet here at this luncheon at a time of momentous transition, momentous transition in foreign, in military, and in domestic policy as far as our country is concerned.

President Nixon has changed the course of our nation. Of many transitions now in process, the most basic and indeed the most important in my view, is the transition from war to peace. The Nixon Administration has been and remains committed to the goal of achieving a just peace in Vietnam.

We are also committed to ending American ground combat involvement in that war. The President's Vietnamization program instituted last year is both to complement and is an alternative to negotiations. Through Vietnamization, American military forces in Vietnam are steadily being reduced from the high point of authorized

strength of 549,500 troops at the time the President took office. The authorized strength has now been trimmed to 384,000, this troop ceiling that will be effected this week.

By next spring it will be down to 284,000, approximately half the size of the force built up in Vietnam at the time the President took office.

Yesterday, in Paris, Ambassador Bruce and Ambassador Habib laid on the negotiating table the historic proposals for peace which President Nixon outlined in his speech on Wednesday night. It is my fervent hope that the other side will eventually respond favorably to this new initiative for peace and will agree to a cease fire in the immediate release of all prisoners-of-war. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, many consequences flow from the transition from war to peace. The change in the nation's course resulted in a sharp decrease in American casualties. It has enabled us to reduce substantially the number of young men that we must take into military service by the draft, and it has permitted us to move forward towards a zero draft call and an all-volunteer force. This change in course has permitted us to have the lowest casualties at any time in the last four and a half years in Vietnam. This past week those casualties were 38. One casualty is too many, but when one stops to realize that the casualties in Vietnam were running at the rate of 300 a week when the President took office and the casualty rate this past week has been reduced to 38. I think this, in itself, is a substantial and an important change in direction as far as the responsibility of American troops——

[Applause.]

On the ground in Vietnam.

Our progress so far in the transition from war to peace in Southeast Asia and from the confrontation of the past to the negotiation of the future has enabled us to make significant reductions in defense spending. Our nation's economy is undergoing an important transition as we shift manpower and other productive resources from war to peace. This shift of resources makes it possible for the nation to devote its energies to the solution of many domestic problems.

In recent years the American people have demanded an intensified effort by government to cope with a number of the ills that trouble our society. I need not run through that agenda of major domestic tasks in which concern is growing.

It would include matters of higher priority, of course—the improvement of our educational system, stronger action to curb the pollution, raising the living standards of the poor, reduction of crime and violence, and the establishment of broader equal opportunities throughout the country. All of these tasks require spending money as part of the prescription for successful action. And in most cases, the amounts are considerable. Some have argued that the only way to get the money needed for the solution of our domestic problems is to take more away from the defense budget, and from national security spending.

It is plain distortion of fact to argue as some do that increased defense spending over the course of the past few years has gobbled up the major part of additional government outlays. Those who make this argument have not looked carefully at the budget as far as the public sector is concerned.

Even during the mid-1960s, when defense outlays were growing because of the increasing American involvement in Vietnam, public spending on non-defense purposes increased by nearly three times as much as the spending for defense. Nevertheless, we in the Defense Department, have not been insensitive to the strain on the taxpayer when both defense and non-defense spending are increasing. Easing that strain was one of the most compelling reasons for reducing the defense budget as soon as this could be done without exposing our nation to unwanted risks as far as its national security and safety were concerned.

Defense spending, ladies and gentlemen, has been cut significantly. Resources formerly channelled into war have been freed for the solution of domestic problems and for other peacetime purposes. And, we are today well along the path of the transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy.

The budget which President Nixon presented to the Congress last February marked an historic change in our national priority. In the current fiscal year, for the first time in 21 years, defense spending is no longer the biggest category of federal spending. This year, more of the Federal budget is devoted to human resource programs than to national security and to defense. The first time in 21 years.

This year for the first time in 21 years, defense spending is less than 40 per cent of the total Federal spending.

This year slightly more than $1 out of every 3 distributed by the Federal treasury is being spent for defense.

This year for the first time in over 20 years, defense expenditures are down to 7 per cent of the Gross National Product from the 9.6 per cent of the Gross National Product in 1968.

The reductions made in the defense budget largely were the results of the progress in Vietnamization in turning over the ground combat responsibilities and other responsibilities of the war in Southeast Asia to the military forces of South Vietnam.

As far as the war in Vietnam is concerned, as it decreased in intensity and as American participation declined as a result of the progress that we have made with this program, the impact of the war on our budget has lightened. The estimated full cost of the war in Vietnam was $29 billion in fiscal year 1969. It was decreased to about half of that cost in this fiscal year's budget, as we end fiscal year 1971.

While Defense spending in dollars in terms of constant purchasing power was reduced by more than $17 billion since 1968, spending for non-defense programs in constant dollars has increased by 18.4 billion dollars. Thus, the so-called peace dividend for the domestic sector has already resulted in reduced defense spending.

Reductions in military manpower make possible another transition, the transition to a zero draft and an all-volunteer military service.

We are moving towards a zero draft call, a goal that we hope can be achieved by 1973. Inductions in 1970 are at a new six-year low.

In addition to the personnel reductions within the Department of Defense, there have been concurrent reductions in defense-related industries throughout the nation. I realize, of course, that the shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy brings with it certain inevitable problems, and these problems are felt right here in San Antonio.

Let me tell you what we are giving high-priority to in this important change from a wartime to a peacetime economy. We are going to go forward and expand our program of helping the communities affected by defense reduction to meet these problems.

Within the Department of Defense I have assigned high priority to the job of our Office of Economic Adjustment, which is working with community leaders in many parts of the country to help them maximize the peacetime potential of both the human and the material resources formerly dedicated to defense uses.

We understand the problems involved, and we intend to do what we can to minimize the disruptions that stem from these reductions. The planned reductions and cutbacks in defense go as far as we can in the present world environment without exposing ourselves to imprudent risks.

The reduction of some two billions dollars made by the House of Representatives in the defense budget as submitted by the Administration, by action yesterday on the floor of the House of Representatives, I believe represent an imprudent risk as far as the safety and security of the United States is concerned.

We in the United States must never close our eyes to the threat which our armed forces must be prepared to face. [Applause.]

That threat has not diminished. The opposition seems to continue to grow and this threat continues to grow as far as our country is concerned and I believe that the $2 billion additional cut which I will reclama to the United States Senate next week represents an imprudent risk as far as our security is concerned.

In the past five years the Soviet Union has gone forward and this threat has been expanding. It has expanded its strategic offensive forces with a rapid and a persistent momentum. As a result it has achieved a position of parity and, in some cases, superiority.

As one striking example, the Soviet Union has forged ahead of us in the number of strategic land-based missiles. Our estimate of the large, monstrous Soviet SS–9 intercontinental ballistic missile deployed or under construction has been increased from some 230 a year ago to more than 300 today.

The Soviet Union now has some 28 Polaris-type ballistic missile submarines operational or under construction, and, at present construction rates, will exceed our fleet of nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines early in 1974.

In contrast, our nation has not increased its force level of strategic offensive missile launchers since 1965.

During this same period, the Soviet Union has pushed the development of its strategic offensive forces with a momentum which shows no sign of slackening.

As Secretary of Defense, I indeed hope that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks which resume in Helsinki in less than a month—on November 2nd—will result in success. We are striving hard to achieve that success, but I must also report to the American people that if these talks are not successful we will face some hard, tough decisions that cannot be delayed much longer if we are to assure the nation's safety and survival.

There are other developments as well which heighten the threat of our security.

The increasing naval capability of the Soviet Union, its growing military research and development program and the powerful conventional forces of the Warsaw Pact in Europe and in Communist China and in North Korea are well to note.

I returned last week from the Mediterranean area where there is visible evidence of expanding Soviet power. I commented there and I would repeat here to the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce that the expansion of the military power of the Soviet Union is not limited, however, to the Mediterranean. We have reported to the American public during recent weeks the increased naval and Soviet fleet operations in many oceans of the world, including the Caribbean.

I know the people of this State, the State of Texas, I know that you with your long coast line along the Gulf of Mexico are particularly aware of Soviet fleet activities in these waters even in the Gulf.

We dare not let down guard as we strive to achieve an enduring peace throughout the world based on President Nixon's three principles of partnership, strength, and a willingness to negotiate.

In order to be successful, however, in negotiations, we must negotiate from a position of strength. [Applause.]

That is why it is essential that the Congress approve the bare bones, rock-bottom budget requests now pending for fiscal year 1971, which began on July 1 of 1970. Any major reduction in these requests will endanger our national security and our pursuit for peace. We have pared this budget to a position, and I know after serving 16 years on the House Appropriations Committee that this budget has been pared and is a rock-bottom, bare bones budget, and it cannot take the substantial reductions which were voted in the Congress just yesterday.

I say this in the light of the momentum which the Soviet Union has developed and is maintaining in weapons procurement, in research, and also in weapons development.

Finally, and most importantly, the safety and the security of our country will depend on the dedicated services of men and women, because the men and women are indeed the important asset we have, and more important than any weapons.

The defense of our nation requires that we maintain not only strong military forces, but also a strong industrial base, and all of us in the defense community appreciate the effective contribution which the people of Texas have long made to our nation's strength.

As a Member of Congress and now as Secretary of Defense I have been aware of the great contributions to the national security which the people of this State have made. That is why I intend to do everything that I can to enhance the status, to enhance the prestige of the men and women who wear the uniform of this country. [Applause.]

And that is why I am concerned about the welfare of the civilian defense workers, whether they are employed by the government or employed by defense industries. I know that there are some who believe that it is trite to say that in national defense people are our most precious asset, but I firmly believe this and want to close my remarks here in San Antonio with this thought:

I want to reaffirm my pride in and the responsibility which I have as Secretary of Defense for these people and for their families. These are the people who contribute so much to the national security and to the safety of the United States of America.

Thank you.

HIGHWAY SAFETY—ADOPTING THE "SLOW-MOVING VEHICLE (SMV)" EMBLEM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill that would amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act so as to require the use of a distinctive emblem—SMV, slow-moving vehicle—in a prominent position on slow-moving vehicles.

In Washington, D.C., as in other areas, there are a number of slow-moving vehicles using the streets and highways; that is, brush and water street cleaners, snow removal equipment, utility repair trucks, salt spreaders and street repair equipment, and other similar equipment. It can be anticipated that the subway construction will increase the number of these types of vehicles and equipment using the city's streets and highways.

I am informed that studies conducted at Ohio State University have established that the SMV emblem has significantly reduced rear-end accidents because the oncoming traffic is alerted to the fact that they are overtaking a slow-moving vehicle ahead.

Adoption of such legislation by the Congress for the District of Columbia would, I am informed, bring the District highway safety laws into conformity with those in the adjoining States of Maryland and Virginia where the laws will go into effect in January 1971.

I might point out that this legislation is similar to that required on slow-moving vehicles in my own State of Minnesota. Our State law, as contained in Minnesota Statutes 169.522, requires the use of an iridescent triangular slow moving emblem on all animal-drawn vehicles, implements of husbandry, and other machinery, including all road construction machinery which are designed for operation at a speed of 25 miles per hour or less.

It is requested that the attached statement of the National Safety Council be inserted in the RECORD since it indicates the support of the Council for legislation such as that contained in my bill. It is my understanding that the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, the American Automobile Association, the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, and the Automotive Safety Foundation also endorse such legislation.

In the interest of traffic safety on the streets and highways of the District of Columbia, I introduce this legislation.

The statement follows:

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL POLICY STATEMENT ON THE SLOW-MOVING VEHICLE EMBLEM

It is necessary for various vehicles with limited speed capability to utilize public streets and highways from time to time. This classification of vehicles includes farm tractors and other farm vehicles, road maintenance and construction equipment, and horse-drawn vehicles, designed for a speed no more than 25 miles per hour.

These slow-moving vehicles frequently cause conflict with faster moving traffic, and it is necessary for drivers of fast-moving vehicles to take extra precautions when overtaking slow-moving vehicles. However, the driver of a fast-moving vehicle must be able to perceive and recognize a slow-moving vehicle in time to take the necessary action to avoid a collision. There is need that the slow-moving vehicle be identified as such. This is partially met by various requirements in states that such vehicles display rear lights and/or flags.

However, these requirements are not standardized and do not necessarily identify the vehicle as of the slow-moving type. A standardized device is needed that not only increases the visibility of the vehicle but also identifies it as slow-moving. This need is met by the triangular reflectorized, fluorescent emblem developed through research by the Ohio State University and recommended by the American Society of Agricultural Engineers. The latter organization has also developed specifications for physical properties, dimensions, component materials, and use of the emblem. (ASAE R276.)

The National Safety Council supports the promotion and use of the Slow-Moving Vehicle Emblem and urges that every effort be made to encourage the use of this emblem on slow-moving vehicles and to educate the public to recognize it as identifying a slow-moving vehicle.

Approved by the Board of Directors, National Safety Council on April 13, 1966.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATS BLAMED FOR COMMUNIST WIN IN CHILE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article by Mr. Paul Bethel appeared in the October 17 edition of Human Events Newsmagazine. Mr. Bethel discusses the reasons for the Communist candidate winning a plurality in the recent presidential elections in Chile. He underlines the seriousness of the situation for the United States should this victory be certified by the Chilean Congress on October 24 and suggests a course of action which we could follow that would help prevent this tragedy. The article follows:

RUN-OFF SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 24: CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATS BLAMED FOR COMMUNIST WIN IN CHILE

(By Paul Bethel)

Is the Soviet Union outsmarting the Nixon Administration in Latin America? This question must be asked—and answered—following the tentative victory of Marxist Salvador Allende as president of Chile. Allende did not win an absolute majority as between three candidates and still must receive the approval of Chile's congress on October 24 to reach that high office by the elective process.

Technically a Socialist, Allende is in fact a Communist who received the backing of Chile's Communist party, the Radical party, pro-Communist members of the Christian Democrats—quite a mixed bag. Moreover, Allende finds Fidel Castro and Communist Cuba to be desirable models, is a frequent visitor to Havana and is a member of Castro's subversive Latin American Solidarity Organization.

Some amazing things happened during the campaign ending in the September 4 elections. While Allende was handing out a list of 167 businesses—involving $2 billion in U.S. investments—that he promised to confiscate if elected president, an unidentified bureaucrat in the U.S. Administration implied to the press that should Allende win, U.S. diplomatic recognition would follow.

Apart from the precedent which may have been set (hostile governments may, with impunity, seize U.S. investments?), the boo-boo certainly did nothing to give second thoughts to Chile's yet-undecided voters which made up about 27 per cent of the electorate at the time. A statement suggesting less than a cordial approval of such thievery would seem to have been in order.

However that may be, about all one hears of Latin American policy in Washington is the furious drumming of fingers on the desk tops at the White House and State Department. Nevertheless, the Chilean crisis must still be faced.

Here is how the Defense Department views the situation:

Missile-firing: Soviet naval flotillas roam the Caribbean and approach to within 25 miles of New Orleans; Soviet "fishing trawlers" impudently nudge their way through

U.S. warships off Cape Kennedy and snake aboard samples of U.S. underwater firings; evidence piles up that Soviet troops are again in Cuba and may command 400-mile-range missiles; Castroite urban guerrillas kidnap and murder U.S. envoys and diplomatic aides almost at will, while the expropriation of U.S. properties in Latin America is leading to the precipitate withdrawal of U.S. power and influence.

And now—Chile!

An exchange which took place at recent House hearings between Rep. Dante Fascell (D.-Fla.) and Atlantic Fleet commander Adm. E. P. Holmes is worth noting:

Fascell: "Admiral, it seems to me . . . as a layman, that with the Soviet intrusion into the Caribbean area, the whole Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico, as well as the southeastern seaboard of the United States . . . have become a No. 1 priority defense-wise. Is that region in that category"

Holmes: "Yes, I think it is. The Russians have made it so. . . . It would not surprise me if it would fit their policy to move in."

Should Chile fall to the Communists when congress meets on October 24 to choose between Nationalist candidate Jorge Alessandri and Salvador Allende, only an incurable optimist could doubt that the Russians would indeed move in. The opportunity provided by 2,600 miles of Chile's coastline would hardly go ignored by an expansive Soviet Union. Naval units based there would land the Rusians smack in the Pacific and tear up our whole strategic balance, escalating Adm. Holmes' fears to the proportions of a nightmare. Indeed, just the psychological impact of a Soviet-backed Chile could be more potent in Latin America than nine Russian cruisers anchored in Valparaiso harbor.

Allende and his "popular front" (Unitary Popular Movement) barely made it. They polled only 36 per cent of the vote. In fact, he did better while losing to the Christian Democrats in 1964 when he polled 39 per cent of the vote. How, then, could Allende win out in 1970 with only 35 per cent?

The answer is as unfortunate as it is simple. Chile's Christian Democrats are responsible for the Communist victory.

Despite overwhelming evidence dating back more than six months that his party had no chance of winning, C.D. standard-bearer Radomiro Tomic did not pull out, making the election a three-way race. Had the issue been drawn between the Communists on the one hand and Chile's National party on the other, the Chilean voter would have handed Allende a crushing defeat.

Brazil's liberal newspaper, *O Estado do São Paulo,* scored the "destructive role" played by Chile's C.D.'s, calling them "neither Christian nor democrats." The destiny of "Christian democracy," the paper went on, "is to be absorbed into extinction by a Communist revolution, a destiny they thoroughly merit."

Colombia's *El Tiempo,* also liberal, hoped that Chile's institutions would be able to tame the Communists, but remarked: "What has happened in Chile is not only important for Chile but for all America, whose political balance has been seriously jarred." Enrique Caballero, *El Tiempo's* editorial writer, really put it to Chile's C.D.'s, writing: "Chile has voted against Christian democracy which has defrauded it."

Costa Rica's Radio Reloj predicted that "Chile is already on the road to a Communist dictatorship," and observers recall the warning given by that country's President José Figueres when he said that Christian Democrats in Latin America "are too far on the left."

Chile's *El Mercurio* blamed the similarity in C.D. programs to those of the Communist coalition with confusing the Chilean voter as to just what was at stake in the election. Other newspapers in Latin America revived the derisive sobriquet which described the Christian Democrats as "little Red fishes swimming in holy water," with *El Universo* remarking that the joke which referred to C.D. President Eduardo Frei as the "Kerensky of Chile" was no longer hilarious.

Why are Latin America's news media and political commentators so certain that Chile's C.D.'s are responsible for the Communist victory?

First, a breakdown of the election returns reveals that only those associated with Allende's MAPU voted the Communist ticket—Communists, Socialists, Radicals and the pro-Communists within the C.D. itself. One would expect that Allende would do better under a coalition of parties in 1970 than in 1964 when he had only the Communists and Socialists behind him. He polled 8 per cent less this year, showing markedly diminished support from the Chilean voter. In fact, only the conservatives showed a net gain.

The final line-up of votes following the September 4 victory bears this out. Allende received only 1,075,616; Alessandrei was right behind with 1,036,279 and Tomic came in a bad third with 824,849. With Tomic out of the race, there was no way in the world that Allende could have won.

And there is this historical perspective to consider. Back in 1964, the conservative Democratic Front faced a situation analogous in every respect to that confronting the Christian Democrats in 1970. They knew then, just as the C.D.'s knew about themselves in 1970, that they could field a presidential candidate only at the risk of splitting the democratic vote and permitting the Communists to slip into power between them.

So they made the issue simple for the Chilean voter. By refusing to put up a candidate, the Democratic Front made the issue one of democracy *or* communism. Jorge Prat, a leader in the coalition, said of the Communists: "If they win, it cannot be written in Chilean history that I was the one responsible for facilitating a Communist victory. Chile's voters responded by giving C.D. candidate Eduardo Frei a 437,000-vote margin, more than 55 per cent.

Why, then, did Chile's Christian Democrats turn their backs on those responsible for their victory in 1964? Why did they, almost knowingly, help the fading Communists to a victory in 1970? This requires an analysis of the Christian Democrats—what makes them tick.

To the surprise of many observers, when the conservatives pulled out in 1964 and left the field to the Christian Democrats, the latter gave them brickbats in return. One of the C.D. statements, repeated over and over during the 1964 election, provides a clue: "The traditional right in Chile has been destroyed for all time!" The "right" in this instance referred to three free-enterprise parties making up the Democratic Front—none of them "rightists" in the accepted meaning of the word.

Indications grew that the radicals within the C.D. were out to seize the party's power. Among them was a pre-election joining of forces between the powerful Christian Democratic Youth and the Czechoslovak Youth Union. They called for "peaceful coexistence among all countries with different social systems," a common Communist propaganda ploy.

The behaviour of the C.D.s prompted the editor of Santiago's Marxist newspaper, Las Noticias de Ultima Hora, to take a long look at Allende's opponents. He spotted among them that peculiar totalitarian twist of mind that afflicts many "liberals" (in this country too, God knows!). The editor found that the anti-Communist nature of the Socialist Falange, the original name of the Christian Democrats 30 years ago, had given way to the anti-free enterprise thinking which governs C.D. policy today The. rush by the C.D.'s toward "total reform" of Chile included a corresponding thrust for control over the free enterprise economy. It followed as inevitably as day follows night that their enemy became those who controlled the motor of the economy—businesses, banks and foreign investors.

While there may be some doubts that Chile's Christian Democrats were cynically exploiting the "capitalists" in order to effect the coveted transfer of power to them, there can be little doubt that the result weakened the tradition of democracy within the party.

Seeing the weakening of those traditions, the Marxist editor remarked: The Marxists may suffer a defeat but already politically they have scored an important victory." Once the C.D.'s were in power, the editor reasoned, they could be counted on to work toward the most cherished objective of the Communists—the destruction of private enterprise and the transfer of power to a government bureaucracy. As between private enterprise and a Socialist state, this line of reasoning went, the Christian Democrats could never bring themselves to side with the former even if democracy itself were at stake.

Take Chile's land reform as it was administered by the Christian Democrats. There is enough land owned by the government in Chile (as in most Latin American countries, particularly in Cuba) to provide for land reform. Yet Chile's Christian Democrats preferred to seize tracts of land which has already been developed with the additional advantage that it eliminated or intimidated the political opposition while dramatizing to the ignornant peasant that it was the "capitalist kulak" who is responsible for his lot.

Chile's farm program has been a failure. About 20,000 (some accounts say 12,000 families) have been settled on expropriated land, where they work for the government on collectives. Lacking incentives, the farmers have not produced up to consumer demands, thus contributing to ruinous inflation (29 per cent per year). For, though copper is Chile's main export, it is agriculture that must provide the real base for the country's growth and food for its people. And Chile, with more arable land per capita than in the United States, must import food.

And there is this to report: The man responsible for Chile's collective farms is the same man—Jacques Chonchol—who organized Fidel Castro's Communist agrarian reform. Chonchol, a Chilean, was found to be involved in terrorist activities of Chile's Castroite Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR) and, without prosecution, quietly dismissed from his job by President Frei. Today Chonchol is secretary general of Allende's Communist-controlled Unity Popular Movement.

It was also during the six years of Christion Democrat rule that Chile's universities came under the domination of the Communists and the pro-Communist leadership of the Christian Democrat Youth. And they were helped along by their political peers.

Addressing a C.D. Youth rally last year, Renan Fuentealba, then president of the Christian Democrat party (the equivalent position would be Larry O'Brien of the Democratic party here), told the youth: "You must eradicate the cultural values of a bourgeoise society . . . unite with the left to bring about needed changes." The C.D. Youth responded by endorsing "violent revolution with arms in our hands" if President Frei failed of even more radical reforms, and urged C.D. leadership "to follow the path of our sister republic, Socialist Cuba!"

Little wonder, then, that today the University of Concepción is dominated by the Castroite Movement of the Revolutionary Left which in turn is allied with Uruguay's murderous Tupamaro gang. Marxists also control the University of Chile and its multi-

plicity of normal schools and technical colleges. The basic teaching is to denigrate the concept of individual liberty and the sanctity of private property as a means of bringing about public acceptance of the primacy of the state in all spheres of activity.

Take this election exhortation by C.D. presidential candidate Radomiro Tomic: "No matter how much the Chileans do to achieve their highest goals, they will be unsuccessful unless capitalism in our country is totally eradicated . . . the battle to eradicate capitalism must be reached in years, not generations!"

Tomic also bragged: "When I was ambassador to Washington, U.S. aid funds to Chile were eight times higher per capita than those any other Latin American country could obtain." Practically calling our policymakers fools, Tomic characterized his tour in Washington as one of "criticism of the Organization of American States' opposition to the Inter-American Peace Force and by a refusal to be dragged into the mercenary anti-Cuba hysteria."

Salvador Allende is counting on significant help from the Christian Democrats. He told a post-election news conference: "We believe that some legislative initiatives will be supported without question by the Christian Democrats . . . because [those initiatives] fit into their thinking and with the program presented to the public by Radomiro Tomic. The fact that Tomic claimed that capitalism and neo-capitalism are undergoing a crisis leads us to propose initiatives that will soothe the national economy."

Both Radomiro Tomic and the head of the C.D. Youth, Pedro Luis Ramirez, called on Allende to personally extend their congratulations for his victory, prompting the Marxist to say that their visits "are very encouraging to our peoples' front."

Should the C.D.'s support Allende on October 24 and should he become president, here is the direction which Aleinde says he will take in foreign policy: "I have already clearly stated that our purpose is to have relations with Cuba, North Korea, North Viet Nam, China and the German Democratic Republic."

He discounted the concern and hostility evidenced by many governments following his victory and countered by saying he had received more than 100 telegrams from "popular movements" in those same countries, perhaps an indication that he will use the subversive Monteristas in Argentina, the MR-8 in Brazil and the Tupamaros in Uruguay for Communist political purpose.

The beginning of press control by an Allende administration also surfaced during a September 5 press conference. He threatened the opposition newspaper, El Mercurio, saying: "I reiterate that El Mercurio should cease being a vanguard for the defense of the interests of a clan that is one of the most powerful in Chile," blasted Chile's radio stations, and called for "newspaper cooperatives to defend the interests of Chile." This is almost a carbon copy of Fidel Castro's initial attacks on Cuba's press which led to the inevitable extinction of press freedom in that sad country.

Chile's proud constitution will also be thrown out if Allende makes it on October 24. He plans, he said, "to replace the constitution of a bourgeoise, democratic regime, an oligarchic government, with a peoples' government," incorporating a one-house congress to be called "the peoples' assembly." A great deal has been reported in the U.S. press regarding Allende's promise of "free election guarantees for all," but the specifics of an Allende program which are the antithesis of that promise have somehow gotten lost in the reporting.

Indeed, the contrast between Latin America and the U.S. news media reporting is remarkable. Generally, the U.S. media have emphasized that the Chilean voter knew what he was doing, the election was democratic, and the like, but reflect little of the sense of disaster with which Chile is viewed by its sister republics.

William Montalbano of the Miami Herald remained properly detached and expressed the hope that Chile's institutions would tame the Communists, reporting Allende's promise of "a revolutionary government, but one without revenge." The New York Times revealed its concern over an Allende victory as "a heavy blow against liberal democracy," with the suggestion that it was more concerned over the C.D. loss than the Communist triumph, saying that Chile's C.D.'s had achieved "solid results over six years," a view disputed rather forcefully by Chile's voters.

In any event, none—mind you, none—suggested the obvious. That would be to urge the Christian Democrats to throw their 70-odd votes in Congress behind the 50 pledged to Alessandri and overwhelm the 80 seats controlled by the Communist's Unitary Popular Movement.

There is no doubt in the mind of this writer, that had the Christian Democrats come out second, the Times and the Liberal Establishment media would (1) point out how the Communists had in fact lost strength since 1964, and (2) urge a "right-wing" Nationalist party to support the Christian Democrats. Their failure to do so under reversed circumstances represents one of the tragedies of news reporting so often commented upon by Vice President Agnew.

Nor have our media supported, as of this writing, a plan by Alessandri to deny the Communists a minority victory. The Nationalist party waited four days for the C. D.'s to support their man, but saw, instead, the "togetherness" of Tomic and Allende. Finally, Alessandri moved, calling upon the C.D.'s to support him when congress meets on October 24. Once elected president, he would step down and clear the way for new popular elections between the C.D.'s and the Communists to be held in 90 days. The Communists would be crushed—perhaps their pretensions to power through the ballot box smashed for all time.

As of now the C.D. has replied by merely asking Allende, in writing, for guarantees that free elections will continue. The asking itself dramatizes the doubt

It also obscures another important part of the Alessandri proposition. By holding the post of president for a few days and then stepping down, Alessandri would have broken the constitutional prohibition which prevents a president from succeeding himself. Eduardo Frei would be eligible to run in place of the disastrous Tomic. Considered a weak man, Frei still is preferable to anyone else the C.D.'s might field for office and infinitely preferable to the Communists.

A great deal rides on the outcome of Chile's congressional vote on October 24. Yet an inhibited silence reigns over U.S. policy, and this may be the result of the power approach to foreign affairs by the White House.

Speaking before a group of press people in Chicago on September 16, a top Nixon aide said that though the Soviet Union and the U.S. have innumerable opportunities to harass each other (read: Chile, Cuba), he warned that such harassment does not contribute to a climate conducive to a permanent settlement. One can only sympathize with medium-level—indeed high-level—State Department functionaries who are restricted in their actions by such "globalities." What they see is the United States being beaten by the specifics of Soviet encroachment.

Allende has dominated Chile's news since September 4, and has moved so far along the path to power—through threats of civil war and the like—that he has restricted even further the U.S. power to act through normal diplomatic channels. There is little chance that behind-the-scenes appeals to Chile's C.D.'s to support Alessandri will bear fruit.

On the other hand, there is a sizable segment of Chilean society—64 per cent, to be exact—who are willing to act. Perhaps the United States would be well-advised to make known that the taxpayer has no intention of subsidizing its enemy, will automatically break relations with a Communist Chile and warn the Soviets against any attempts to lodge their power on the South American continent. Given this ax handle of encouragement, the Chilean press, the Catholic organizations, businessmen and others may use it against the C.D.'s to prevent them from supporting the Communists.

The likelihood is that neither approach would be completely successful. In the latter instance it would at least have some effect on Chile's neighbors. Argentina and Brazil would take heart, Venezuela's own ruling Christian Democrats would be put on notice not to play the same game and barter away free-world oil to the Soviets, and Peru's anti-American military junta would be encouraged to re-think its own pro-Communist direction.

The worst thing of all would be to do nothing. President Nixon recoiled from applying the Hickenlooper Amendment against Peru when it confiscated U.S. properties; this led to confiscations in Bolivia. And now, Chile! It will be very difficult for the President to lay these events at the feet of previous administrations, for they are his responsibility and his alone.

OUR CANADIAN NEIGHBORS—1970

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, news from Canada has been prominent in recent days. Both certain internal events and external developments have been extensively reported by our news media.

All too frequently, however, we may have more news of events in Europe or Africa, while Canadians, because of their access to our news media, are generally better informed about us.

The Honorable Adolph W. Schmidt, our Ambassador to Canada, has said "too often we allow the easy familiarity, good will and fundamental values we both share to obscure the fact that Canada and the United States are two different nations with different views of the world and their interests in that world."

This statement is taken from the remarks of Ambassador Schmidt in a speech delivered some seven weeks ago at the Lake Placid Club, Lake Placid, N.Y.

I was privileged to be among those present on that occasion. I was impressed then with the keen sense of appreciation that our Ambassador evidenced for the importance that both Canada and the United States have for the other. On hearing his remarks, and on reading them since, I am convinced that they demonstrate a deep insight into, and understanding of, the problems that, in Ambassador Schmidt's confident view "will be resolved to our mutual satisfaction."

The full text of Ambassador Schmidt's remarks follows:

OUR CANADIAN NEIGHBORS—1970

I

Ladies and gentlemen, in a few days, I will have been in Canada one year. Shortly after my arrival last September, the Humble Oil tanker *Manhattan* started through the

Northwest Passage with the full cooperation and ice-breaker assistance of the Canadian Government. That voyage, however, touched off some spark of latent nationalism or concern among a certain percentage of the Canadian people, and things have been humming ever since. As a result my first year in Canada has been a stimulating, fascinating, and challenging one.

As a result of previous visits and vacations in Canada, I learned long ago not to make the mistake of saying "Canadians are just like us," because they are not. There are strong historical differences, for instance. During our Revolutionary War, 50,000 colonists who decided to remain loyal to the British Crown migrated to Canada, often at great personal and financial sacrifice. They were known as the "Empire Loyalists" and went first to Halifax, next to Toronto, and others finally to Vancouver. The family names of those American colonists persist still today among the leaders in those communities. Too often we allow the easy familiarity, goodwill and fundamental values we both share to obscure the fact that Canada and the United States are two different nations with different views of the world and their interests in that world.

Prime Minister Trudeau is quoted as saying "Living next to you is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly and even-tempered is the beast, one is affected by every twitch and grunt." Living next to this colossus of the south has produced in many Canadians a kind of ambivalence—they desire and approve of all the benefits and advantages which this geographical juxtaposition provides, but they resist and resent the slightest interference or encroachment which this geography from time to time imposes.

In general, Canadians know much more about us than Americans know about Canada. Because of the ready access to American communications and publications, Canadians read our newspapers and magazines and view our television programs avidly. Contrariwise, there is little news of Canada in most of our newspapers and magazines. My classmate and predecessor in Ottawa, Livingston Merchant, edited a series of six essays while Ambassador, written by knowledgeable American and Canadian authorities which he entitled "Neighbors Taken For Granted."

On a person-to-person basis, an American rarely experiences any open anti-Americanism. But he finds that many Canadians have a distorted picture of the United States because television, press and other media tend to emphasize the unfavorable: In foreign policy, the United States is an international troublemaker. All U.S. rivers and lakes are polluted, all U.S. blacks are oppressed. The U.S. is making a power grab for Canada's natural resources. Consequently, a certain disillusionment has emerged. It was expressed recently by Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, John J. Greene, in Denver as "what appears to many as the sudden tragic disappearance of the American dream which in some ways has turned into a nightmare." The Embassy team naturally tries to correct the errors and the distortions and to present United States policy and objectives accurately.

II

Before my appointment to Canada, I had always known that the mutual involvement of our two countries was substantial in many areas. But I did not appreciate *how* substantial it is, until I looked into the actual figures after my arrival. The current trade across our common border amounts to $19.5 billion a year—more than our trade with all of the European Economic Community, including Great Britain. Equally striking, I think, is the fact that this trade with Canada is greater than our total trade with all of Asia including Japan and all of Africa combined.

U.S. private investment in Canada amounts to $30 billion, which again is more than our investments in all of Western Europe, including Great Britain. In this connection, many of you may be interested in knowing that Canadian private investment in the United States amounts to $9 billion. If these figures are divided by 200,000,000 and 20,000,000 people respectively, it shows that the per capita Canadian investment in the United States at $450 is three times the per capita American investment in Canada of $150. This ratio has limited statistical significance perhaps, but it does show that the citizenry in each country think extremely well of the investment climate and opportunities in the other. And I think this is a plus for both of us.

It is obvious, that with the millions of transactions which go across our border every day, problems and difficulties are bound to arise. I believe one should start with the realization that disputes are inevitable and normal. The wonder is that we do not have more of them. But it is the function of all the departments of our two governments and of the art of diplomacy to get on top of such problems, and to work on them until they are resolved. Together we have succeeded well and often in the past in resolving such difficulties to our mutual satisfaction, and I am sure we will continue to do so in the future.

III

I thought it might be of some interest to this audience tonight if I mentioned the kinds of problems which have arisen in recent months between Canada and the United States, and what we are doing about them. On the political side, a number of recent problems deal with the Law of the Sea.

The Canadian Government recently passed Arctic pollution control legislation which would permit Canada to impose ship construction standards and to control navigation in "shipping safety control zones" extending up to 100 miles from Canadian territory in the Arctic above the 60th parallel. The U.S. shares Canada's objective of combating pollution in the Arctic, where the effects may be ruinous to the delicate ecology of the region. The U.S., however, regrets that Canada acted unilaterally. The U.S. view is that new departures in international law should have broad, multilateral agreement in order to avoid chaotic situation resulting from conflicting claims. We are hopeful that such agreement can still be achieved with Canada's cooperation. The U.S. is also concerned that unilateral action, however well motivated in a particular case, could serve as a stimulant for other countries to assert far-reaching and unreasonable extensions of jurisdiction over sealanes that would seriously diminish the freedom of the seas.

Similarly, we regret that Canada also passed legislation extending her territorial sea to 12 miles and permitting the Government to extend Canada's exclusive fishing zones to include large bodies of water such as the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. Again, what we regret is that Canada acted unilaterally. We believe that the time is right for the conclusion of a new *international treaty* fixing the limit of the territorial sea at 12 miles. However, we want such a treaty to provide for the freedom of transit through and over international straits, which, under a 12-mile limit, would become for the first time part of the territorial waters of other countries. Examples of such straits are—and to emphasize the importance of this issue to the United States and other countries—Gibraltar, Malacca, Dover. The United States has also expressed its willingness to establish, but through multilateral agreement, carefully defined preferential fishing rights for coastal states on the high seas. The United States and Canada still have boundary problems to settle. Last month U.S. and Canadian officials began discussions on the determination of boundaries on the continental shelf areas lying off our coasts. The possibility that oil may be discovered in some of these areas increases the urgency, and complicates the task, of reaching an agreement. Nevertheless, I am confident that an agreement will be achieved.

Although Canada has vast fresh water resources, its population and industry is heavily concentrated in the Great Lakes area and concern about pollution in Canada is growing. With the border between our countries running through four of the five Great Lakes, we and Canada have a common interest in cleaning up the Lakes, and, in keeping them clean. The International Joint Commission, established in 1909, among other things is charged with preventing disputes regarding the use of boundary waters, and now finds that dealing with pollution has become a major item on the agenda of its semi-annual meetings. In their search for more effective ways of organizing to fight pollution of the Great Lakes, both of our countries are counting on the IJC to be of help.

Incidentally, as a further indication of our involvement, Canada and the United States have established 17 joint institutions—commissions, conferences, and committees which meet on a regularly scheduled basis—to deal with common problems. In the first two weeks of March 1970 there were 17 separate delegations from Washington in Ottawa, meeting with their Canadian opposite numbers.

IV

Some of you may remember the Paley Commission Report of the early 1950s which pointed out that the United States with only 6% of the world's population was consuming annually over 50% of the world's industrial raw materials. A continuation of this consumption rate during the ensuing 15 years has left the United States self-sufficient in only 10 out of 36 of the most important raw materials consumed by our manufacturing industries, causing us to import all or part of our requirements for the remaining 26 materials. Ten of those in which we are no longer self-sufficient are petroleum, natural gas, iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, tin, nickel, cobalt and bauxite.

One of the complicating factors in this situation is that while the raw material situation of the United States is declining, the raw material situation of the Soviet Union is becoming stronger. During the past twenty years the Soviets have been exploring extensively for mineral deposits, have been spectacularly successful in Siberia, and are graduating six times as many geologists as the United States to continue even more intensive exploration. As a result, they are self-sufficient in 29 of the 36 important raw materials previously mentioned and need to import only 7.

This is mentioned only to emphasize the over-riding importance of Canada to the future of the United States, for Canada remains a storehouse of industrial raw materials. As a result, one of the major economic problems between our two countries is future energy policy, which involves petroleum, natural gas, electric power and uranium.

Energy policy

Local shortages of electric power in the United States this summer, and the sharp rise in the delivered price of overseas oil, bring with them a realization that we may be faced with basic changes in our energy picture. Recognizing this possibility, President Nixon more than a year ago appointed a task force to study our oil import policy. The task force report, published last February, recommended movement toward an integrated North American energy market, and we are now actively discussing this question with Canada.

Though we import only about four per-

cent of our total petroleum requirements from Canada, the regional importance of these imports, notably from Alberta into the Chicago area, is much greater. At the present time, with overseas supplies restricted by production and pipeline limitations in the Arab countries, and by tanker availabilities, it is most fortunate that ample and secure supplies of Canadian crude are at hand.

Present reliance by the United States on Canadian supplies of natural gas is less than four percent of our total requirements, but is expected to increase to fifteen percent in twenty years. Electric power exchange across the border, and Canadian reserves of uranium also probably will be increasingly important in the years to come.

Canadians are quick to recognize the advantages in mutually-profitable economic arrangements with the United States. At the same time there is, quite naturally, increasing sensitivity in Canada to the need to conserve resources to meet future Canadian needs. Hundreds of millions of dollars of trade a year are involved, making this one of the most important policy areas for our two countries, one that will require increasing attention in the months to come.

Investment, Denison Mines, Canada Development Corporation

There is also great sensitivity at the moment regarding future U.S. investment in Canada. In 1967, the last year for which complete data are available, some 25 percent, or C$50 billion of the C$200 billion in total assets of Canadian corporations was controlled by foreigners, the great majority American. The automobile industry is more than 90 percent owned by American companies. Sixty-six percent of the petroleum industry and 46 percent of manufacturing generally is in U.S. ownership.

Belief is growing in Canada that the relatively large extent of foreign control means that decisions vitally affecting the Canadian economy are often made outside of Canada. According to this view, foreign parent companies, seeking to maximize the sales and profits of their world-wide business, may take decisions, in conflict with Canada's national interests, affecting employment, exports and imports, and research and development by their Canadian subsidiaries. U.S. laws and regulations to which U.S. parent companies are subject allegedly influence decisions about the operations of Canadian subsidiaries.

Past Canadian governments have already restricted foreign control in areas of the economy considered vital, including transportation, radio and television, and banks and life insurance companies. The most recent government action was taken earlier this year when the share which foreigners may own in new Canadian uranium mines was limited to 33 percent. The restriction was imposed after a Canadian corporation, the Hudson Bay Oil & Gas Company, more than half of whose shares were held by Continental Oil Company of the United States, offered to purchase a controlling interest in Denison Mines, a leading Canadian producer of uranium.

Following its action to block the takeover of Denison, the government announced that it was working out an overall policy toward foreign investment which is expected to be made public later this year. There have been indications that the proposed policy will not seek to impose new limitations on foreign-controlled firms already in Canada. For the future it may seek to limit foreign takeovers and to restrict foreign ownership or control from exceeding certain limits in such additional sectors of the economy considered vital to Canada's national interests.

The Trudeau government has also announced that it will introduce legislation to establish a Canada Development Corporation to channel government funds and private savings into growth industries. At one point it was thought that this agency would be used to purchase Canadian firms to prevent them from falling under foreign ownership. But now it seems that the Canadian Development Corporation will more likely serve to mobilize the funds of small savers for investment in the kinds of enterprises the government desires to foster.

Canadian Radio Television Commission—CRTC

Regulations now being worked out by the Canadian equivalent of our Federal Communications Commission establish new standards for the Canadian content of television and radio programing. These requirements will go into effect by stages beginning October 1, 1970, and by October 1, 1972, programs of Canadian television stations must be at least 60 percent Canadian; and of the remaining 40 percent of "foreign" programing, not more than 30 percent can come from any one country. For radio programs the Canadian content requirement will be 30 percent.

This kind of national policy on radio and television programing will both limit the television viewer's and the radio listener's exposure to non-Canadian programs and will encourage Canadian producers, directors, writers, composers, and performers by providing them with a protected market for their services.

v

I have dwealt at some length on the attitudes and problems which are currently engaging the attention of our two governments. I do not wish to leave you with the impression that these problems are overpowering or worsening our relations. I am sure they will be resolved to our mutual satisfaction in due course. In fact, and in spite of the frequent "tweaking of the lion's tail," I find an enormous reservoir of goodwill in Canada for the United States. The recently published Government White Paper on "Foreign Policy for Canadians" had no chapter on the United States. It summarized it in one sentence—"The United States is Canada's closest friend and ally and will remain so." In turn I think I speak for all United States citizens when I say that there is nothing but goodwill here for Canada.

In the days ahead it is important that this spirit be cultivated and enhanced. Some of the basic principles on which our two countries were founded, and for which millions of our forebears died, are being challenged and denied in many parts of the world today. These basic issues are freedom vs. tyranny; does the state exist for man or does man exist for the state; trial by jury and habeas corpus vs. trial by peoples courts; and freedom of religion vs. atheism. As we are called upon to continue to defend these issues and principles in the days ahead, I believe our two peoples will find continuing bonds of strength and friendship in their steadfastness in safeguarding them.

A SOLUTION TO THE POLLUTION ASPECTS OF NONRETURNABLE GLASS CONTAINERS

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a solution to the pollution aspects of nonreturnable glass containers is rapidly being developed. A program is being sponsored by the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute which is a glass recycling program. I have been informed that it is achieving tremendous success. It is so successful that plans are underway to extend it nationwide.

One of the glass plants in my district at Marienville, Pa., is taking the lead in Pennsylvania in furthering this project. This firm is a division of the Glass Containers Corp. and is a very fine local industry. The Glass Institute is also researching in the development of other means of disposing of our Nation's solid waste. This includes new methods of separation of diverse types of waste. The secondary use of nonreclaimable glass waste is also being studied.

In their sincere effort to join other industries and government agencies in attempting to solve the pollution crisis in this Nation, the glass container industry of the United States should be given special praise for their efforts which include the expenditure of large sums by the industry on this problem.

This industry should be given ample time by Congress in order to develop and expand this recycling process. A portion of the Federal appropriations to curb pollution could well be funneled to this endeavor.

HONORARIA OF RADICAL REVOLUTIONARY SPEAKERS

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the House of an occurrence on yesterday of great concern to this legislative body and to the Congress as a whole. I am under a duty to the House to bring to its attention a most serious invasion of the privileges of the House and a grave and unwarranted obstruction of its legislative functions.

On yesterday, a judge of the Federal judiciary on the basis of an ex parte application filed on the same day, and without notice to the members of the committee or parties-defendant involved, proceeded in summary fashion to enter a restraining order against the Superintendent of Documents, Mr. Carper W. Buckley; the Public Printer, Mr. James L. Harrison; and Donald G. Sanders, chief counsel of the House Committee on Internal Security, restraining the publication of a report to the House in the manner and form which the Committee on Internal Security had agreed to report it and under which I, as chairman, was under duty by the rules of this House to report promptly to the House.

Never before in the long history of this Nation has the Federal judiciary in any of its branches ever undertaken to restrain, either with or without hearing, the printing of the whole or any part of a House report. This incredible action was taken by Judge Gerhard A. Gesell, a U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, to enjoin the printing of a committee report titled "Limited Survey of Honoraria Given Guest Speakers for Engagements at Colleges and Universities."

In order to make clear the setting in which this action of the court occurred, let me briefly review the circumstances culminating in this extraordinary action of the court. As you know, the Congress, within recent years, has been particularly concerned with the subject of revolutionary violence. This, indeed, has been a matter of great concern to the country as a whole. The Committee on Internal Security, created February 18, 1969, by resolution of the House, was mandated to conduct investigations of revolutionary groups, their members, agents, and affiliates, and by that mandate was required to report to the House the results of any such investigation together with such recommendations as it deemed advisable.

We are faced with ever-mounting demands by Members of the House and the public for legislative action on this subject. However, the legislative problems we face on the subject of subversion are of the utmost complexity and difficulty. We must find the answer to certain basic questions; namely, whether additional Federal legislation is necessary, what form it should take, and what is the Federal role as contrasted with the State role in the exercise of police power on this subject.

In a February 1969 statement, I advised the members of the committee that the foregoing questions and the disposition of legislation referred to the committee would require the most painstaking and thorough inquiry and understanding of the extent, character, and objectives, the organizational forms, financing, and other facts with respect to those organizations and individuals engaged in revolutionary violence, sedition, and breach of peace and law, and submitted to the committee a proposal that study and inquiries be made on these subjects. The committee agreed, and resolved that such studies and inquiries be made and that the chairman report thereon from time to time with his recommendations.

Pursuant to this initial resolution and subsequent resolutions adopted by the committee, investigations and hearings were undertaken with regard to such organizations, their members, agents, and affiliates, including very extensive investigations of the Students for a Democratic Society and the Black Panthers.

An important and relevant question, as I have noted, is the source and means of financing such organizations and individuals.

It was evident in the many published accounts of speaking engagements made to large audiences on college and university campuses, promoting violence and inciting to acts of force, violence, and terrorism, that such speaking engagements might be an important source of financing of the activities of such groups and individuals. On March 5 of this year, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told the House Subcommittee on Appropriations that the sources of contributions to the Black Panther Party were many and varied, including engagements at secondary schools, colleges, and universities where Black Panther Party leaders received honoraria of up to $1,900 for each engagement, as well as transportation costs. William Kunstler, counsel for the defendants found guilty of using interstate facilities to start a riot during the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, told newsmen quite candidly:

> We raise most of the money for our movement through speaking engagements.

With the authorization and approval of the committee, the staff conducted a preliminary survey on this subject, and the study was reported to the committee. At the direction of the committee, a proposed report to the House was prepared and considered at meetings of the committee, and it was agreed last Wednesday that the results of the investigation on this subject be reported to the House. The report, titled "Limited Survey of Honoraria Given Guest Speakers for Engagements at Colleges and Universities," was circulated to members of the committee on Friday, and notice given of my intention, as chairman, to file the approved report with the House today. In some way, unknown to me, the galley sheets of the proposed report which I was to file with the House by direction of the committee, was placed in the hands of Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Yesterday morning a complaint was filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia by the Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, Nat Hentoff, 25 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., John Doe, and Richard Roe, appeared as plaintiffs in this suit against the members of the Committee on Internal Security, Donald G. Sanders, its chief counsel, Carper W. Buckley, Superintendent of Documents, and the Public Printer, U.S. Government Printing Office. This was allegedly a class action on behalf of persons identified in the report as members, or participants in the activities, of Communist organizations, militant, radical, or extremist groups, self-proclaimed revolutionaries, or who provided public support to such groups and organizations, and had been the recipient of specified sums as speaker's fees or honoraria for engagements on campuses.

The complaint alleged that the committee report would be filed on the afternoon of October 14 as an official document of the committee which will be printed, published, and made available to the public. It was asserted that the filing and publication of this report had no legitimate legislative purposes, but was, in effect, being carried out by the defendant members of the House, the Superintendent of Documents, the Public Printer, and the chief counsel of the committee for the purpose of deterring colleges and universities from permitting plaintiffs to appear on their campuses, and for the purpose of punishing plaintiffs for their views.

The complaint asked the court to declare the action of the defendant committee members in preparing and seeking to publish the report as "unconstitutional," and asked the court to enjoin the defendants from filing, printing, publishing, or disseminating the document and from disclosing any material or information contained in it.

This complaint was not served upon any of the named defendants when filed yesterday. Instead of serving the defendants with notice of the application for injunctive relief, Lawrence Speiser acting for the American Civil Liberties Union and the plaintiffs named, applied to the court for an immediate hearing on the complaint with a view toward obtaining a restraining order. He took the unwarranted course simply of speaking with a U.S. attorney for the Department of Justice, Mr. Joseph M. Hannon, Chief of the Civil Division, advising him of the fact that a complaint was filed, although he knew that the Department of Justice had not been given authority to act upon this matter or to represent the defendants. Acting on Mr. Speiser's application, Judge Gerhard A. Gesell, Federal district judge, then set the matter for hearing at 2 p.m. that day.

A message to this effect was conveyed to me by my staff while I was in attendance at a committee hearing. I instructed Mr. Sanders and my legislative counsel, Alfred M. Nittle, to visit with the U.S. attorney and to ascertain the facts of the alleged action. In view of the haste with which the court was moving, I was unable to communicate with the members, or to do more.

Mr Sanders and Mr. Nittle attended the court at 2 p.m., with Mr. Hannon. The court was advised of the lack of notice, and the further fact that the committee defendants, the Superintendent of Documents, and the Public Printer, were unrepresented at the hearing. Nevertheless, the court proceeded on an ex parte basis to determine whether a temporary restraining order should be granted.

Now mind you, here is a complaint which, in effect, charges the named defendants, including the Members of the House, their staff, the Superintendent of Documents, and the Public Printer, with participating in a conspiracy to deprive the plaintiffs of constitutional rights. The complaint alleged no matters of facts in support of these scandalous, offensive, and vaguely conclusory allegations. There was no allegation remotely suggesting that the action of the committee was unauthorized. The complaint on its face squarely invaded the constitutional privileges of the Members of the House not to be questioned in any other place for any speech or debate in the House—article I, section 6, clause 1, U.S. Constitution.

Yet despite these facts, the court proceeded in summary fashion to adjudicate the most delicate and sensitive questions involving basic constitutional doctrines of separation of powers. It did so without the attendance of, or notice to, parties in interest. It did so without the taking of evidence. It did so upon unsupported, conclusory, and scandalous allegations of a complaint unverified by the parties and signed and verified only by Lawrence Speiser on information and belief as counsel for the plaintiffs. With consummate and total disrespect for the privilege of the House, Judge Gessell then summarily entered an unprecedented order restraining the publication of a House report.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Members of the House cannot passively

accept this assault upon the privileges of the House. I have today filed the report which the Superintendent of Documents and the Public Printer have been restrained from printing by a single member of the court. No doubt an application will be made to dissolve this restraining order. But quite obviously this is not enough.

Both we and our brethren on the Senate side are witnessing repeated and callous intrusions by the judiciary upon the legislative function. This is a phenomenon of recent years. It appears that unless action is taken to restrain the courts in the exercise of unwarranted powers, we shall not remain a coordinate branch of government, in the system of liberty ordained by our forefathers. Let us give consideration to the means for redressing these evils lest we become the victims of our own indifference, and supinely suffer the degradation of our constitutional system.

Copies of the petition, courts ruling, and temporary restraining order are as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

CIVIL ACTION No. 3028–70

Nat Hentoff, 25 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York; John Doe, Richard Roe on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs,

v.

Richard H. Ichord, Claude Pepper, Edwin W. Edwards, Richardson Preyer, Louis Stokes, John M. Ashbrook, Richard L. Roudebush, Albert Watson and William J. Scherle, as Chairman and Members of the Committee on Internal Security of the United States House of Representatives, 309 Cannon House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515; Donald G. Sanders, Chief Counsel, Committee on Internal Security of the United States House of Representatives, 309 Cannon House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515; Carper W. Buckley, Superintendent of Documents, and James L. Harrison, Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office, North Capitol & H Streets, Washington,. D.C 20401, Defendants.

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

1. This is a class action to enjoin the filing, printing, publication, and dissemination of a report listing persons whom the defendant assert are "radical revolutionaries", which publication is for the purpose of deterring college and universities from permitting such persons to appear and speak on their campuses.

Parties

2. Plaintiffs:

Plaintiffs are citizens of the United States. On information and belief, they have been named in the above-mentioned report and, along with the others in the class, labeled as "communists", "radical revolutionaries", and "radical pied pipers of pernicious propaganda."

3. Defendants:

Defendant Richard H. Ichord is Chairman of the Committee on Internal Security of the United States House of Representatives (hereinafter the Committee). Defendants Claude Pepper, Edwin W. Edwards, Richardson Preyer, Louis Stokes, John M. Ashbrook, Richard L. Roudebush, Albert Watson and William J. Scherle are members of the Committee. Defendant Sanders is the Chief Counsel of the Committee. Defendants Buckley and Harrison are officials of the Government Printing Office and are responsible for the printing of official government documents. All defendants are to be found in the District of Columbia.

Class action

4. Plaintiffs sue in their own behalf and on behalf of a class of persons consisting of those whose names appear in the report (hereinafter "blacklist") which defendants are about to publish. Joinder of all members of the class is impractical because the members of the class are so numerous and because of the short time available for seeking immediate relief. The claims of the named plaintiffs are typical of the class. The relevant questions of law and fact are common to all and plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class. The defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the class. An adjudication of the rights of the individual representatives would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of all other members of the class and would avoid inconsistent of varying adjudications and multiple litigation.

Jurisdiction of the court

5. This suit raises questions under the Constitution and laws of the United States and the amount in controversy exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds $10,000. Jurisdiction rests on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 2201 and 2202 and on D.C. Code 11–521.

Cause of action

6. Plaintiffs are persons of various professions and political beliefs who have spoken at a number of colleges and universities, exercising their rights of free speech under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

7. On May 18, 1970, defendant Ichord advised the other defendant members of the Committee that he planned to investigate the honoraria paid to persons "whom we know to be associated with revolutionary groups."

8. In June, 1970, defendant Ichord wrote to the presidents of 179 American colleges and universities, requesting that they identify such speakers, their sponsors, the amount and source of any honorarium.

9. On information and belief, many colleges and universities responded to that request by supplying the Committee with the names of such persons.

10. On information and belief, the Committee has compiled this information into a blacklist which it plans to file on the afternoon of October 14, 1970, as an official document of the Committee and which will be printed, published and made available to the public.

11. The blacklist identifies all those on it as "members, or participants in the activities of communist, communist-front, or communist-infiltrated organizations, and/or militant, radical or extremist groups, or self-proclaimed revolutionaries."

12. The assertion in the blacklist that all those on it fall into such categories is false, and, is in any event an unwarranted categorizing of political speech in an attempt to inhibit and deter such speech.

13. The aforesaid project, and the filing and publication of the aforesaid blacklist has no legitimate legislative purpose, but is being carried out by the defendants with the purpose and effect of: (1) deterring colleges and universities from permitting plaintiffs to appear on their campuses as speakers, on the basis of the false assertion that such activities by these colleges and campuses finances and thereby promotes "the radical, revolutionary movement"; and (2) punishing plaintiffs for their views by exposing them to the harassment normally associated with blacklisting.

14. No adequate remedy at law exists for plaintiffs and the class they represent.

15. Unless relief is granted, plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury.

Wherefore, the plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

1. That the Court declare that the actions of the defendant committee members in preparing and seeking to publish the aforesaid blacklist are unconstitutional.

2. That the Court enjoin the defendants from filing, printing, publishing or disseminating the blacklist and from disclosing any material or information contained in it.

3. That the Court grant such other relief as it deems appropriate.

LAWRENCE SPEISER,
HOPE EASTMAN,
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs.

Of Counsel:

MELVIN L. WULF,
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

NAT HENTOFF, ET AL., PLAINTIFF, v. RICHARD H. ICHORD, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

VERIFICATION OF COMPLAINT

The undersigned attorney for plaintiff hereby avows that he is familiar with the subject of the complaint in this action, that he has read the foregoing complaint, and that, to the best of his knowledge, the factual allegations contained therein are true and correct.

LAWRENCE SPEISER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13th day of October, 1970.

---.

My Commission expires March 31, 1971.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

CIVIL ACTION No. 3028–70

Nat Hentoff, et al., Plaintiffs *v.* Richard H. Ichord, Claude Pepper, Edwin W. Edwards, Richardson Preyer, Louis Stokes, John M. Ashbrook, Richard L. Roudebush, Albert Watson and William J. Scherle, as Chairman and Members of the Committee on Internal Security of the United States House of Representatives, et al., Defendants Washington, D.C., October 13, 1970

The above-entitled cause came on for hearings on Plaintiffs' Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief before the Honorable Gerhard A. Gesell, United States District Judge, at 2:00 p.m.

Appearances:

Lawrence Speiser, Esq., Hope Eastman, Esq., Counsel for Plaintiffs; Joseph M. Hannon, Assistant United States Attorney, Counsel for Defendant Donald G. Sanders; *Court's ruling.*

PROCEEDINGS

The Clerk: Civil Action No. 3028–70, Nat Hentoff, et al. v. Richart H. Ichord, et al. Mr. Lawrence Speiser and Mrs. Hope Eastman for the Plaintiffs. Mr. Joseph M. Hannon for the Defendants.

The Court: Gentleman, in view of the time factors that are involved and knowing that this matter will unquestionably be taken this afternoon to the Court of Appeals, the Court is going to undertake to give its ruling orally at this time.

The Court has before it in this case a complaint for injunctive and declaratory relief framed as a class action seeking a temporary injunction to enjoin a proposed report of the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives, captioned, "Limited Survey of Honoraria Given Guest Speakers for Engagements at Colleges and Universities."

The complaint verified by its counsel in general terms indicates that the proposed report is scheduled to be published at noon tomorrow.

Initially the Court in confronted with the claim by amicus that there has not been the appropriate notice under Rule 65. The

Court feels that in view of the presence of the various officials here in Court today, the urgency of the situation and the fact that Plaintiffs were lulled into a belief that Mr. Hannon represented all of the Defendants, that the spirit of the rule has been met and, accordingly, the Court will entertain and consider the issues presented on the merits.

The first matter the Court must determine is whether or not there is in this case subject matter jurisdiction. The complaint states a claim under the Constitution, clearly raises a Federal question. There is also clearly alleged an imminent threatened injury, and the issue presented, as the Court sees it, is concrete, a specific real and live issue tendered for specific adjudication.

The merits presents a question involving separation of powers which is always a very difficult question for the Court to confront, as it arises particularly these days with increasing frequency.

Obviously, this Court must accord deference to the Committees of Congress, a coordinate branch of the Government, and to their authority to conduct investigations and proceed in the conduct of Congressional affairs. But it is clear under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Powell case, which the Court believes overrules a number of the cases cited by amicus, as interpreted by our Court of Appeals in the Davis case, the Court is not barred from considering a constitutional issue of this urgency and specificity merely because it may involve some intrusion into the delicate area of separate powers under our Constitution. Thus the Court feels the matter must be resolved in accordance with traditional considertaion of equity following the standards that are appropriate in a situation of this kind in the exercise of the Court's discretion.

There is not presented here any challenge to the authority of the Committee to engage in the work of the Committee under the various general assignments it has had from the Congress. The more specific question presented is whether there is a valid legislative purpose with respect to this particular document which is before the Court. In other words, is this report pursuant to a valid legislative purpose of Congress conducting its traditional role or is it merely, to use the language of such cases as Watkins v. United States, "an attempt to expose the private affairs of individuals for the sake of exposure alone?" That is the initial question which the Court must confront here.

The issue also, as the Court sees it, is not, as the Plaintiffs suggest, whether or not the report in its entirety should in any way be enjoined but more specifically the question of whether or not an injunction should issue with respect to the publication of the names of listed speakers that are set forth in various lists in the proposed report be-because it is in that respect that there may be an intrusion into the rights of individuals threatening their rights of free speech and assembly under the Constitution for the sake of exposure rather than for any legislative purpose.

While the Committee apparently undertook to inquire into whether or not various subversive organizations, so-called, were receiving funds from speakers on the various campuses of the United States, it made no definitive investigation into that issue as far as this report is concerned but merely satisfied itself with obtaining a list of speakers, then checking various private and public lists available to the Committee for the purpose of determining whether there was any indication that any of these people in any way had any connection with organizations which the Committee considered in some manner extremist, revolutionary or distasteful to the members of the Committee. The purpose in publishing the names is clearly suggested in the galley where it is stated that:

"The Committee believes that the limited sampling made is sufficient to alert colleges and university administrators, alumni, students and parents to the extent of campus speaking in promoting the radical revolutionary movement." Clearly a non-legislative purpose.

It appears to the Court that the Plaintiffs here have a legitimate grievance and that the Court should permit all of the interested parties full opportunity to be heard on the matter. The Court appeals to the conscience of the Congress and feels that the traditional methods which have long applied in the Federal Courts of this land should apply in this case just like any other case, and that there should be a careful examination into anything that purports to be, as this does, an indirect attempt to inhibit and deter freedom of speech under the First Amendment in a manner which is contrary to constitutional principles and chilling in its effect.

The Court is well aware that there is no practical remedy if Congress, in its wisdom, chooses directly or indirectly to ignore the Court's order.

Basic rights of Plaintiffs may be infringed as the Court sees these papers and our Constitution demands that they be given their day in Court. Hence the Court has concluded that a temporary restraining order must issue and that the matter should be set down in two days if the Defendants wish to take advantage of the provisions of Rule 65, to which reference has been made.

The Court feels that considerations of fairness and proper regard for the rule of law requires this result and the Court earnestly hopes that the Defendants will accept the necessities of orderly procedure.

There is no consideration of the public interest that has been brought to the attention of the Court that necessitates any immediate release of the challenged document. It is the traditional role of the Court of equity to preserve the status quo which is preserved by enjoining the release of these names and the Court feels that the Plaintiffs have a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits.

There is no effort here to impede investigatory activities of the Congress and there is no effort in any way here to restrict what Congress may say or do no the floor of the Congress. There is nothing here that affects speech and debate by Congressmen.

The Court will issue a temporary restraining order permitting the publication of this report but enjoining any publication in the report listing the speakers. The names of the speakers as listed shall not be published and any publication of those names is legally unauthorized.

I have before me a proposed form of restraining order which has been submitted by the Plaintiffs. I think it can be readily adapted to the ruling of the Court, limited to the names of the speakers.

I say to you, Mr. Hannon, that this matter will be set before a Judge of this Court within two days or next week, in accordance with whatever is the wish of the Defendants in that regard. If you wish a forty-eight hour hearing, it will be granted.

I would ask counsel to look at the proposed restraining order which was handed to the Court and make the necessary changes in it consistent with the ruling the Court has just made. When you have done that and have reached some conclusion as to the date of the hearing, I can endorse the order accordingly.

I want to express my appreciation for the presence of the distinguished gentlemen here from the Congress. I have attempted to do what a Federal Judge always should do in circumstances such as this, to do what is fair and right in connection with the serious constitutional issues raised and I feel certain that upon a full hearing as to these matters all of the rights an interests of the parties can be fully developed.

Mr. HANNON. I don't believe Your Honor was reading from an opinion?

The COURT. No, I have no opinion in front of me.

Mr. HANNON. Is this going to be written up as the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Court?

The COURT. This would constitute my findings of fact and conclusions of law as required under the rule. I will direct the court reporter to transcribe it immediately for the benefit of all concerned. I have no opinion here.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, Your Honor.

The COURT. I have simply had an opportunity to look at these and make a few notes.

Mr. HANNON. I appreciate what Your Honor has told me and we would like a copy of the Court's findings.

The COURT. Yes.

Mr. HANNON. I suggested to the Court that you had no jurisdiction over the members of the Congress. The Supreme Court has said so twice. Although Your Honor was very careful in your opinion, I did not catch who the Court is going to enjoin, who you are going to enter the restraining order against. You didn't mention who it is Your Honor is restraining in that. I would like that, please.

The COURT. I would think the injunction should run to all persons other than the named Congressmen, themselves. It would run to the printer and to all of the staff, and all of the people that would necessarily be involved in the publication.

Mr. HANNON. Not to the members of the Congress but to the staff, the other Defendants named and their agents, is that what I understand, Your Honor?

The COURT. That is what I have in mind. I see no need of enjoining the members of Congress. They are free to publish this report in so many ways anyhow there is no point in trying to get involved in that. They can make speeches on television; they can talk everywhere they wish.

Mr. HANNON. If Your Honor is clear in his mind, as I am in mine, that the Court does not have jurisdiction over these Congressmen by virtue of Powell v. McCormack, which Your Honor adverted to, and Dombrowski v. Eastland, would the Court at this time sua sponte dismiss this lawsuit as to the members of the Congress?

The COURT. No.

Mr. HANNON. Thank you, Your Honor.

The COURT. You gentlemen can bring back the order to chambers when you have it in shape.

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Ida Z. Watson, certify that I reported the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on October 13, 1970 and that the foregoing Pages 1 to 10, inclusive, constitute the official transcript of the Court's Ruling.

IDA Z. WATSON.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

CIVIL ACTION No. 3028–70

Nat Hentoff, et al., Plaintiffs v. Richard H. Ichord, et al., Defendants.

TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

It appearing to the Court from the verified Complaint and the application for Temporary Restraining Order and accompanying affidavit that a Temporary Restraining Order, pending hearing and determination of plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction should issue, because, unless defendants (except the named Members of Congress) are restrained from printing, publishing and distributing the Report on Honoraria Paid Guest Speakers for Engagements at Colleges (a copy of which has been filed and impounded as the Court's Exhibit) which con-

tains any list of names of individuals who have had speaking engagements at colleges or universities, plaintiffs will suffer immediate and irreparable injury, loss, damage, and infringement of constitutional rights before a hearing can be had on plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction;

And the Court having concluded from the materials before the Court that the printing, publication and distribution of any such lists of names as part of said Report may be unlawful, unauthorized by Congress, serves no proper legislative purpose and infringes upon the constitutional rights of those so named;

Now, therefore, it is ordered, that defendants (except the named Members of Congress) and their agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and any persons acting in active concert or participation with them (except the named Members of Congress), be and they are hereby restrained until the determination of plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction from directly or indirectly seeking to print, publish or distribute any list of names of individuals who have had speaking engagements at colleges or universities as part of a proposed Report on Honoraria Paid Guest Speakers for Engagements at Colleges and Universities.

It is further ordered, that the 23rd day of October 1970 at 9:30 o'clock a.m., at the United States Courthouse in Washington D.C., is fixed for the time and place of hearing plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction.

It is further ordered, pursuant to Rule 65(c) that plaintiffs post a bond in the sum of one dollar ($1.00).

GERHARD A. GESSELL,
Judge.

CONFIDENCE IN NIXON IS AT 35 PERCENT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article will be of special interest, particularly since the objective of many candidates' campaigns is to restore the confidence of the people in the Government:

THE HARRIS SURVEY: CONFIDENCE IN NIXON IS AT 35 PERCENT

(By Louis Harris)

Contrary to Harry Truman's experience in 1948 when he ran successfully against the Republican 80th Congress, President Nixon appears to have aroused a storm of criticism over the way he has handled the Democrat-controlled Congress in 1970.

Here is where the public stands on some of the sharpest clashes that have recently taken place between Republican President Nixon and the Democratic House and U.S. Senate.

By 52 to 33 per cent, the people feel that Congress was more right than the President in the case of the Hill-Burton hospital appropriations. Congress passed a bill providing for more money for the construction of hospitals than Mr. Nixon had asked for. The President vetoed the bill. Congress overrode the veto.

A short time later, the Congress passed an appropriations bill for the Office of Education that provided more funds than the President had requested. Mr. Nixon vetoed the bill as inflationary. Congress overrode the veto. By 52 to 35, the public feels that Congress was right.

Congress also passed another bill which called for more money for housing, veterans' benefits and space. The President once again vetoed the measure. This time, Congress failed to override him. On this issue, the public split right down the middle, with 42 per cent taking side of Congress and an equal 42 per cent that of Mr. Nixon.

In the latest Harris Survey, President Nixon's over-all job rating has slipped to below the 50 per cent mark. The number who feel he "inspires confidence personally in the White House" has fallen to only 35 per cent, down from a high of 61 per cent in April, 1969.

One of the sources of a deterioration of public confidence in the Chief Executive has been a growing public disenchantment with the way the President has handled his relations with Congress. This is the trend since January:

[In percent]

August 1970:	
Positive	29
Negative	57
Not sure	14
July:	
Positive	37
Negative	52
Not sure	11
February:	
Positive	42
Negative	40
Not sure	18

One reason why Congress has been able to at least temporarily win its battle against the President is that the issues of health and education, along with pollution control, are just about the only areas in which the American people are willing to see more of their tax dollars spent these days.

The thrust of Mr. Nixon's TV appearances this past summer has been to bring his case on Cambodia before the American people or to explain his vetoes of congressional legislation. Certainly when he kept his word on bringing American troops out of Cambodia by the end of June, he was given much credit by the public.

Yet, something happened to Mr. Nixon's credibility in the process, as the following result indicates:

"As far as the war in Vietnam and Cambodia is concerned, do you think President Nixon has been frank and straightforward about the war, or do you think he has not told the American people the real truth about the situation there?"

[In percent]

Been frank, straightforward:	
August	39
July	48
May	42
Not told people real truth:	
August	49
July	38
May	46
Not sure:	
August	12
July	14
May	12

While a minority held that Mr. Nixon "has not hidden anything" or "he tells what he can within security bounds," a plurality volunteered that "he is hiding a lot" or "what the boys out there tell us is something different."

REFORM OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a Congressman receives an interesting proposal from a constituent whose discontent with the inadequacies of our governmental system has generated constructive thought. Usually the complaints are heard, but words tend to die away at the thought of action. Not so with Mr. James E. Christian of Walnut Creek, Calif. He has found himself to be one of the parent silent majority. Yet for Mr. Christian, silent has come to mean concern. Realizing the plight of an American society seemingly content with allowing itself to slowly succumb to its own self-perpetuated ills, Mr. Christian has turned his concern into concepts: ideas for change, for a type of reform that will hopefully instill a new hope in the vast young silent majority—the leaders of a few years hence whom we cannot now afford to lose.

Mr. Christian's challenging proposal deals with reform of the electoral process. I call the attention of my colleagues to its carefully thought our suggestions.

The letter follows:

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF., *October 4, 1970.*

JEROME R. WALDIE,
Congressman, Cannon Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: Several years ago, while I was active in the Walnut Heights Property Owner's Association, you were responsive to our requests and submitted and steered a bill through the State Legislature. This bill made it possible for citizens to call for an election to decide whether or not Drainage Zones with attendant taxes would be formed in our county. Previous to your bill, these tax districts could be formed by majority vote of the County Board of Supervisors with no confirmation by voters of the tax district required.

More recently, approximately two years ago, you were extremely helpful in obtaining a compassionate re-assignment in the United States for my son who was in Vietnam, and whose wife and infant son were both quite ill.

I remind you of these instances not only to identify myself in your mind, but to illustrate to those of my personal friends receiving a copy of this letter that you are responsive to your constituency and that it is possible for a small individual citizen to have his voice heard by his government.

In one of your recent news letters you wrote at some length of your efforts to unseat Speaker John McCormick at the beginning of this session of Congress. You referred to the Congress as a "special interest" group and spoke of its inflexibility and resistance to change inherent in the seniority system. It took much political courage for a new representative to act as you did, and I commend you. I also commend you for pin-pointing what I believe is the most important source of dissatisfaction among our young people today. I am speaking not of the radical, violent left among the university students and minority groups, but of the great "silent majority" of youth from the middle class and lower middle class people. They contend strongly, and I believe rightly so, that our government is not *responsive to the people as a whole.*

My son John, 23, attended the University of California at Santa Barbara last winter and will return this fall as a senior. During the last two quarters he had the misfortune to live in the Isla Vista area which was the center of so much unrest. It is not possible for those of us who were not there to understand fully what it was like for those of the "young silent majority" to be caught in the cross fire between the relatively few spoiled brats of the radical left who were willing to burn the Bank of America and the overreaction of the police from Santa Barbara and Los Angeles counties. I do feel strongly,

that while the radical left gained few active supporters for their revolutionary cause, the police and the local and state government officials lost many supporters from among the "young silent majority" by their unbridled repressive measures in the Isla Vista community. Repression by a police state is a poor substitute for the anarchy of the revolutionaries whether they be Communist inspired or simply bent upon destruction. Intelligent young people like I consider my son to be, and the sons and daughters of many people like me are not going to accept police repressions as an alternative to anarchy.

To argue that "the students started it" or that "the police can't tell the good kids from the bad" avoids the issue. The point is, some things in our society are rotten; many of our young adults know it, and are unwilling to accept it. The main problem seems to me to be the one you have pinpointed. Our government, especially at the lower levels, is not responsive to orderly change initiated by the people. It is responsive primarily to organized special interest groups that can bring political pressure to bear upon our elected representatives by giving money to support their political campaigns or threatening to withhold support. As a result our elected representatives either must be very wealthy in their own right in order to be their "own man" so to speak, or they must be realistic and compromise many times the best interests of all the people for the benefit of this or that special interest group.

"Special interest" groups are the people that get things done in this country, or conversely, prevent things from being done. Much of the strife in our country today is due to the "special interest" groups, whether they are left or right in the political spectrum, being willing to place their specific selfish interest above that of the country as a whole. No wonder that old fashioned "4th of July" type of patriotism appears to have died. We have become a nation of many powerful parts, lacking sufficient cohesion to bind them into a reasonably unified whole body.

When our young people see a whole nation being brought to its knees by strikes, see executives convicted of violations of restraint of trade laws, see highway lobbies resisting use of gas tax funds to further development of mass transportation, illustrations are endless, they see a nation in which only powerful organized groups, right or left, good or bad, are effective. The unorganized "people" have no voice.

If my foregoing analysis is largely correct, and admittedly it is vastly oversimplified for the sake of brevity, then in order for our government to become responsive to the "silent majority", whether young or old, we must change our election laws so our representatives can respond to the will of the whole people rather than the will of the Teamster's Union or General Motors. Concurrent with this, the "parent silent majority" must cease being silent and become involved. They must realize the "youthful silent majority" does not have the same goals we had in our youth, and that changes in the old order are coming. For the benefit of my personal friends receiving a copy of this letter, I am attaching articles by Henry Ford II, and John D. Rockefeller III, that I came upon recently. They beautifully cover the subject of the great drive for changes abroad in the entire world today, and the unresponsiveness of our government and society of "big" groups.

With respect to our election procedures, much of our youth feels that our National Convention system must go. To watch and listen to adult men and women carry on as they do, to see television network commentators and programers attempting to influence the choice of candidates by when and where they are given exposure fills many of our youth with disgust and a sense of revulsion. I feel exactly the same way.

When I inquire how candidates should be selected, my son and his friends reply, "by primary elections." They bog down however when they try to decide how a person qualifies to run in the primary elections. Frankly, I am unable to come up with a specific procedure, but I have a few ideas to present to you for consideration.

At the very outset, a politically motivated man would declare himself as a potential candidate of a "major" political party. The word "major" must be defined precisely with the object in mind of preserving a two party system, but not limit it to two parties. However, I feel there should be a limit of three parties. We can not permit a large number of splinter parties to develop with each polarized around their "special interest" group for the obvious reasons that no government so constructed could ever develop a positive sense of direction. Italy today is an example of this. Surely all politically aware people could find an endurable situation in a "Left", "Right", and "Center", party if two parties would not suffice.

After a person declared his proposed party affiliation he would then obtain signatures on a petition endorsing his candidacy from at least 10% of the registered voters who have registered themselves as members of that party. To obtain this 10% is going to call for attending some party meetings and caucuses to gain the support of the party organization in this initial phase so that groups of people can be contacted readily to facilitate and obtain the signatures. "Special interest" groups would be very active and influential at this point, and might influence two or three potential candidates within the same major party grouping. All the money that any group wishes to spend for media to reach the people could be spent at this point. There are certainly more than ten "special interest" groups so some "wheeling and dealing" would no doubt take place between groups to assure getting "their man" the required signatures to qualify.

Much thought would have to be given to how this "potential" candidate qualification procedure would function from local to state to national levels, but it does not seem insurmountable.

The "potential" candidate qualification period would be limited to 90 days. The primary election would follow in 45 days. During this period preceding the primary election all election expense would be borne by the public treasury. Predetermined sums commensurate with realistic need would be allocated to each candidate to be used as his organization sees fit. Television time would be available only for state and national offices, and allocation of TV time would be controlled by an election commission of stature such as the FTC, ICC, and FAA, to prevent candidates appearing at exactly the same prime time spots. The people should not have to choose which candidate they want to hear. They should be able to hear all candidates.

City and county candidates would have to make a real effort to go to the people. A special section of the newspapers would carry the ads of all candidates. No billboards. Local TV spot "catch phrase" commercials prohibited. Local radio time allocation by the local arm of the election commissions selected above. Consequently local candidates would have to use radio to speak at length on issues, and sell the idea of people attending their rallies in person. Local schools and government auditoriums available to all at no cost.

Why this elaborate procedure? To make it possible for educated people of modest financial means to be elected to public office without becoming subservient or politically obligated to more than 10% of the registered voters of his party affiliation. He could be "his own man" after the primary to a much larger extent than is now possible. He could then be responsive to the people if he is subsequently elected in the general election.

The general election would follow in 45 days. Incidentally, primary and general elections would be held from Saturday 6:00 p.m. to Sunday 6:00 p.m. so all people would have equal opportunity to vote. All expenses would again be paid from the public treasury.

TV media would again be controlled by the election commission. Special interest group activity limited to direct mailing for which they would pay full postage rates. Special interest groups would have to subordinate their interests to the whole. They would have to curry the favor of the candidate instead of the candidate seeking their endorsement. This situation might play into the hands of the politician willing to take the undertable favors of a special interest group, but I doubt many would take the risk because he would have to compete with several others in the next primary election. Elections for city and counties would be every two years, state and national elections every four years. City and counties need to be more flexible to meet minor changes in society having impact upon our daily lives.

I have made it sound so simple, haven't I? You ought to be able to draw up a bill and get it through Congress by the end of the year! Such thing is of course, worse than absurd. Mr. Waldie, what I propose is a Herculean task and I know it. However, in this current session of Congress men like yourself have dared to speak out. Who are these men? Could you be instrumental in organizing them and then refine the general suggestions made above into a workable and constitutionally legal procedure. Perhaps you feel that my suggestions are unworkable. If so, what thought have you given to the problem of the government's unresponsiveness, and how can people like myself be helpful?

By what ever means such a reform proposal is developed, the responsibility to sell it to the people would pass to people like myself. Demand for these reforms would have to spring from the bottom up, not the top down. I believe it is possible to accomplish this without a formal organization and huge sums of money by utilizing something akin to the chain letter. One man writes his Congressman and local assemblymen at the state and county level advising him to support this program. He sends 10 copies of this letter to 10 personal acquaintances—five on a local level and five others to acquaintances scattered throughout the country. Hopefully each of his friends will follow through and do likewise, etc. Naturally it would be the ultimate in wishful thinking to believe all would do so, but if only 25% of those receiving such a letter followed through, in six months time the power generated would dwarf the atomic bomb. Representatives at all levels would unquestionally hear the voice of the people. They would have no choice but to respond.

I believe Henry Ford II has correctly analyzed our situation. We are at a major crossroads in history. Either the "silent majority" speaks through democratic procedures and becomes active and responsible enough to be deserving of the fruits of a free society or anarchy, or fascism, will fill the world which we have allowed to develop by our apathy.

Young people today see the "squeaking wheel gets the grease" method as the one that pays off in a society dominated by "big" groups. Change and progress seem possible only by "protest and pressure". The young of all species of life learn primarily by the examples set by the elders of their species. If we believe in the dream of our

forefathers that the people are capable of governing themselves, then clearly the burden of proof and demonstration rest upon we members of the "parent" silent majority.

At this moment, my son, John, strongly believing that election procedures must be changed, cynically feels that I must be crazy to think that members of Congress (beneficiaries of the present system) are going to aid in bringing about that change. He feels it would be impossible to secure a majority of the Representatives and Senators to vote for a Constitutional amendment that might ultimately put them out of office. He will be right if we fail to generate an irresistible and orderly demand for that change by the masses of people putting pressure upon present elected officials to do so.

You have demonstrated in the past that you are a skillful politician (after all, you are a Democrat and I have been a registered Republican all my life) and in tackling the seniority system last winter you showed some qualities of statesmanship. Will you and others in Congress of like thinking give this idea consideration? If you feel it is a worthwhile goal and is within the realm of possibility to achieve, will you provide the direction on a non-partisian basis that would be needed?

It took more than a few minutes to frame this letter. I shall not expect an immediate reply, however, I will appreciate a reply over your signature rather than from a member of your office staff.

With many thanks and much appreciation for your past help when I have called upon you, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. CHRISTIAN.

SHERIFF'S SHERIFF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, today's nationwide cry for law and order poses the problem of finding the most able men in the field to provide leadership to accomplish this objective. These same men, many times, carry the responsibility of rehabilitating those in county jails who may need assistance. Progressive leadership can be found in the ranks of today's law enforcement officials.

One such officer, is Michael N. Canlis, sheriff-coroner of San Joaquin County, Calif. Mike has been in the forefront for many years, fostering programs to rehabilitate prisoners. I would like to record here a reflection of this man's philosophy which appeared in an article in the Sacramento Bee newspaper of July 19.

Before requesting that this news article be printed, I would first like to give you some background on this sheriff of sheriffs, a title that seems appropriate for Mike, who was elected this year as president of both the California State and National Sheriffs Associations. The Ford Foundation recently established the police development fund to support efforts by police departments to upgrade their performance in law enforcement and the administration of justice. This is the largest private agency in the country concerned exclusively with police work, and Mike Canlis was selected to serve as a charter member of its board of directors. Mike is past president of the California Peace Officer's Association; has been past president and is presently an officer in many law enforcement organizations, State, Federal, and local

He entered the sheriff's department January 6, 1939, and has served as sheriff-coroner since 1960. He was appointed by the Governor, and is presently serving his fifth term as one of two public members of the California State Board of Corrections. He was a member of the Governor's Commission on Preemption and the Law and the Joint tion of Justice. He is a member of the California Delinquency Prevention Commission, Professional Advisory Panel of the California Council on Crime and Delinquency, member of the National Association of Counties Crime and Public Safety Steering Committee, Attorney General's Community Relations, and many other National and State advisory boards and commissions.

In addition, he is a member of the board of trustees of the Pacific Center for Western Historical Studies, member of the board of trustees of the San Joaquin Pioneer and Historical Society, and serves as director of many community, civic, and charitable organizations and is affiliated with numerous others. He is president of the Stockton Rotary Club.

He also serves as a member of the board of directors of the California Crime Technological Research Foundation and is a member of the American Social Health Association Drug Abuse Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will find the Sacramento Bee article written about my good friend Mike Canlis as thought-provoking as I, and may appreciate this man's concern when he says, "You gotta' change."

The article follows:

SHERIFF IN STOCKTON SHOWS A CONCERN

(By Douglas Hope)

STOCKTON.—Michael N. Canlis sometimes does things that raise eyebrows among his colleagues in law enforcement.

Things like unlocking jail cells every day to let 200 prisoners go to work or attend school.

Things like giving a citation to a young mother, instead of putting her in jail, when she has been caught in an amateurish shoplifting attempt.

Things like sending a sergeant out to ask a housewife if the deputies who just answered her complaint about a vicious dog were attentive, courteous and wore their hats when they came to her house.

"You gotta change," says Canlis, and these are some of the ways he does it.

Not all his colleagues may agree with the way he changes things, but when both the California State and National Sheriffs Associations named new presidents within the last month, the names were the same: Michael N. Canlis, sheriff of San Joaquin County.

National attention is not new to Canlis. His innovative programs are known to law enforcement executives through national conferences and workshops and their personal visits to San Joaquin County. Best known is a work furlough program, currently involving 200 county jail prisoners, under which inmates are released during the day so they may retain their jobs, contribute to the support of their families—and pay room and board to the county.

There are others, among them: A cadet training program which gives promising high school graduates part-time jobs and in-service experience while they go to college; a school attendance program, similar to work furlough, under which 23 prisoners recently earned their high school diplomas; and the issuance of citations rather than arrest and jail for certain misdemeanors, chiefly shoplifting.

These programs and the approach they reflect would seem to qualify Canlis under his own definition of the ideal modern policeman: "A man who's aware of his fellow man, and concerned about him.

"If I didn't capsulize it like that, I'd have to say a man who was educated to this point, who is physically able to that extent—and these are things that are really not as important as that I know you're a human being, and that you are there and that I do have a concern."

SOME UNHAPPY

Canlis is aware this kind of philosophy sometimes angers persons who argue for a single-minded, get-tough approach by police.

"People bug me when they mistake humaneness and common sense for softness—nothing could be further from the truth," he says. "For example, if we issue a citation to a mother of two children instead of sending her to jail for shoplifting, we've saved her from an exposure whose severity far outstrips the punishment required by law—and we've kept her out of a system (jail and probation) that is not noted for its successes."

But Canlis cautions a newsman: "Don't make me sound like a social worker. I'm a policeman and I want to sound like a policeman."

And he does when he talks about how to control civil disturbances on and off campus.

"The answer, truly, to the problems that confront us today is more policemen, and until such forces get organized in sufficient size, this problem is always going to confront us."

Or when he talks about the crime rate:

"Crime just must be considered in the true perspective of the disruptive forces in our society, and when it is so considered you'll find that it's second only to war . . . Crimes of all types have reached incredible proportions which have far outstripped in contagion any communicable disease which you would long ago have considered epidemic and pledged your total energy to eradicate."

On citizen support for law enforcement:

"First, people must become involved to report crimes, to associate with the law enforcement agency and let the lawless elements of the community know that they care, and that they will insist that all people obey the law."

PROFESSIONALISM

Law enforcement, Canlis is fond of saying, has advanced "to a level of reasonably competent mediocrity" and requires increased professional competence and public moral and financial support to make further progress.

Change is essential to progress, and one of the marks of progress is the provision of options: New ways to treat offenders, as in his workfurlough and school programs; new equipment to give the policeman more and better ways of dealing with problems; better educated and trained personnel who can respond in a variety of appropriate ways to differing situations.

The same man who deals with the armed hoodlum, he points out, also must handle situations involving the long-haired social protester, the noisy neighbor and the picket line of housewives pushing baby buggies around a supermarket.

Today's policeman, he says, spends 25 per cent of his time making decisions about how to handle varying problems. Many times it is impossible to teach him a pat answer—for instance, what degress of response to use with an angry crowd whose insults may escalate to real violence.

"All we can do is sharpen his thought processes to where he can make a good decision . . . everybody else has already made their decision. They're going to throw the rocks, or the firebomb, or shoot . . . and he has to react.

"So first, we try to select those persons we can train . . . we give him situations in training and we keep available as much information as possible in intelligence to keep him aware of what the tenor is . . . then we provide him with every kind of equipment the community can afford, so he has the option of using a club, or Mace, or his handcuffs, or his physical abilities—or his articulate defense."

Canlis's own deputies soon will be testing a new option, possibly an effective middle course between shooting a fleeing suspect or letting him escape. The new device is a gun which shoots a soft wad that strikes with the force of a sharp blow and marks the target with an indelible dye—but does not penetrate the skin.

Using another favorite description, Canlis says, "Law enforcement has become the front-line instrument of government . . . it has been our heritage to inherit the problems of our society which no other agency of government can immediately cope with or control."

In 1970 that means social protesters who, he says, use police as a foil to dramatize their causes. "They would have no confrontation if they didn't have us, because everybody else would run away. And we haven't run away. So our honor is intact."

Lack of preparedness, particularly a shortage of manpower, has forced police to adopt "almost military" tactics in response to demonstrations and resistance by social protesters, Canlis says.

While experience has shown that an early showing of massive force will prevent or delay violent protest, he says, police get to the scene too late, too few, too often. And once a demonstration has gotten out of hand, military tactics—the "sweep", an instance—may be the only answer.

"This is not, in my opinion, the role of police in a society as developed as completely as this one," Canlis says. "There's got to be another answer."

MUTUAL AID

In California, at least a partial answer may be a revision of the mutual aid system under which local law enforcement agencies are bound to aid each other in crisis situations. This arrangement was adequate in days when the crises were infrequent and short-lived, he says, but has become a crushing financial burden in times of civil unrest and enduring tensions.

"Los Angeles spent . . . hundreds of thousands . . . to send the major portion of the force to Isla Vista, but the people of Los Angeles are not really involved with the temper of that very small community."

Canlis would like to see two major changes: A buildup of state-paid campus police forces at places like the University of California at Berkeley where the existing "token force is unrealistic;" and state reimbursement of local governments for the costs of aiding their neighbors.

He also would like to see the state buy and stockpile in strategic locations such expensive riot-control gear as mobile command posts.

He is encouraged by the type of men now being attracted to law enforcement.

"These are bright, articulate young people who are better educated, who can assume these differing roles with some ease, who are not fixed in their opinions, who seem to be able to flow rather than inject themselves into a situation, who are understanding."

These changes, he argues, would free local funds for a necessary buildup of regular police forces and speed the dispatch of men and equipment when mutual aid still was necessary. The goal would be prevention before serious trouble develops.

At the same time, Canlis says, any attempt "to enforce the law before it was broken or challenged" would be contrary to the police role in a democracy. The purpose of preserving order is to preserve the right of dissent as well as to protect lives and property.

"The only one who guarantees your right to dissent is that thin blue line, that almost unbelievably small force of local law enforcement agencies," Canlis says. "Nobody else is doing it—that is, in a meaningful, physical everyday sense."

One of the things that keeps "the thin blue line" thin, Canlis says, is the existence of too many laws and too many police responsibilities which have nothing to do with crime fighting.

"It's ridiculous that it takes hundreds of thousands of laws to enforce the Ten Commandments," he says. "The courts are bogged down. The system of criminal justice was never designed to handle this morass that is being injected into it. They can't possibly do it. And the frightening fact is that most of the criminals are free and unknown to the system."

Canlis believes the sheriffs associations, both state and national, can be effective tools for helping law enforcement upgrade its professional skills. As head of the 23,000-member National Sheriffs Association, Canlis will make his voice heard in appearances before congressional committees during consideration of anti-crime and police-aid bills.

COMMUNICATION

He also intends to improve communications among association members and form at least two new committees, one on standards and ethics and a second on the application of new scientific and technological developments to crime fighting.

Such communication is vital, he indicates, otherwise the mere "need for bodies" to maintain law and order could result in stagnation and a perpetuation of the status quo in police methods. Americans—"who have never made a major commitment to law enforcement"—must demand and pay for a raising of police standards as part of the war on crime, Canlis declares.

Fighting crime in a democratic society, he says, requires more than just getting tough.

"This is not a shoot-'em-up society," he says. "Our society right now is telling us to stop shooting because there's got to be a better way. We think there is, too."

A BAD RISK

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the Washington Post by Art Buchwald indicates why Congress is studying the policy of some insurance companies:

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: A BAD RISK

(By Art Buchwald)

There has been a rash of automobile insurance cancellations lately by the major companies, and everyone is very nervous about it. The other day my wife was notified that her auto insurance policy was being canceled. The notification gave no reason for the cancellation, and since my wife had not been in an accident, she was preplexed.

She asked me to get to the root of it and I took the next plane to visit our insurance company. The company is housed in a 56-story aluminum and tinted-glass skyscraper on a 30-acre shopping plaza overlooking most of the state of Connecticut.

I arrived on the 35th floor where one made inquiries concerning canceled insurance policies. After browsing through the company literature, which told how insurance was making America great, I was ushered into the office of Clyde Featherstone.

I gave Mr. Featherstone the cancellation notice and he clucked once or twice and then disappeared. He returned in a few moments with the folder.

"What did my wife do wrong?" I demanded.

"Your wife didn't do anything wrong. Her records are all up to snuff."

"Then why did you cancel her insurance?"

"Because of Trembling and Trembling, her insurance agent."

"Trembling and Trembling?" I said.

"Yes," said Featherstone, going through the folder. "They've been very naughty boys, very naughty indeed."

"Did they steal any money?" I asked.

"Worse! They've written too many policies this year that people have made claims on. We've had to pay out $1,897 to Trembling and Trembling clients in the last 12 months."

"But what's that got to do with my wife's insurance policy? She didn't get any of the money."

"Ah, but since you are with Trembling and Trembling *you* are now considered a bad risk. Their record is your record."

"That's nonsense. I hardly know Trembling and Trembling," I protested. "I wouldn't recognize them if I saw them on the street. This is guilt-by-association."

Featherstone smiled, "You came to us through Trembling and Trembling and you will leave with Trembling and Trembling. This company will not put up with people who make insurance claims against it."

"But that's what you're here for," I said. "To pay people off when something happens."

"That's a foul lie," said Featherstone, losing his smile. "We're here to build buildings and real-estate developments, and finance ships and airplanes and ball parks. If we keep paying out claims, where would we get the money to construct this 56-story building with its beautiful shopping plaza and underground computer center?

"Do you realize," said Featherstone, "that every dollar we pay out in a claim is a dollar we have to take away from our advertising budget, which tells the public what wonderful insurance people we are?"

"I appreciate all that," I said, "but surely you have to pay some claims in order to stay in the insurance business."

"That's what Trembling and Trembling thought," Featherstone said, as he tore up my wife's folder.

I thanked Featherstone for his kindness and understanding. He got up to shake my hand. "If you're staying in town for dinner we have a great restaurant on the roof garden which is bringing us 15 per cent profit a year."

OPERATION EARTHSHINE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on October 3 I joined with Scouts and

area residents in cleaning up trash in the Essex area. The day-long project, named Operation Earthshine by the two Essex high school girls who conceived the idea, was deemed a great success by those who saw the results.

The project was the idea of Denise Bonner and Kathy Allen—both students at Kenwood Senior High School in Essex. These girls worked long hours during the summer coordinating the participation of Scout troops and other young volunteers. Clean up was conducted at five locations, one of which was the Essex bank of Back River which I explored early this summer to find sources of pollution in the river.

Four local improvement associations agreed to help out with the project: The Essex Improvement Association, the Foxridge Civic Association, the Middleborough Civic Association, and the Goodwood Improvement Association. Each group donated $25 to the effort, in addition to providing workers.

Six local Girl Scout troops and a Boy Scout troop participated: Girl Scout Troops No. 13, No. 408, No. 1120, No. 587, No. 1201, and No. 446; and Boy Scout Troop No. 745.

Local businesses were exceptionally cooperative in donating time, goods, and services. The refuse was hauled away by Robb Tyler, Inc., and the Seaboard Salvage Co., both of Baltimore.

I plan to use Operation Earthshine in Essex as a model for other communities in my district to follow and I should like to commend the hard work of Denise Bonner and Kathy Allen—as well as the many other young volunteers—by informing my collegues in the House of Representatives of their fine effort. The following press release, which I issued after Operation Earthshine, details the scope of this outstanding community effort by Essex young people and adults:

OPERATION EARTHSHINE

Rep. Clarence D. Long (D., Md.) today joined scouts and residents in cleaning up trash in the Essex area. The day, named "Operation Earthshine" by the Kenwood High School students who conceived the idea, was deemed a great success by Rep. Long because of widespread communitly involvement to fight pollution.

I'm going to try to get every improvement association in my district to follow the fine example set by Essex residents in cleaning up Maryland, Rep. Long said. Long pointed out that this type of operation not only helps clean up the environment, but once a boy or girl has spent a day cleaning up this kind of trash, he will join the expandi g ranks of people who are permanently indoctrinated against themselves littering the landscape.

The Maryland Congressman led Boy Scouts from troop #745 to the section of Back River which he explored early this summer to find sources of pollution in the River. At that time, he found the following debris in the short space of 60 yeards: a piece of broken furniture, a drum, an old tire, an auto wheel drum, broken beer bottles, a bedspring, broken glass, a chromium car strip, steel mesh, some springs, three springs from a car seat, broken bottles, two more car seat springs, a steel frame, a tire, a steel auto drum, a tire, more beer cans, anothr car seat spring, the hood of an auto, corrugated sheet metal, an auto seat cushion, aluminum molding, an old shirt, mattress stuffing, rusted iron molding, two more car seat springs, an auto steering wheel, rotten canvas, an auto steering column, and a 55-gallon oil drum. Today's "Earthshine" effort was planned to clean away much of this trash.

In addition, clean-up work was done at four other locations, Rep. Long said. Crews met on Eastern Avenue by the Middlesex Shopping Center, on Old Eastern Avenue, on Hyde Park Road, and on Virginia Avenue in Essex and proceeded from these bases to remove trash which had been left by careless litterbugs. Girl Scout Troops participating were: #13, #408, #1120, #587, #201, and #446.

Rep. Long said the Operation Earthshine project was the idea of two Kenwood High School girls—Kathy Allen and Denise Bonner. Four local improvement associations agreed to help out with the project: The Goodwood Improvement Association, The Essex Improvement Association, the Foxridge Civic Association and the Middleborough Civic Association. Each group donated $25 to the effort, in addition to providing workers.

Rep. Long reported that local businesses were exceptionally cooperative in donating time, goods and services:

MacDonald's donated 150 hamburgers and 150 packages of French fries.

Gino's donated 240 hamburger patties and 240 hamburger rolls which the kids cooked.

The Baltimore Coca-Cola Bottling Company donated 10 cases of Cokes.

Robb Tyler, Inc. donated trash receptacles and pick-up service to remove the trash.

Jack Goodman, owner of Seaboard Salvage Company, donated 4 large dump trucks and 7 men to haul away big trash from Back River and elsewhere.

Deep Creek Junior-Senior High School donated the use of kitchens to cook the hamburgers and store the Cokes.

Dolphin Yacht Basin donated a large boat to use in removing trash on Back River.

THE QUESTION OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR FORMOSA—TAIWAN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lungchu Chen, Secretary for External Affairs of World United Formosans for Independence, has sent me copies of an explanatory memorandum on "The Question of Self-Determination for Formosa—Taiwan" and a proposed U.N. resolution on "Self-Determination for Formosa—Taiwan."

In a statement prepared earlier this year and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I considered the plight of the Formosan people and the need to breathe life into their right to determine their political future.

The national security of the United States does not require the United States to determine who governs each nation of the world or what geographical area should or should not be sovereign. Many of us are working to decrease the need for untrammeled national sovereignty and for wider international cooperation.

But until international harmony becomes more widespread our country cannot ignore legitimate claims to nationhood, especially when such claims are a viable alternative to incorporation into a closed society such as mainland China or continuation of a rightwing dictatorial regime. Formosa—Taiwan—presently is not governed with the consent of its citizens. This is not a reason to surrender it to China. But neither should we be content with the status quo wherein the United States actively supports the dictatorial Nationalist Chinese regime on Formosa.

There is a third alternative and Dr. Chen's materials describe it—self-determination for Taiwan:

THE QUESTION OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR FORMOSA (TAIWAN)

(Prepared by the World United Formosans for Independence)

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

1. For more than twenty years now, the United States has failed to resolve the question of China in the U.N. This is largely attributable to the fact that Formosa, also known as Taiwan, has too often been misidentified as "China." Fundamentally speaking, "China" is not at issue, because it is quite clear who governs the 800 million people on the China mainland. The real issue is Formosa, whose legal status has remained undetermined since the 1951 Peace Treaty with Japan terminated Japan's "right, title and claim" over the island.

2. Formosa ("a beautiful island" in Portuguese) is a hundred miles off the southeast coast of mainland China. (Unless otherwise specified, Formosa is meant to include the Pescadores, and is used interchangeably with Taiwan). Of the 14 million inhabitants on Taiwan, 12 million are native Formosans (Taiwanese) whose ancestors began to settle in Formosa four centuries ago from southeastern China to be free from authoritarian Chinese rule, and 2 million are Chinese, who fled to Formosa with Chiang Kai-shek in 1949 when the Chinese Communists took over the Chinese mainland.

3. From its inception Asian and European Powers sought to make Formosa their colony. During the seventeenth century, foreign powers, notably the Portuguese, Spaniards and the Dutch, as well as dissident Chinese forces, vied for control of the island. In 1683 the Ch'ing Dynasty of China nominally annexed Formosa and kept it under very loose control for about two centuries. In fact, in 1871 the Ch'ing government of China stated to Japan that Formosa was "outside its jurisdiction" and thus it could not be held responsible for what Formosans had done to Japanese nationals in Formosa. Not until 1887 did the Ch'ing government proclaim Taiwan a province of China. But shortly afterward, defeated in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–1895, China ceded Formosa to Japan and agreed to Korea's "independence" by the Treaty of Shimonoseki concluded in 1895. Hence, from 1895 to 1945, Formosa was ruled by Japan.

4. When Japan surrendered, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Command in the Pacific, General Douglas MacArthur, authorized the Nationalist Chinese authorities to accept the surrender of Formosa from the Japanese and to temporarily undertake military occupation of the island as a trustee on behalf of the Allied Powers, which took place on October 25, 1945. The subsequent atrocities, corruption, deprivations of human rights and maladministration of the Nationalist Chinese occupation authorities were such that Formosan rage exploded on February 28, 1947, after the Chinese police killed a Formosan woman for selling untaxed cigarettes. During the "2–28 Incident," as the event is remembered by Formosans, about 20,000 Formosan leaders from all walks of life were seized, tortured and then brutally massacred in March, 1947, by the occupation forces and reinforcements sent by Chiang

Kai-shek from the Chinese mainland. The Formosan leaders who survived the genocide by the Chinese occupation forces either went abroad or underground to struggle for self-determination and independence for Formosa. Thus began the worldwide Formosan Independence Movement of today.

5. On January 21, 1949, at the height of the Chinese civil war between the Communists and the Nationalists, Chiang Kai-shek legally resigned as the President of the Republic of China, a post he assumed on May 20, 1948 in Nanking, and was succeeded by then Vice President Li Tsung-jen.

6. On October 1, 1949, the Chinese Communists led by Mao Tse-tung defeated the Nationalist Chinese (Kuomintang) forces headed by Chiang Kai-shek and proclaimed the establishment of the People's Republic of China.

7. Chiang Kai-shek, repudiated by the Chinese people, fled with the remnants of his military and civilian personnel to Formosa in the autumn of 1949. On March 1, 1950, Chiang Kai-shek unconstitutionally and illegally reimplanted himself on Formosa as the "President" of the "Republic of China" and the actual ruler of Formosa. Chiang thus quickly transplanted and coercively and oppressively imposed on Formosa the Nationalist Chinese Constitutional structure designed to govern China replete with the government officials.

8. All of this was done against the wishes of the Formosan people and in defiance of the trust of the Allied Powers, for, at that time, Formosa was legally still a Japanese colonial territory under the Allied military occupation of 1945, as reaffirmed in the Japanese Peace Treaty of 1951. Chiang declared a permanent state of seige under martial law on Formosa justified by the transparent hoax of fighting the Chinese "Communist rebellion." International supervision by means of the Allied Powers Trusteeship was thus illegally and arbitrarily converted into a dictatorship, usurping the sovereign power of the Formosan people.

9. In September 1951 the Peace Conference with Japan was convened in San Franciso: 51 Allied Powers participated. One of its principal tasks was to settle the status of Formosa, Japan's former colony.

10. Since territorial claims are a principal source of conflict in world affairs, it is well recognized that "who renounces what, to whom and when" is to be stated in unequivocal terms in a peace treaty. In this instance, the Peace Treaty with Japan made it clear that Japan renounced all her "rights, tile and claim" to Formosa but the Treaty did not specify any beneficiary. The sovereignty of Formosa was not transferred to either the so-called Republic of China or the People's Republic of China.

11. The decision to keep Formosa's status indeterminate, as stated by the British delegate at the Japanese Peace Conference, was of profound significance:

"The treaty also provides for Japan to renounce its sovereignty over Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. The treaty itself does not determine the future of these islands. The future of Formosa was referred to in the Cairo Declaration but that Declaration also contained provisions in respect to Korea, together with the basic principles of non-aggression and no territorial ambitions. Until China shows by her action that she accepts those provisions and principles, it will be difficult to reach a final settlement of the problem of Formosa. In due course a solution must be found, in accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In the meantime, however, it would be wrong to postpone making peace with Japan. We, therefore, came to the conclusion that the proper treatment of Formosa in the context of the Japanese peace treaty was for the treaty to provide only for renunciation of Japanese sovereignty."

12. In the same vein, shortly after French recognition of the People's Republic of China on January 27, 1964, President Georges Pompidou (then Premier) made it clear on April 23, 1964 that the act of recognition in no way implied French acquiescence to Peking's territorial claim over Formosa. In his view, "Formosa (Taiwan) was detached from Japan, but it was not attached to anyone" under the Peace Treaty with Japan; hence, Formosa's indeterminate status "must be decided one of these days, taking the wishes of the Formosa population into consideration."

13. After the 1951 Peace Treaty with Japan formally ended that nation's sovereignty over Formosa only a mandate from the people living on Formosa could have justified the legitimacy of the continued rule of Formosa by the Chiang's Nationalist Chinese regime. Knowing the free will of the Formosan people, the Chiang Kai-shek regime does not dare hold a plebiscite in Formosa.

14. Taking advantage of the crisis conditions of the post World War II world, the Chiang Kai-shek exiled regime has continued to occupy Formosa illegally by terroristic and police state tactics against the wishes of the Formosan people. The neo-colonialistic domination, subjugation, and exploitation of the people of Formosa by the corrupt Chiang regime has made Formosa a de facto non-self-governing territory under the despotic rule of a foreign invader and aggressor. Formosa is a captive territory.

15. The exiled Nationalist Chinese regime represents neither the people of China nor the people of Formosa. Its specious justification is the fraudulent myth that it is "the only legitimate government of China" and its "sacred" task is to "recover the Chinese mainland." Members of the three national congressional bodies, who were elected on the Chinese mainland in 1947 and 1948 for 3- and 6-year terms and later fled to Formosa, are still in office, in Formosa, without ever having been elected by the Formosan populace.

16. The Formosans comprise over 85% of the island's population yet are allowed only a 3% token representation in the three congressional bodies created on the Chinese mainland before Chiang's flight and now based on Taiwan. The actual figure of Formosan representation is as follows: 32 out of 1448 in the National Assembly (which elects the President and the Vice President), 17 out of 447 in the Legislative Yuan (in charge of legislation and appropriation), and 6 out of 74 in the Control Yuan (empowered to censure, to impeach high government officials, to audit, and to give consent to certain key Presidential appointments).

17. Imposing the reign of terror under a perpetual state of seige (martial law) since 1949, the tyrannical Chiang Kai-shek regime has violated every article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The torture and massacre of tens of thousands of Formosans, the arbitrary imprisonments, dehumanization, and denial of human rights and justice by the Chiang regime have made Formosa a captive garrison state based on provocative militarism. Formosans have no civil rights. There is no freedom of expression and no freedom of association and assembly; and judiciary is under military domination; ex post facto laws are enforced for political acts committed prior to the passage of the prohibition statutes; there is no remission of punishment for political offenses committed by persons underage; leniencies are denied a political offender's family; and there is no parole for political offenders. In sum, there is a total denial of due process of law. As the Chinese Hitler, Chiang Kai-shek has committed and continues to commit crimes against humanity. In 1953, Chiang himself told his KMT party: "If there is no fuhrer-type leader there can be no fatherland and no revolution can be successful."

18. There is, in fact, no China problem. The real issue is Formosa, whose status is yet to be settled.

19. The 14 million people living on Formosa—a larger population than more than two thirds of the U.N. Member States—are self-sufficient and capable of managing their own affairs. They want to become masters of their own destiny and establish a free and independent country of their own.

20. The fundamental principle of self-determination embodied in the Charter has been affirmed and reaffirmed, applied and reapplied in many concrete cases since the United Nations came into being. In its Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 14 December 1960, Resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly declared, among other things, that—

(1) The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

(2) All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

This Declaration, buttressed by numerous other Assembly resolutions and international practice, and the International Covenants on Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly in 1966 have solemnly established that—

All peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. (Article 1, Paragraph 1 of both Covenants)

21. If the principle of self-determination means anything at all in the contemporary world, it means that a plebiscite must be held to ascertain the popular will of the majority of inhabitants on a former colonial territory whose international legal status remains undetermined. The shared demands, aspirations and identity of the people most directly concerned are of decisive importance.

22. The case of self-determination for Formosa is very much like those of former colonial peoples of Asia and Africa. Because of the coincidence that Formosans have the same skin color as their colonial rulers—Japanese before the Nationalist Chinese now—the impact of their case for self-determination is often lost upon the Member States of the United Nations. The one color—one ruler concept does violence to human rights and human dignity which are the bucklers and shields for self-determination. Many of the Member States to whom this request is addressed emerged as independent States through the route of self-determination initiated by the international influence of the United Nations, including holding plebiscites under its direct aegis.

23. Therefore, a legally, politically and morally sound solution to Formosa's indeterminate status is to hold a plebiscite in Formosa. It must be held under the auspices of the United Nations in accord with the principle of self-determination. Only in that manner can the Formosan people freely express their will and determine their future.

24. Only when Formosa becomes free and independent can the China question be answered. There is only one China. When it fulfills the Charter requirements, it should be seated in the United Nations. There is only one Formosa, which should be free and independent.

25. In the light of the foregoing, we urge the Member States to adopt in the 25th General Assembly a Resolution, declaring the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations applicable to Formosa (Taiwan),

particularly the peremptory principle of self-determination. Noting the critical relation of Formosa's status and world peace, the Member States can direct the appropriate U.N. instrumentality to commence the implementation of a plebiscite for Formosa (Taiwan).

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON SELF-DETERMINATION FOR FORMOSA—TAIWAN

The general assembly

Considering that self-determination is a fundamental principle of the United Nations and of World Order,

Recalling the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples contained in its resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960,

Considering its commitment to human rights throughout the world,

Considering its competence to deal with matters of international concern that may threaten the peace of the world,

Recognizing that Formosa (Taiwan) is a former Japanese colony whose international legal status has been left undermined by the post World War II Peace Treaty with Japan,

Deploring that the Chiang Kai-shek's *Kuomintang* (Nationalist Party) regime has continued to occupy Formosa with neither international legal right nor the consent of the people of Formosa,

Noting with grave concern that the continued illegal occupation, neo-colonial domination, subjugation and exploitation of the people of Formosa by the Nationalist Chinese exiled regime contravene purposes and principles of the United Nations,

Confirms

That denying self-determination to the people of Formosa under the perpetual state of siege (martial law) constitutes a threat to the peace;

That the legal, political and cultural status of Formosa are matters of international concern;

That by virtue of the foregoing the plenary jurisdiction of the General Assembly is activated;

Recommends

That an internationally supervised plebiscite be held forthwith on Formosa (Taiwan) to resolve the indeterminate status of Formosa and to decide the form of government desired by the electorate people of Formosa;

That the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples be forthwith directed to supervise the preparations for the plebiscite.

LANAKILA PROVES IT CAN BE DONE ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, history tells us that primitive societies often rid themselves, sometimes violently, of all nonproductive members—the aged, the infirm, the crippled, the sickly. Although our society cares for those who cannot care for themselves, we hear increasing complaints about the public resources committed for that care.

It is my distinct pleasure, therefore, to call attention to Lanakila Crafts, Inc., of Honolulu.

Next week I will have the pleasure of sharing in the 10th anniversary celebration of Lanakila Crafts, a nonprofit, privately operated, totally self-supporting rehabilitation facility serving persons with all types of handicaps.

Lanakila Crafts provides its clients with on-job training in actual work settings focusing on preparing the "client" to become a taxpaying contributor to society.

Last year alone, 70 Lanakila clients were returned to active competitive employment; another 33 became self-supporting through the facility's extended employment program.

What the dedicated staff, officials and supporters of Lanakila's Crafts are engaged in, Mr. Speaker, is the rehabilitation of people. And along the way, they produce some of the more desirable souvenirs of Hawaii.

I would like to share with my colleague and other readers of this journal a most moving and descriptive passage from the latest annual report of Lanakila Crafts:

From the minute a client punches in on the time clock at Lanakila Crafts, he is under a work schedule like any private industry. Whether his job is to sort raffia, string plastic leis, stitch handles onto potholders, sand miniature canoes, tag souvenir items, pack merchandise, or deliver the some 292 products to one of 368 commercial retail outlets, he is a vital link in the Lanakila chain. This actual work experience is preparing him to take his role in the world of competitive employment.

Today he dyes raffia in huge steaming vats . . . tomorrow he boils sheets in a laundry. Today she stitches a bean bag . . . tomorrow she is a seamstress on the assembly line of a muumuu factory.

By selecting Hawaii's growing tourist industry and its need for souvenir items and service skills, Lanakila relates every one of its 27 functions to working in the outside world.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, Lanakila Crafts is a tribute to handicapped persons who possess the will to work, and to the community minded trustees, staff, and supporters who have helped to make this facility such a substantial success over its first full decade of operation. I take this opportunity to congratulate Lanakila Crafts and its trustees in the hope that its 10 years of successful service to the people of Hawaii may serve to inspire others in other communities to similar public service.

DR. C. E. HENNEBERGER HONORED BY THE PEOPLE OF ATWOOD, KANS.

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, recently the people of Atwood, Kans., honored Dr. C. E. Henneberger, an able and dedicated physician and surgeon who has served them for 50 years, and who plans to continue practicing medicine as long as he is able.

There is no man more dedicated to his patients than Dr. Henneberger. Many people believe the days of the house call or after-hours office visit are over, but I can assure you that it still exists, at least in western Kansas.

The demands made on a country doctor are many, and the people of Atwood are indeed fortunate to have such a man as Dr. Henneberger. They are doubly fortunate, for many rural communities have no doctor at all.

The general practitioner sometimes seems to be a thing of the past—the trend in all fields is toward specialization, and medicine is no exception. But we are realizing now what a toll the emphasis on specialization can take on the medical care—we need family doctors who are willing to locate in rural areas.

We in Government are going to have to do something about the medical crisis we are facing today, and I am sure we will. We need more doctors, more hospitals, more money, more help. But, most of all, we need men like Dr. Henneberger, who are willing to give of themselves to help others.

Dr. Henneberger's life serves as an example to young doctors who truly want to help people. We do not ask them to do what he has done—to serve a community for 50 years of muddy roads and sleepless nights—but only to consider the immense satisfaction that can come from serving your friends and neighbors and contributing to their lives and happiness.

I would like to include in the RECORD excerpts from a speech that was given at Henneberger Appreciation Night:

We are here today to honor a very unusual man, a man who is richly endowed by nature, both physically and mentally, a man whose ability as a surgeon would have permitted practice in the hospitals in the great cities of this country, but who chose instead to live the life of a country doctor among us.

We have taken him for granted these many years, and although many of us owe our good health and some of us our very lives to his knowledge, skill and ability, we have not paused to, or known exactly how to, say "thank you" to him.

This is a day set aside in this community to say to Dr. Henneberger, "We do appreciate what you have done for us the first fifty years, and we will let you know later what we think about your next fifty years of service to us." For Dr. Henneberger is not retiring; he loves the practice of his profession too much and the genuine satisfaction he derives from knowing that he has been able to help humanity in a medical way.

His many patients and friends will be pleased to know that he will be in his office tomorrow, and the next day and for the days thereafter, caring for and advising those who come to him. For he does not intend to retire so long as he is capable of helping humanity in a medical way. Physically and mentally alert as a man many years younger, Dr. Henneberger's interest in the practice of medicine is evidenced by his continued study and his regular attendance at many refresher schools and medical seminars each year, and we are grateful to him for his continued ambition to improve and maintain his skills.

He came to Atwood on June 7, 1919, and in 1920 purchased the Luther Home and performed surgical operations with the front room chandalier for his lighting. The building was enlarged and became the Henneberger Hospital, and with his wife Frances as manager, it was operated until about 1942 when they began taking patients to hospitals in neighboring towns.

It was through him that we became interested in a county hospital which was finally dedicated in 1950, and he became the leading

advocate for the construction of a Good Samaritan Home in Atwood, which was finally opened in February, 1962.

To Dr. Henneberger, the Hippocratic Oath, which he took when he was graduated from medical school, is a sacred trust. I have heard Dr. Henneberger say that a doctor's duty is to care for all persons desiring his services, regardless of whether that person can pay for the services and regardless of the character of the person. I am sure it can be said, without fear of contradiction, that Dr. Henneberger never refused to care for any person who needed medical assistance and desired his services.

His collections have not always been good, especially before health insurance of the modern day, and he is one of many doctors who have simply written off thousands of dollars on the books because people were not able to pay. But I am sure he has never refused his services because people were not able to pay him and that a destitute person can still have his services upon request if that person really needs him. Even during the wee hours of the morning, he will get out of his bed and make the call regardless of how tired he is.

We are fortunate in having three good doctors in Atwood, for many communities this size are without the services of a single doctor. There is a genuine need for more people to become general practitioners in the small communities, and let us hope that there will be young doctors so inspired by your worthwhile achievements, Dr. Henneberger, that they will elect to become general practitioners in small towns.

A FLAG OVER CAMP SUGAR PINE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the flags that fly over the U.S. Capitol have a special significance and it is with great pleasure that I send them to institutions of learning and citizen groups for their use.

I recently sent a flag to the Reverend Donald E. Raisner of the Temple Baptist Church in Richmond, Calif., for use at a camp located high in the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Reverend Raisner, an old and dear friend who sadly is leaving Richmond in the near future, wrote a most moving and thoughtful dedication address which I would, at this time, like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

PRESENTATION AND DEDICATION OF THE NEW AMERICAN FLAG TO CAMP SUGAR PINE, OAKHURST, CALIFORNIA, ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1970

The old American flag which has long flown over our Camp Sugar Pine has become tattered and worn. During this Summer of 1970, it looked bad, and the feeling arose that it would be nice to have a replacement, one which had a great deal of particular significance to it. In conversation with Wes Heinrichs, our Camp Manager, the possibility of securing a flag for the camp which had flown over the United States Capitol in Washington, D.C., specifically for Camp Sugar Pine, was raised. If it could be carried out this would be a tremendous thing.

Congressman Jerome R. Waldie, 14th District, California, was contacted by the Rev. Donald E. Raisner, Pastor of the Temple Baptist Church, Richmond, about securing an American Flag for Camp Sugar Pine and having it flown over the Capitol in Washington, D.C. in the name of the camp. On July 25th, Congressman Waldie wrote: "I have already obtained a flag and have requested the Architect of the Capitol to fly it over that edifice for Camp Sugar Pine." Subsequently, Congressman Waldie received the flag with the certification that it was flown over the United States Capitol in the name of Camp Sugar Pine on August 3, 1970. The Architect wrote to him: "This is to certify that the accompanying flag was flown over the United States Capitol. I understand that this flag will be presented to Camp Sugar Pine by the Reverend Donald Raisner, Temple Baptist Church, Richmond."

In making this presentation of the new American Flag with its present significance, I believe that we must weigh the times in which we are living. These are perilous days, with much hatred, violence, and the outward endeavors of an increasing number of people to violently overthrow the government of the United States. It goes without saying that there are many things wrong in our nation today. From the Christian point of view, we must say that sin is running rampant, and that there is very little regard anymore for the moral principles of the Christian religion. The advocates of sin are on the upswing, and the Christians are remaining silent, and at a time when the spokesmen for Jesus Christ must speak out and be heard. This is a day when it should and must be costly to be a Christian, but such a price must be paid if the cause of Christ is to be served. There may be much wrong in our nation, but there is a whole lot more right with our nation. It is not so much the nation that is out of tune, but the people within the nation who have allowed themselves to become degraded, who subsequently would degrade the nation downward to their level of life. This nation is still a great nation, and in principle it is still basically a Christian nation. It stands at a time when it needs the support and undergirding of all of the great citizens that it has, it needs the strength and stamina of its many Christians to stand together united for Christ and for this nation which has afforded to all people far more than any other nation has ever afforded its people, far more freedoms and opportunities, far more prosperity and concern for all, than any other nation presently or previously upon the face of the earth which God has given us. The time has come for a reversal of thinking, and the undying support of the citizenry for this nation, people working together, not to destroy it, but to make it even better and stronger than ever before. We may not always be right, we may not be all right, but we must be trying to make things right, both with our God and with our fellow man.

We are gathered now in presentation and dedication of this new American flag, which has a great deal of significance for us here at Camp Sugar Pine. Let us think of the Flag, what it means and what it represents. On Flag Day, 1940, and reprinted with epilogue on Flag Day, 1970, the New York Times printed the following editorial, and I would like to read it for you as found in the September, 1970 issue of The Reader's Digest:

"What's a flag? What's the love of country for which it stands? Maybe it begins with love of the land itself. It is the fog rolling in with the tide at Eastport, or through the Golden Gate and among the towers of San Francisco. It is the sun coming up behind the White Mountains, over the Green, throwing a shining glory on Lake Champlain and above the Adirondacks. It is the storied Mississippi rolling swift and muddy past St. Louis, rolling past Cairo, pouring down past the levees of New Orleans. It is a lazy noontide in the pines of Carolina; it is a sea of wheat rippling in western Kansas; it is the San Francisco peaks far north across the glowing nakedness of Arizona; it is the Grand Canyon, and it is a little stream coming down out of a New England ridge in which are trout.

"It is men at work. It is the storm-tossed fisherman coming into Gloucester and Provincetown and Astoria. It is the farmer riding his great machine in the dust of harvest, the dairyman going to the barn before sunrise, the lineman mending the broken wire, the miner drilling for the blast. It is the servants of fire in the murky splendor of Pittsburgh, between the Allegheny and the Monongahela, the trucks rumbling through the night, the locomotive engineer bringing the train in on time, the pilot in the clouds, the riveter running along the beam a hundred feet in the air. It is the clerk in the office, the housewife doing the dishes and sending the children off to school. . . .

"It is small things remembered: the little corners of the land, the houses, the people that each one loves. We love our country because there was a little tree on a hill and grass thereon, and a sweet valley below; because the hurdy-gurdy man came along on a sunny morning in a city street; because a beach or a farm or a lane or a house . . . was once, for each of us, made magic. It is voices that are remembered only, no longer heard. It is parents, friends, the lazy chat on a street or in a store or office, and the ease of mind that makes life tranquil. It is summer and winter, rain and sun and storm. These are flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood, a lasting part of what we are, each of us and all of us together.

"It is stories told. It is the Pilgrims dying in their first dreadful winter. It is the Minuteman standing his ground at Concord Bridge, and dying there. It is the Army in rags, sick, freezing, starving at Valley Forge. It is the wagons and the men on foot going westward over Cumberland Gap, floating down the great rivers, rolling over the great plains. It is the settler hacking fiercely at the primeval forest on his new, his own lands. It is Thoreau at Walden Pond, Lincoln at Cooper Union, and Lee riding home from Appomattox. It is corruption and disgrace, answered always by men who would not let the flag lie in the dust, who have stood up in every generation to fight for the old ideals and the old rights, at risk of ruin or of life itself.

"It is a great multitude of people on pilgrimage, common and ordinary people, charged with the usual human failings, yet filled with such a hope as never caught the imaginations and the hearts of any nation on earth before. The hope of liberty. The hope of justice. The hope of a land in which a man can stand straight, without fear, without rancor.

"The land and the people and the flag—the land a continent, the people of every race, the flag a symbol of what humanity may aspire to when the wars are over and the barriers are down. To these each generation must be dedicated and consecrated anew, to defend with life itself if need be, but above all, in friendliness, in hope, in courage, to live for."

Then this epilogue was added in 1970: "This was the meaning of the flag 30 years ago; this is the meaning today. But it is a measure of the bitter divisions of our era that the symbolism of that flag should have become distorted and degraded by the partisan extremists of both New Left and Old Right. The flag must not be captured by the repressive legions of the Right; nor must its meaning be destroyed by the frustrated demagogues of the Left, who find a cheap and easy outlet by reviling it and dragging it in the dust. The flag is a symbol of the unity of America. We must not allow it to be perverted by the forces of disunity, whether

Birchers or Weathermen, that today are abroad in this land."

This flag which is presented to Camp Sugar Pine today must carry with it the meaning of the fullest extent of the greatest elements of our nation. Let us fly it with pride over our Camp: pride in our Nation, pride in our people, pride in ourselves. Therefore, in behalf of our nation, in the meaning and intent of all that is great in our nation, and for Congressman Jerome R. Waldie, I present to you, Mr. Wes Heinrichs, as Manager of Camp Sugar Pine, and representing the camp, its Board and all of the Churches which are a part thereof, as well as its many campers, past, present and future, this American Flag and supporting documents, and this plaque, which should be placed in some significant place at Camp Sugar Pine, and which reads: 'This Flag of the United States of America was flown over the Capitol, Washington, D.C. on August 3, 1970, especially for Camp Sugar Pine, Oakhurst, California: Provided by Jerome R. Waldie, Member of Congress, 14th District, California; and Presented by Rev. Donald E. Raisner, Temple Baptist Church, Richmond, California."

Let us now raise this Flag above our camp, and may we ever fly it with pride and dedication as members of this great United States of America. (May the Flag be Raised)

Let us now rededicate ourselves as Christians and citizens of these United States by repeating together the Pledge to the Flag, and then remain together for a prayer of Dedication.

DONALD E. RAISNER, *Pastor.*

A FORLORN AND SORROWFUL CAUSE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1970, an editorial by Patrick Owens appeared in Newsday lamenting the lack of action this country has taken on improving industrial safety. He contends that:

Workers have been dying wholesale in America's factories and other work places since the first iron works was established in the colonies.

Little has changed in 200 years. While our knowledge of technology has grown at astronomical rates, workers are still dying on the job at a conservative estimate of 14,500 persons annually. Industrial progress has not significantly improved the health and safety of the laborer.

In response, Congress has acted only in the face of violent disasters such as the tragedy at Farmington, W. Va., in which 78 miners lost their lives by giving protection for small groups of workers. Yet, the bulk of this Nation's workforce still has no guarantee of safe and healthful conditions at the place where they spend one-third of their lives.

Those who espouse cleaning up the air outside our homes and factories must expand their cause to include cleaning up the air inside our factories, which is just as crucial to the health and well-being of Americans who work.

Let us not wait for another disaster to move us. I call upon the Members of this body to act promptly and favorably on H.R. 16785, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, which will come to the floor for final action. Let us say that the cause of industrial safety was not "forlorn" in the 91st Congress.

The editorial follows:

A FORLORN AND SORROWFUL CAUSE

(By Patrick Owens)

There is a special poignancy about the laments of the nation's industrial safety crusaders that they have been failed by the environmentalists. Workers have been dying wholesale in America's factories and other work places since the first iron works was established in the colonies. The terrible toll that commerce and industry have taken of our environment doubtless started at about the same time. But this is a big country and it has taken centuries to mess it up so completely that environmental degradation has become a widespread threat to life and health.

The environmentalists are certainly a new phenomenon compared with the advocates of industrial safety. But here is this old and precious cause trying to pig-a-back a ride through Congress on the shoulders of the latest sensation among glamorous movements.

WORKERS' LIVES UNDERVALUED

One can hardly blame the industrial safety advocates, such as Congressman Dominick Daniels of New Jersey, for seeking help wherever they have hope of finding it. His is a forlorn and sorrowful cause because Americans simply do not value the lives of workers very highly. Workers themselves join in under-valuation. In a very high proportion of industrial accidents, the worker is contributorily negligent. Some 14,500 die each year from accidents or illness sustained on the job. This incredible toll could simply not occur in a society which truly believed the things we say in our living rooms about the value of human life.

Truth is, we value lives in proportion to the imagined value of those who live them. We countenance the expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars to keep enfeebled old men technically alive—that is, breathing and taking nourishment, often intravenously—because such old men have inherited or laid up fortunes on this earth.

We tolerate without attention in the public prints the pollution of the nation's textile plants to the point where some 100,000 textile workers are incapacitated annually with "brown lung" disease, an ailment contracted through inhalation of tiny pieces of lint.

Stewart L. Udall complained in these columns a few weeks ago about the failure of the environmentalists to rise to attack such problems. This suggests to me a rather roseate view of the environment movement and its potentialities.

Jerry Mander of San Francisco, a partner in the nation's most creative and socially responsible advertising agency, put the situation in a better perspective in an article in Scanlon's. It was entitled "Six Months and Nearly a Billion Dollars Later, Advertising Owns Ecology" and in it Mr. Mander quoted the calculation of Montana's Sen. Metcalf that during 1969 the public utilities spent "nearly $300,000,000 on advertising, more than eight times what they spent on research, all the while proclaiming in their ads their feats of antipollution research."

Many gallant and dedicated people who do not see ecological problems as a public relations challenge to industry are involved in trying to save our environment. But these almost always lose their battles, despite the hue and cry they are able to raise up. They have been unable to stop Storm King. They are unable to stop the new Con Ed plant in Queens. And five will get you a hundred and ten that they will be unable to stop Long Island Sound from being ringed with nuclear reactors.

A RIFT BETWEEN THE GOOD GUYS

The rift between the environmentalists and the advocates of industrial safety is a dramatic example of the divisions which keep the good guys in the country on opposite sides of the street.

But it is a rift built into our socio-economic structure. It is one thing to agitate for the preservation of an oak tree or a scenic vista. It is quite another to insist that the life of a textile worker is too precious to be sacrificed to brown lung.

In the old southern phrase, the difference is between preachin' and meddlin'. It may occasionally be possible to bulldoze a state or local government to save a chunk of the country from some especially noxious predation. But not, if you notice, when the profit and loss statement of one of the great corporations is at stake. These are always at stake, or imagined to be, in arguments over industrial safety. And that is why the subject is almost never raised.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE MORRIS K. UDALL ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION ACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the last 3 to 5 years there has been a lot of talk about the need to reorder our national priorities; to shift Federal funds from defense and defense related spending to domestic programs. As time has passed and the wastefulness of some of our current defense spending has become obvious, the Nixon administration and the Congress have indeed taken some tentative steps to put our house in order.

For instance, just last week the House of Representatives voted a $2 billion slash in the administration's requested military budget. And, this year we will spend around $73 billion for defense as opposed to $80 billion in fiscal 1969.

Further, it is estimated that by next June, the Federal Government will be awarding only $28 billion worth of new defense contracts. This amount compares to the $34.4 billion figure for the current year and $42.3 billion for fiscal year 1968.

I am in favor of this trend and I believe most Americans would agree with me that the country is on the right track. For instance, businessmen have recognized that a reordering of national spending priorities would have a beneficial effect on our troubled economy.

The myth that capitalism thrives on war has been discredited by our involvement in Vietnam. And no wonder.

It has been estimated that since 1965, when American involvement in Southeast Asia escalated to present levels, corporate profits adjusted for Vietnam induced inflation have dropped 17 per cent. By the same token, the real average wage of the American working man has dropped 2 percent. To date, $113 billion of military expenditures are directly traceable to the Vietnam war and in this year alone we will spend $11 billion of Federal funds to pay the interest on that portion of the budget deficit attributable

to the Vietnam war. Experts in the money markets will tell you that this is the single most significant factor in the record high interest rates we will suffer from and in the steep decline of the stock markets over the last 18 months.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that defense spending is declining and that we seem to be on the road toward substantial if not complete military disengagement from Vietnam is not going to be instantly beneficial to our economy. I anticipate a really agonizing period ahead for many Americans as our economy shifts gears from emphasis on defense and aerospace spending to emphasis on needed domestic programs.

As things stand today, some of the Nation's best companies and more highly educated workers are caught up in the defense spending syndrome. As we move into a period of deep cutbacks in military and space expenditures, the domestic job market is fast becoming glutted with highly educated and skilled scientists, engineers, and technicians. This trend can only accelerate as the budget pinch affects more and more companies.

Of 1,100,000 engineers in this country, it is estimated that 29,000 are now out of work. In 1969 only 4,000 found themselves similarly situated. Since last May, over 16,000 aerospace workers have been laid off. Men accustomed to making between $25,000 and $30,000 each year are having to wash dishes or accept welfare payments just to eat.

To make matters worse, these people find themselves jobless at a time when the non-defense economy is at best stagnant. Today, there is simply no demand for a person who has spent his adult years on missile design, spy satellite control or the studying of the behavior of exotic metals at high altitude.

Nor is the coming dislocation confined to the highly trained defense workers. If all public and private manpower employed as a consequence of Vietnam is released, a total of nearly 2.4 million workers will enter the job market. They will be accompanied by workers displaced by cutbacks unrelated to Vietnam—Pentagon efficiency moves, the loss of local nondefense business when the local defense plant shuts down, and so on. Without a major effort to lessen the coming impact of our defense cutbacks, we could well enter a period of depression at a time when there is a need for economic expansion.

Some will note this problem and dismiss it, pointing out that the Federal Government really should not be in the business of providing work for a labor force that finds demand for its work to be slackening. The conventional wisdom is that our economy is basically one of free enterprise and the forces of the marketplace ought to be allowed to work their collective will on the fate of people who suddenly find themselves out of work. This is fine as far as it goes, but I believe that the Federal Government must share a large part of the responsibility for the lack of employment opportunity now present for defense and aerospace workers.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the military hardware market is one that has been created by the needs of the Federal Government. There is no private market for a new Titan missile or a Sherman tank. By our emphasizing sophisticated military production since the end of World War II we have created a tremendous dependency on the part of many corporations and workers on the military dole. Government, by cutting back its demand for military and aerospace hardware, leaves a void that can only be filled by Government participation. The Federal Government simply must find a way to rechannel these enormously talented people so that our country will have the benefits of their services in the years to come.

That there is now and will be a need for the services of scientists and the like cannot be doubted. We need scientific and technical expertise to show the way in cleaning up the environment. We need scientific and technical expertise to build rapid transit systems that reduce reliance on the automobile that both pollutes and congests. We need scientific and technical expertise to produce low-cost housing to replace the rundown tenements that all too often are found in the ghettos of major cities. We need scientific and technical expertise to produce low cost clean energy and to improve sewage and other services provided by our municipalities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a number of my colleagues in introducing the National Economic Conversion Act. Simply stated, the bill is designed to move both the Federal establishment and defense and aerospace industries into a process of shifting Federal efforts from defense activities to domestic ones. We propose to do this in the following framework.

Create a National Economic Conversion Commission comprised of Cabinet members, heads of selected independent agencies, and representatives of labor and management groups.

Create a conversion fund and require defense and aerospace contractors to deposit 12.5 percent of pretax profits into it. The Federal Government, in turn, pays an annual interest on the amount accumulated and supplements the fund to the degree necessary.

Charge the commission with the job of overseeing the fund and approving conversion plans drawn up by defense and aerospace industry to work on domestic problems such as pollution technology, rapid transit systems, low-cost housing, and so forth.

Allow industry to draw on the conversion fund for use as a capital base in the development of these new programs.

Use a portion of the fund to pay temporary compensation to those workers who are victimized by defense cutbacks.

This bill is not going to be without controversy, but I think it is desperately needed. In recent years, the Congress has been appropriating money for the types of domestic programs that we all recognize are essential. But the appropriation of these moneys is not in and of itself going to involve defense industries in developing these programs.

Take, for instance, our large aerospace firms. The directors and officers of these corporations have a duty to their shareholders to see to it that their profit and loss sheet remains healthy. Since this is the case, the impetus is clearly there for these companies to be pushing for more of the same types of contracts that they now secure from the Federal Government. They are geared up to build airplanes and any attempted transition to a program of building rapid transit systems, for example, could result in deteriorating profits over the next few years.

What we need then is an outside stimulus for these industries to get involved in domestic problems. I view the National Economic Conversion Act as the ideal vehicle to provide this stimulus. If we are successful in passing this legislation, I feel that we will not only pave the way for a smooth changeover from a defense-oriented economy to a domestic one, but that the impetus will be there for increased domestic spending as well. Companies will then have the incentive to do advanced research and development for domestic projects along with defense programs and will in all probability throw their considerable weight behind the increased funding for the former.

I have talked to many scientists and technicians about the concept that we embody in the National Economic Conversion Act, and I can tell you that they are eager to get on with the job of solving Americas' social problems. Our educated manpower is a fantastic resource, one that must not be wasted. If we are to avoid this waste, Mr. Speaker, the legislation that we introduce today will have to be enacted.

HORTON COMMENDS ANTIQUE BOTTLE COLLECTORS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the diversity of interests and hobbies in our country keeps America from becoming stagnant. There are many pressing problems faced by our country, yet it is the special interests of individuals that gives each person a certain dimension.

Such a special interest is collecting old bottles. It is becoming widespread and the diggers have unearthed some very beautiful bottles—amber, blue, green, speckled, and purple—with extremely interesting shapes.

I am pleased that more than 660 members belong to the Genesee Valley Bottle Collectors Association in my area. The club, started in January 1969, is one of the largest devoted to collecting antique bottles, in the Nation. It composes 23 counties in New York and 24 other States and Canada.

John Guttenberg, my constituent, and manager for corporate communications for Xerox, is president of the Genesee Valley Bottle Collectors Association.

At the annual convention of the Federation of Historical Bottle Clubs, John was elected chairman of the federation for 1971 which means Rochester will be

the federation's headquarters during the next year. The federation has 83 member clubs around the country with 13,000 members.

At the convention, the members adopted a resolution supporting H.R. 12284, a bill that would prevent unethical dealers from selling new glass as old glass or misrepresenting bottles as being historical and original.

I would like to insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge my colleagues to support it.

In addition, I would like to share with my colleagues a story from the Wall Street Journal, the Times Union, and an article by John P. Guttenberg which appeared in the Brighton-Pittsford Post, presenting the history behind the hobby.

The story and articles follow:

FEDERATION OF HISTORICAL BOTTLE CLUBS

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 12284 ADOPTED AT THE 2D ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION, ROCHESTER, N.Y., JULY 25, 1970

Whereas, The Federation of Historical Bottle Clubs represents 82 historical bottle collecting organizations across the nation made up of thousands of family and individual collectors with but one single purpose in mind—to preserve in their collections that historical bottle Americana (and of other origins) that strikes their collecting fancies, and

Whereas, The innocents as well as the advanced collectors of this honorable and traditional pastime, that of collecting, have fallen prey to the sellers of bottles of both recent American and foreign manufacture that have been misrepresented as being historical and original, and

Whereas, There is an immediate demand by historical bottle collectors everywhere in this great nation to put an end to those unjust and unethical practices, and

Whereas, There presently is a House Resolution 12284 introduced by the Honorable Louis C. Wyman of New Hampshire and presently sits idly in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce before the Honorable Harley O. Staggers, Chairman, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federation of Historical Bottle Clubs, representing 82 clubs and thousands of individual collectors nationwide, by a unanimous vote of its membership at this convention, petitions the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to bring House Resolution 12284 to a favorable vote and to report it out of Committee to the United States House of Representatives so that the Honorable Representatives of these thousands of Federation member, collectors and the growing numbers of thousands of potential Federation collecting members will surely receive the unqualified support of the House of Representatives for this measure that will protect the nation's third greatest and most respected collecting hobby from the intrusion of unidentified counterfeit historical bottles.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 9, 1970]

QUICK, GRAB A SHOVEL: COLLECTORS PAY LOTS FOR ANCIENT BOTTLES, THEY SEARCH THROUGH DUMPS AND DIVE INTO SUNKEN SHIPS; A CLUE: LOOK NEAR PRIVIES

(By Lester Smith)

A lot of people are willing to pay a lot more than two cents for an empty bottle. There are people, for example, who will pay you $80 for an empty Coke bottle.

Not just *any* Coke bottle, of course. It has to be one made in 1916 or 1917. And don't think you can sneak a 1925 or 1930 bottle in as a ringer. Aficionados know all the markings on old bottles, and they can tell a '17 model from a '25 model with the same ease that a little boy can tell a '62 Dodge from a '63 Plymouth.

And there are plenty of aficionados. Bottle collecting, it seems, is a widespread hobby. There now are so many collectors, in fact, that on a nice day it's hard to find an old dump in this country that isn't overrun with bottle-hunting scavengers. Most of the hunters keep the bottles—they have no real reason for collecting bottles, they say, except that it's a hobby—but some sell them, occasionally for handsome prices.

Most collectors won't tell anyone where they collect. "Does Macy's tell Gimbel's?" asks Mrs. Sylvia McKenzie, a Lowell, Mass., collector. "Dump diggers don't tell anyone where they dig." Edwin Lowe, a Gloucester, Mass., fireman, says the old rubbish heap where he digs "'is my dump, and I won't say where it's located."

But May Jones, a 60-year-old Nara Visa, N.M., woman who is one of the country's champion collectors, does offer amateurs a hint on where to look. Investigate areas around old outhouses, she suggests, because old-timers used to wander out to the privy to sneak a drink. Mrs. Jones doesn't know how many bottles she owns, but she does know she has 5,000 pounds of them. That's how much weight has been added to the trailer she keeps them in. She surely has more bottles than there are people in Nara Visa. The population is listed at 150, but Mrs. Jones says that figure "must be counting six litters of puppies."

ONE SELLS FOR $950

Most of the old bottles bring only a few dollars, but some fetch hundreds. T. R. Langdell, an auctioneer in Milford, N.H., conducted three auctions of bottles in 1969, selling a total of $50,000 worth. One, a flask that had Masonic emblems impressed in the glass and that was made in Keene, N.H., around 1800, sold for $950. A 170-year-old flask with eagles imprinted on each side brought $500. A 100-year-old bottle, in the shape of a pig, with the label still on it, sold for $390.

"This bottle thing is the hottest business in the world right now," says Mr. Langdell, who auctions everything from land to cows. He said one bottle auction drew 500 to 600 people from all over the country. "When people fly into Boston and rent Cadillacs to drive up to New Hampshire to spend a day buying bottles, you know there's real enthusiasm," he adds. This year, he says, he expects to auction off $100,000 worth of old bottles.

Collectors say collecting has its hazards. Rummaging around in an old dump is dangerous, so Massachusetts' Mrs. McKenzie wears electricians' heavy work gloves to protect against the broken glass and sharp metal. Diane Wain, a pretty schoolteacher in Bermuda, says a friend of hers defies barracuda to dive for bottles off the island. "He's so carried away with it that you don't bother to ask how he is when you see him—you ask how his bottle collection is coming along," she says.

Some valuable finds are made on sunken ships. Carroll W. Hussey, an Alfred, Maine, antique dealer whose license plate says Bottles, says his most valuable possession is a pint-size, olive-green bottle with Masonic emblems that was recovered in a salvage operation off Bermuda. He paid a dealer $150 for the bottle, which he says is priceless today and not for sale. It was aboard a ship sunk in 1816. A similar bottle is in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, he says.

NO DEPOSIT, NO RETURN

But most bottles are unearthed in old dumps. In Boston, construction men working on a tunnel stopped work not so long ago when they came upon an ancient rubbish dump. The men began scrambling around as if they had hit an ancient treasure. "We got over 50 bottles," says one worker. William Degnan, an antique dealer in Acton, Mass., says more than 4,000 bottles have been recovered from one dump, which he will describe only as being "somewhere in southern New Hampshire."

Not all valuable bottles are old, however. In 1964, the maker of Lestoil detergent came out with a promotional bottle that was a replica of an old colonial flask. Now the replica is a collectors' item. And the first no-deposit—no-return bottles, ruby-red numbers made by Anchor Hocking for Schlitz beer in the late 1940s, now bring $5 or more.

[From The Times-Union, Rochester, N.Y., Jan. 25, 1968]

THEY'VE CAUGHT THE "COLLECTING FEVER"

(By Joan Lynn Schild)

Fifty-nine superbly colored bottles sparkle on specially lighted shelves in the living room of Mr. and Mrs. John P. Guttenberg, Nettlecreek Road, Perinton.

They are historical flasks, free-blown in pictorial molds in glass factories along the eastern seaboard and in Kentucky, West Virginia and Ohio during the 19th century.

They range from amber, emerald and blue to the now rare amethyst and purple, in molded designs inspired by persons and events conspicuous in the exuberant life of the young nation.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Guttenberg caught the collecting fever from their families. Guttenberg, a former lieutenant in the Navy and now manager of corporate communications for Xerox, gets his from his mother, the late Mrs. John P. Guttenberg Sr., and his great aunt, the late Mrs. Lester Garson, Inveterate antiquers, they took him, a lad of 15, on collecting jaunts.

"I had to buy something in self-defense," he joked, "so I bought a bitters bottle. I've been collecting ever since."

Mrs. Guttenberg takes her interest in art and collecting from her great-great-grandfather, Edward Hicks, famous Quaker painter of "The Peacable Kingdom" scenes.

Historical flasks are their favorite collecting pieces, because of their shape, the quality of the glass, their color and design, but primarily because of their historical background and their pure Americanism. "They are alive with the events of the day," Guttenberg said.

The first bottle glass colors were amber, olive-green and aquamarine, in many shades and tones. To these were added greens, cornflower blues to deep cobalts and, occasionally, deep purple.

In the Guttenberg's collection are portraits of national heroes, presidents and would-be presidents, railroads and steamboats. There are some with a sunburst motif, one of the commonest, and some with a cornucopia design.

They have American eagle flasks and a Masonic flask, which shows a square and a compass, with clasped hands underneath.

Especially interesting is one with a portrait of Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale. She was brought to the United States by P. T. Barnum and gave two concerts in Corinthian Hall, Rochester, in July, 1851.

The rarest piece in the collection is a dark green Stiegel-type flask dating about 1790. It bears an original label which says "Camphor." Pasted on the back is the label of an apothecary in New Hope, Pa., who, Mr. Guttenberg presumes, filled the flask with camphor and sold it to some of his customers.

Another rarity, made about 1860, commemorates Major Ringold, a hero of the Mexican War. It is noteworthy for its amethyst color, the majority of historical flasks being either aqua, green, amber or olive.

[From the Brighton-Pittsford Post, Pittsford, N.Y., May 21, 1970]

WHAT'S ALL THIS BUSINESS ABOUT COLLECTING ANTIQUE BOTTLES?

(By John P. Guttenberg, Jr.)

The Genesee Bottle Collectors Association sponsored a major antique bottle exhibit and sale recently at Bristol 50 Acres.

This article on the background of bottle collecting was written by John P. Guttenberg Jr. of 28 Nettlecreek Rd., Perinton, association president.

Bottles and glass blowing date back to the First Century before Christ.

Students of history often forget that it was America's first industry—having begun with the construction of a glass works in 1609, two years after the founding of the Jamestown Colony in Virginia, for the purpose of trading glass beads and bottles with the Indians.

Glass was a precious commodity during much of our history since only the well-to-do could afford it. No wonder that until the manufacture of bottles became economical through mass production in the post Civil War industrial revolution, bottles were more prized than their contents. Whether filled with spirits or medicine, bottles were refilled time and again for their owner's use.

Curiously, the "boom" in collecting antique American bottles has come partly because this ancient and artful craft is threatened with extinction.

With one-way, no deposit bottles, tin cans and the dozens of synthetics now used to package items which were formerly bottled, we may see the glass container as we know it today disappear before this century closes.

Scientists have already found a way to produce bottles that will eventually decompose, thus eliminating the waste problem, and recently it was discovered that ground glass mixed with other substances made one of the strongest road bed materials—again helping to find a means of using waste bottles for other purposes.

Today, the United States manufactures about 30 million bottles annually, but most are disposed of when their contents have been used. Therefore, it is not surprising that collectors are scouring grandma's attic, Uncle Harry's barn or Aunt Sally's cellar for old bottles. Many collectors are digging deep into old town dumps dating back a hundred years or more to find early specimens.

Rochester and the Genesee Valley area was a center for the production and distribution of bottles for much of the 19th Century. The famous Clyde Glass Works was located to the east—those at Lancaster and Lockport to the west. The Erie Canal was a major artery for the shipment of bottles. The prodigious orchards and vineyards of this area demanded huge quantities of canning jars and bottles, Rochester was the home of H. H. Warner Co. and Doyle's Hop Bitters, making this city the third largest center for the production and distribution of patent medicines and cures in the late 19th Century. And the famous Ball Brothers, whose canning jars still bear their name, lived in Canandaigua. Fred Locke, a pioneer in power distribution insulators, started in Victor and the company still thrives today.

Today's bottle collector has no definitive profile other than being somewhat of a "fanatic" about his hobby. In our area they run from teenagers like Tom Olson of Pittsford to retired master glassblower Leo Ehrstein of the city, who learned his craft in the early part of this century. Women are avid collectors, too—with about the same strength in numbers as men.

Bottle collecting tends to be a "family" hobby, with husband, wife and children all involved. Bottle diggers (or "Grubbers" as they are known in the bottle world) often go off together like those on a camping trip or Sunday picnic—adding rakes and shovels to the basket of sandwiches in the back of the car.

The appeal that bottles hold for most collectors is in their rich colors, unusual shapes and aethetic appeal, great history and the technology behind them. Bottles made prior to the Civil War were free-blown or mold-blown (often from crude wooden molds that left whittle marks on the bottle) and their shape and lines were irregular for the most part. Necks and collars around the bottle's lip were applied in separate steps. With automation, bottles became standardized in shape, color and the consistency of the glass.

[From the Genesee Valley Newspapers, May 21, 1970]

WHY BOTTLE COLLECTING

Bottles which have embossing or labels on them hold great appeal to the collector. Many bottles, especially bitters, cures, medicines and soda or mineral waters, carried the names of the maker and the town or city where they came from. Labels on patent medicines and cures spoke of relieving every malady known to man or beast and could be used internally and externally.

Historical or pictorial flasks usually bore familiar symbols of the Republic such as busts of presidential candidates, national heroes, the American Eagle, the horn of plenty, ears of corn, anchors, or masonic symbols.

The last masonic flasks were produced around 1830 because of an event that took place in Batavia in the late 1820's. A man named Morgan was denied his 33rd masonic degree and in a fit of pique revealed the secrets of free-masonry to the editor of the local newspaper. When published, the news traveled across the young nation and a wave of contempt against the masonic fraternity drove it underground until after the Civil War. But the national contempt was mild compared to the wrath of local free-masons in Mr. Morgan's area.

He was placed in the jail at Canandaigua for his own protection, from where he was ultimately abducted, never to be heard of again.

Most early bottles have well established value. Many bring hundreds of dollars at sales and auctions. The more common and later bottles bring less money, but in recent years, for example, an interest in canning jars and insulators from telephone and telegraph poles has increased their price by high multiples. Canning jars and insulators today can run from under a dollar to well over $100 depending on rarity, color, age and embossing.

Some collectors specialize, others build general collections. Specialists have an infinite number of sub-categories to work within their area of interest (e.g., bottles of one color, or all from one glass house or region). Most collectors appreciate all bottles and find that there is much to be learned even if they have been at it for years. There is a dearth of information about bottles despite their long history in America and a spate of literature that has appeared in the last decade, which has been dubbed the bottle collecting boom.

Price guides abound for those who attempt to establish value for identifiable bottles—but these are often inaccurate because the author is basing his prices on what the traffic will bear in his neck of the woods. Also, prices change rapidly in bottle collecting due to increased interest in the hobby and the parallel scarcity of bottles as they are acquired and taken off the market.

A good way to determine price is to follow sales, auctions and classified ads in antique and bottle publications. Another approach is to talk with knowledgeable collectors who have a "feel" for the market. In the end, however, the value of a bottle to its owner may not be its price in dollars and cents, but its beauty or uniqueness, its having been handed down in a family or found in some obscure place.

Collectors are fond of displaying their treasures on shelves and windowsills. Nothing is more thrilling for a collector than to pull out a bag with a new acquisition carefully wrapped inside that can be shown to a fellow collector.

Swapping and trading is an active pastime among collectors, and a good memory serves the serious collector well if he wants to make the right deal with the right person who has the right bottle.

Patience is indeed a virtue for bottle collectors. Many veterans have learned the wisdom of tracking desired items for years through private collections, estate sales, untapped town dumps, etc. Highway construction and urban renewal projects in recent years have laid open new fields for the collector to pour over. Still, many collectors find that excavating around dumps, barns, old houses is fruitful (if there was no town dump, bottles were buried in the yard) or covered over privy holes (an ideal spot to drop a flask if dad heard mother coming down the path while he was nipping or for getting rid of poison bottles that you didn't want the children to get hold of).

The search goes on and the interest increases daily. There are more than 110 antique bottle clubs in America and a rough estimate of bottle enthusiasts is probably several hundred thousand.

Fakes and reproductions are appearing on the market and the neophyte and veteran collector alike must be wary of the unauthentic item passed off as the real thing. A New Hampshire congressman introduced a bill in Congress last year stipulating that foreign reproductions of bottles entering the United States must be so marked.

The "boom" in bottles and bottle collecting continues.

Who knows but that today's coke bottle, aspirin bottle or perfume bottle may be tomorrow's collectable treasure!

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT CONGRESSMAN—REPRESENTATIVE SAM FRIEDEL—BY A GREAT CLERGYMAN—DR. ABRAHAM SHUSTERMAN

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, for almost 18 years, the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States has had the pleasure and the benefit of the wisdom, wide experience, and complete dedication far beyond the call of duty, of one of our distinguished colleagues. I refer to the gentleman who represents the Seventh Congressional District of the Free State of Maryland—SAM FRIEDEL.

Because of rather unusual circumstances in the recent Maryland Democratic primary election last month in which two other candidates sought the high office so very ably filled by our esteemed colleague—Congressman FRIEDEL, the Greater Baltimore area and,

indeed, the Nation itself, will be deprived of his invaluable service.

As chairman of the House Administration Committee, chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, ranking majority member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, he has given the best of himself, on behalf of the largest city south of the Mason and Dixon line, his State and our Nation. It is needless for me to remind this great House of the important role he played in the passage of vital legislation, and of his leadership in congressional committee hearings and deliberations. At all times, he fought for what he deemed best for the United States and his impending departure from this historic Chamber will leave a void that will be very difficult to fill with a man who possesses Representative FRIEDEL'S experience and vision.

It has just come to my attention that one of Baltimore's highly esteemed clergymen, Dr. Abraham Shusterman, rabbi of Har Sinai Temple, the oldest continuously Reform congregation in America was founded in 1842, expressed his deep disappointment in the primary election results in a moving letter to our distinguished colleague.

Dr. Shusterman was one of the three clergymen in the well-known television series "To Promote Good Will"—the other two being a highly respected Protestant minister, and a learned monsignor of the Roman Catholic Church. I should also like to mention that Rabbi Shusterman is the only non-Christian to ever receive the Cardinal Gibbons Medal for his outstanding service to religion and the community.

Because of the importance in these days to promote good will, and also due to our respect for and admiration of our colleague from Maryland, I should like to insert Dr. Abraham Shusterman's letter in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

HAR SINAI CONGREGATION,
Baltimore, Md., October 6, 1970.

Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SAM: I wanted to be absolutely certain of the outcome of the primary before writing to you. We share your natural disappointment in the results but we also share your pride in a number of undeniable facts—first, you have had a great career in Washington. No representative has been closer or more helpful to his people; second, no one candidate could have defeated you . . . it took two of them. You could have readily defeated anyone else; third, you will go out of office with the respect, good-will and gratitude of all who have known you and have worked with you.

As for me, I am proud that you were Har Sinai Brotherhood's first honored man of the year. I look forward to dedicating some portion of the new building as the Brotherhood's gift in your name. We have placed the plaque aside, awaiting the proper day.

We send you and Regina our best wishes. May God bless you both and grant you many happy and rewarding years.

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM SHUSTERMAN,
Rabbi.

PRICE OF PREPAREDNESS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Honorable David Packard, received the Crozier Gold Medal from the American Ordnance Association for distinguished service to armament for the United States. His timely address on that occasion has now been published by Ordnance magazine, and it is of such importance that I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House.

In a day when many are striving to reduce the Defense budget at all costs, he gives us an important lesson in the price of preparedness in a nuclear age. I sincerely believe a reading of this brief article will be especially helpful for Members of Congress in deciding on their votes on important legislation affecting national security, and I urge all Members to take the time to review Mr. Packard's words.

The article follows:

PRICE OF PREPAREDNESS

(By Hon. David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense)

When World War I began, the United States Army was about equal in size to the army of Sweden. Despite impressive progress from a standing start, the productive capacity of American industry was not effectively tapped until the war was near its end, too late for use in the conflict.

Most American troops in the American Expeditionary Force reached Europe in British transports. Our armies went into battle with British or French artillery pieces and fired French-manufactured artillery ammunition; our airmen flew Allied planes. Our soldiers manned French tanks. Of 23,000 tanks on order in the United States, only 76 had been completed at the time of the Armistice.

Fifty years ago, after his retirement, Maj. Gen. William Crozier wrote a book entitled "Ordnance and the World War—A Contribution to the History of American Preparedness." It was written, he said, "in order that we may not again enter a war under conditions requiring so much time for their correction and so much protection by other forces while we are making our own ready. . . ."

General Crozier's book did not achieve its purpose. World War II again found the Nation ill-prepared.

In the first half of the 1930's, the severe domestic problems of the depression led to reduction in the armed forces. Spending for national security was cut back more than 25 per cent. As Hitler began to rearm Germany, we continued to starve our already anemic military forces.

Among the consequences of our policy was the loss of able, trained personnel. How many military leaders were lost to the Nation cannot be known. But in 1933, only the resistance of Congress prevented the execution of a Presidential plan to discharge from the armed forces a number of officers who were over age in grade. Among those slated for discharge as an economy measure were Lucius Clay, J. Lawton Collins, Leslie R. Groves, Alfred M. Gruenther, James A. Van Fleet, and Matthew B. Ridgeway.

Since promotion was strictly by seniority, these officers were then first lieutenants after 15 years of service. There was simply no opportunity to advance, regardless of professional competence.

As late as 1939, the year World War II began, we were spending only $5 million for military research and development. As late as 1938, we were spending no more to acquire armored vehicles than for horses, wagons, saddles, and harnesses.

After Pearl Harbor, we were forced to send men to combat areas who had never even seen—in training—the weapons they were given to use. For 2 years or more an inadequate supply of materiel restricted most of our forces to little more than holding operations.

World War II was followed by another period of neglect of our armed forces. When war broke out in Korea, again the Nation was unready.

Sixteen days after North Korean forces crossed the 38th parallel and began to squeeze a meager force of South Koreans and Americans into the Pusan perimeter, the majority leader of the United States Senate, Lyndon B. Johnson, took the floor to make these remarks:

"Our equipment . . . is plainly inadequate in quantity, it is not the right kind, and it is not at the right place.

"Our Marine Corps troops have been reduced to a point where it is impossible for them to furnish a single war-strength division to General MacArthur. . . .

"Our Army divisions do not have the number of battalions they need to function efficiently in combat.

"Far more dollars are being lost in South Korea than all the dollars we have saved—if we have saved any at all.

"We will lose more dollars and lose more lives because our economy was false, our overconfidence was unjustified, our emphasis was wrong."

It is no exaggeration to say that our Nation has been poorly prepared for three of the four major conflicts in which it has become involved in this century. The costs of unpreparedness in lives and in treasure have been tragically high. In the past, time has been granted to us to recover from initial setbacks, to arm, and finally to win the day.

In the nuclear world of today, we cannot count on time to be our ally. We must be prepared at all times, or we will not survive.

Americans have short memories. They are less inclined than some others to heed the lessons of history. In some ways, this may be good. We do not hang on to enmities of the past. We do not brood for long over yesterday's grievances.

To forget our past mistakes, however, is to court disaster. Philosopher George Santayana said: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." I can think of no more appropriate motto to hang on the wall of every office in the Pentagon as we plan our defense posture for the 1970's.

There are great pressures toward a reduction of our military power in the decade of the 1970's. The pressures come from the domestic front, both economic and political.

We in the Department of Defense recognize the urgency of unmet domestic needs and the seriousness of the problem of inflation. To permit increased Federal spending to meet these needs without further fueling the fires of inflation, the President has made significant cuts in the level of defense expenditures.

The course we are following is a realistic course, not because of any significant lessening of the antagonism and tensions around the world, but because of the increasing ability of our friends and allies to carry a larger share of the burden of their own security. It will be a safe course if reductions are limited and carefully controlled to maintain a foundation of strength adequate and re-

sponsive to potential contingencies of the future. This foundation must include an adequate nuclear deterrent.

Our armed forces are being reshaped on the basis of the Nixon Doctrine. The essence of that doctrine is a sharing of responsibility between our country and other nations with which we are joined by the bond of common interests. The change which the Nixon Doctrine is bringing about is greater self-reliance on the part of other nations, particularly in providing the manpower needed for their defense.

In South Vietnam we are witnessing the first application of the Nixon Doctrine. Our military forces there are being cut in half because of the encouraging development of the will and the ability of the people of South Vietnam to provide for their own defense.

The changes in our defense posture which are being made result from the most exhaustive and comprehensive examination of defense and other national needs that has ever been made. This review is a continuing process which is meant to guard against neglect of any of the responsibilities of our national Government. In the opinion of the civilian and military leaders of the Defense Department, the reductions in forces and programs recommended by the President go as far and as fast as we can go without assuming excessive risks.

There are strong pressures, however, for reductions that go far beyond those which President Nixon has approved.

The greatest concern that I have at the present time is that defense cutbacks will go beyond the point of prudent risk. The greatest responsibility that Secretary Laird and I have is to keep the Nation on the course of orderly reduction in defense and to maintain a capability that will protect the American people in the years ahead.

Our past experience should teach us that an inadequate level of defense spending is an illusory form of economy. In a month or two a war eats up the savings realized over the course of many years by insufficient funding of defense. In a future war, unpreparedness would be more than costly—it would be suicidal.

Our military capability in the future is determined by what we do—or fail to do—today. Weapons and equipment of sophistication do not spring into being overnight.

And so I feel deep concern that the United States is currently spending, for military research and development, between $2 and $3 billion less annually than the Soviet Union. What we have for the defense of our Nation 5 or 10 or 15 years from now will depend on the vigor and effectiveness of the research and development effort today.

We must attach special importance to the research and development effort—to both its quantity and its quality—for the purpose of maintaining in the years ahead military power that will be effective in keeping the peace. In this field we cannot afford to be second to any nation in the world.

The Nixon Doctrine, looking to a situation in which the United States will need less military manpower, asserts at the same time a determination to provide a nuclear shield for the protection of other nations. To carry out this responsibility, as well as to protect our own people, we cannot permit any relative deterioration in our strategic forces.

At Vienna, negotiations are now going on which, we hope, will produce a reliable agreement on the mutual limitation of strategic weapons. Such an agreement could reduce somewhat our future expenditures on nuclear weapons. But, until such an agreement is concluded, we cannot ignore growing threats to our security, nor can we fail to take timely action to counter them.

We must remember that in the past 5 years, the United States has stabilized deployment of strategic offensive weapons, while the Soviet Union has accelerated both their development and their deployment. Our Nation has made no basic change in the force levels set in 1965–1967. On the other hand, the Soviet Union continues to add to its total of strategic nuclear weapons. And, as we have seen, the Chinese are still on their technological track to a ballistic missile.

As Secretary Laird and I have pointed out, it is not the strategic balance that exists today that disturbs us but the momentum established by the Soviet Union in its vigorous development and deployment of strategic offensive weapons. The vigor of the Soviet effort is indicated by the fact that Russia now has more land-based ICBM's than the United States. Nor can we forget the progress of Communist China toward an ICBM capability.

For these reasons, the President has recommended to Congress a modest addition to the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile program which was approved last year.

Safeguard is merely a minimum prudent step to protect our deterrent capability in the face of a large and growing Soviet nuclear-missile capability and a budding Chinese capability. It is a step which will not quicken the arms race. It is a step which does not hinder arms-limitation talks. It is a step which is subject to annual review by the President and the Congress. But, at this moment, I strongly believe it is a step we must take if we are to maintain a meaningful deterrent throughout the 1970's. To forego the Safeguard deployment is a gamble this country cannot afford to take.

The course toward which President Nixon is steering the Nation is in the direction of peace. His policy is one of responsible internationalism. It does not contemplate a United States which will patrol the world as a global policeman nor a United States which abdicates responsibility and cowers in isolationism.

Successful implementation of the President's foreign policy requires a strong defense posture for our country as far into the future as any of us can see.

The consequence of past failure to maintain such a posture are the casualties of three wars which have occurred in the lifetime of most of us.

Let us not in the future be forced again to mourn the loss of young Americans who died because their country let its sword rust. Let us not forget that on our preparedness and our national resolves depends the survival of our country.

ADMINISTRATION'S SUCCESSES

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the second session of the 91st Congress comes to a something-less-than-glorious pause, before resuming, lameducks and all, in mid-November, I would like to talk about some of the administration's successes during the last 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that we have had a President who has handled foreign affairs as well as has President Nixon.

For 21 months now, America and the world have moved steadily toward peace. At the same time the world has become aware that, while the United States will stand by her commitments and will work in the cause of peace, we will no longer be policeman for the world.

The inflexible policies of the 1940's and 1950's gave us unnecessary problems in the 1960's, and President Nixon has quickly recognized that they will not do for the 1970's.

From this understanding has come the Nixon doctrine—the doctrine that says we will provide a nuclear umbrella for our allies, and we will supply them with arms and materiel, but they must do their own fighting.

President Nixon means what President Johnson said: that American men will not again get bogged down in the morass of Asia.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the President's success in bringing American soldiers out of that morass is a high-point of his administration to date.

He could have done it with abject surrender, as some have urged; he conceivably could have done it with a nuclear bomb, at what price no one knows.

Instead, he is doing it in such a way that the South Vietnamese will be able to defend themselves and be able to choose their own form of government, even after we have gone.

What is happening is that President Nixon is living up to our commitments to South Vietnam but is doing so in such a way that they must live up to their own commitments to freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, as peace grows nearer in the Far East, so does it appear more imminent in the Near East where there is talk now of abiding by and extending the cease-fire rather than of going back to war.

The President's persuasive powers, his show of strength at the proper time and his own appearance in the Mediterranean all made clear to the Nations of the Middle East and to those who seek to stir up trouble there that the President is prepared to do what is necessary to prevent a full-blown war from breaking out.

Just as the President has sought to bring peace to the world's trouble spots, so has he also sought to bridge the gaps between the United States and the small nations of East Europe. His success in Rumania and Yugoslavia is manifest.

Mr. Speaker, the list of the President's accomplishments in his first 21 months in office is long. I have not mentioned the SALT talks or the agreements with Japan concerning Okinawa. But who can deny that President Nixon's most important accomplishments are in the realm of world peace and international stability.

As the Congress recesses, I believe its Members should take full cognizance of these facts. The partisan issues in the upcoming election are domestic. The accomplishments in foreign affairs transcend any partisanship.

WALTER W. STRALEY OUTLINES GOALS OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S NATIONAL READING COUNCIL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to attend the first

meeting of President Nixon's National Reading Council held here in Washington.

The members of the Council spent a full day outlining and discussing goals for the Council and late in the afternoon, the members attended a reception at the White House hosted by Mrs. Nixon, who has agreed to take on the challenging task of serving as honorary Chairman of the National Reading Council.

Mrs. Walter W. Straley, Chairman of the Council and vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., presented an excellent synopsis of the day's proceedings which I shall include in the RECORD today.

May I first congratulate the President for his initiative in creating the National Reading Council. I am particularly grateful for this national commitment to reading because as chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, I am reminded every day by testimony before our committee of the urgent need for improving America's verbal skills. The President shows great understanding in making this one of his administration's main goals.

It is also most pleasing to see the First Lady take on the difficult role of honorary Chairman of the Council. As a former schoolteacher herself, Mrs. Nixon shows deep compassion and understanding of the problem. First Ladies have made many significant contributions toward improving the welfare of our Nation, but I believe history will record Mrs. Nixon's contribution in raising the reading standards of our children and adults as one of the most significant and meaningful.

I am including in the RECORD today the brief introduction of Mr. Straley made by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliot Richardson; and Mr. Straley's own remarks.

It should be evident from the remarks of both Secretary Richardson and Mr. Straley that the National Reading Council is off to a good start.

Secretary Richardson's and Mr. Straley's remarks follow:

Secretary RICHARDSON. Mrs. Nixon, members of the National Reading Council, ladies and gentlemen.

It has been a great pleasure for me in the last twenty-four hours, to have had the occasion, first yesterday evening and then this morning, to meet with the members of the Council and to develop some sense of the commitment and the dedication that you are bringing to an urgent national priority.

As I said this morning, I knew that I was speaking for President Nixon in telling you that he, as the head of our government, and we in the Department of HEW, and all of us throughout the government who can in any way lend our support to your efforts, want to do this. And certainly, we want also to underscore our own sense of appreciation to each of you who are contributing to this objective, for the sacrifice of time that you are going to be devoting to it, as well as the contribution of talent and knowledge and experience from a very wide range of diverse background.

We're deeply grateful to all of you.

But certainly, among you there is one individual to whom we have special reason to be indebted. I heard him speak briefly this morning—at least I heard him briefly—and since I had to leave before he had concluded his remarks, I'm very sorry to say—I would very much like to have been there not only long enough to hear him in full but to have participated with all of you.

I did, however, hear him long enough to develop a sense of the kind of qualities that he's bringing to his very important role as the Chairman of the Council. And certainly his backgroud is one that uniquely endows him for this responsibility.

He has not only held major positions as a business executive, but the process of climbing the ladder in the American Bell Telephone System has brought him to the Vice Presidency of the whole company for Environmental Affairs, which I take it, includes all of these things, education among them, that affect the quality of life.

In his extracurricular capacities he has also equipped himself for his present role. He is, and has been for a number of years, a member of the Board of Overseers of Grinnell College, a member of the Educational Task Force of the New York Urban Coalition, and he has served in the past as a member of the New York City Board of Education, and certainly New York City has an enormously large and complex educational system, and exhibits within its whole range many of the kinds of problems with which this Council is going to be concerned, in the years ahead, in developing a strategy for the nation in coping with the problems of reading handicaps.

We have of course stressed from the outset the importance of the partnership that is going to be involved in this effort, a partnership not only between the Federal government and state and local governments, but between government at all levels and with the private sector, including concerned individual volunteers.

It is a very great personal pleasure and honor for me now to present to you your own Chairman, for a few words of summary and discussion of today's meeting, Mr. Straley.

Chairman STRALEY. Thank you, Mister Secretary; Mrs. Nixon, distinguished colleagues:

It is a pleasure for all of us to be associated with Mrs. Nixon as Honorary Chairman of the National Reading Council, and we do offer our gratitude to you, Mrs. Nixon, for your hospitality in allowing us to join you here, to conclude our day-long meeting.

The other members of the Council have received a small memento of this inaugural meeting of ours. And so, we thought it fitting that we bring you one and I think it also appropriate that Mrs. Straley just hand it to you. The little book symbolizes the history of our reading attempt in the United States, going back in this case to 1836. By 1920, 122 million copies of McGuffey's readers had been sold.

They portray a time when our world was rural and mostly lovely, perhaps for many of us, not the world we know. But it's a reminder that we've been at this reading business for a long time. And, that we have not yet succeeded.

Our charter is stated well, I think, in the July 31st statement of President Nixon's, when he announced the appointment of this Council. He said that this Council, "will work closely with private and public organizations as well as professional educators and others to strengthen and assist reading programs and foster innovation in the reading field."

He said further, "I hope the Council will serve as a catalyst for the nation in producing dramatic improvement in reading ability for those requiring it, and in encouraging reading by all our people. For the ability to read is essential to the fulfillment of each person's potential, and I expect the National Reading Council to do much to enhance that ability. With its help the right to read can become a reality by the end of this decade." We accept this charter from the President and from the Secretary.

In our first meeting today we did, to my belief, three things.

We received from each other and from colleagues in the field of education information on the scope of the reading problem, as an exercise in self-instruction.

Secondly, we were brought up to date as to the status of the National Reading Council and its operating arm-to-be, the National Reading Center, to be located here in Washington, D.C.

Finally, the members of the Council gathered just before we came to the White House for an hour and twenty minutes (which may be a record in policy-making deliberation) and recommended certain priorities of action for the National Reading Council and for the National Reading Center. I shall mention those briefly.

As to number one, our self-instruction: Mr. Louis Mendez, in charge of the Right-to-Read Program in the United States Office of Education, reminded us that there are about $420 million of reading-related Federal funding from the Office of Education. He reminded us of our responsibility of counselling that agency and others in the Federal government on the reordering of reading-related efforts to make as certain as we can that reading achievement results from reading funding.

He called our attention to the fact that much good work is being done in the school systems and that twenty-two states already have priority reading programs under way.

Mrs. Eleanor Wolfe, of the Office of Voluntary Action, called our attention to some 250,000 active volunteers in reading tutoring, adult, parent, young people, and college age persons. I know most of us consider in our three group meetings—that we ought to add to the quarter of a million volunteers until we count them in many millions.

Doctor Reese of Princeton spoke of the lack of statistics to enhance our knowledge of the disastrous impact of illiteracy on the economy of the country. He did say that those who have finished the eighth grade have, on the average, a $900.00 difference in annual earning power over those who do not finish the fifth grade.

We also had our attention called to the lessening number of unskilled jobs, which do not require effective reading skills, in the economy at this time. Twenty-five years ago, 30% of the jobs in the United States could be described as unskilled, today only 15% are so described. Probably by the latter part of this decade only 5% or fewer will be described as jobs which may easily be held by the low achieving reader.

We also consider the fact that our present work force has within it as many as twenty-five million persons who do not read well enough to assure themselves of promise of progress beyond their unskilled starting jobs. And that now we are suffering a dropout rate from our elementary and secondary schools in the United States of as many as 800,000 children a year.

We learned that the American Association of Junior Colleges estimates that in urban Junior Colleges, as many as one-third to one-half of entering freshmen do not read well enough to make satisfactory progress without remediation.

Jeanne Chall reminded us that our reading system has become embroiled in controversy about classroom methodology; that we ought *not* to search for the one perfect classroom method of teaching reading, but search among all methods available for those with workable principles which may be applied to the millions we are failing to reach.

Doctor Reese reminded us that we must

not forget the adult illiterate. I am occasionally glad to be reminded of my service on the New York School Board, for my service there accounts for my presence here.

One day, at a strike-bound elementary school, the mother of a small black beautiful child came up to me, and said, "Mister, I am not asking for anything for myself. I'm asking for my child. What are you going to do about my child?" Well I don't want to be emotional, but this is the question to which so many of you addressed yourself today.

Then, Doctor Reese reminded us that the mother cannot be left out of our consideration. For the cycle of illiteracy will not be broken until the mother *joins* in an effort of reading, and thereby joins in the joy of reading.

We talked too briefly about the bilingual problem. Our friend Louis Nunez reminded us that Puerto Ricans in the United States will remain a bilingual people within a monolingual society. He asked us how we are going to modify our institutions of learning so that we adjust ourselves to the idea that children and adults will always be with us who must learn and use and be taught and live with two or more languages, rather than just the one we impose upon them.

Louis Harris, the polling specialist, reported his preliminary effort to help this Council find its way toward a literacy index. I do remind my fellow Council members that if we are in fact to report to the Secretary and to the President each year on reading accomplishment in the United States, we must have some kind of an index with which to begin. Otherwise, I think we shall be more fuzzy than factual in our reporting on national accomplishment or the lack of it.

Lou and his people used five forms, which they call "survival forms", a Social Security application, a bank loan application, a driver's license application, a Medicare application and a welfare application, and he simplified them somewhat, so as to be completely fair. Then he sampled them nationally among all people of sixteen years of age or over. He discovered that as many as 18½ million Americans do not read well enough to fill out these simple survival forms without trouble. And he reported this study to the Press today, and perhaps they will pay more attention to it than to us. Which is understandable, for I don't think our organization at this point is particularly sexy so far as the Press is concerned.

The structure of the Council was described. Some of you will serve as directors of the National Reading Center which we said is going to have space at 1776 Massachusetts Avenue. And we like the idea of our new address. And you will see on our new Logo "1776" on one side, Right-to-Read in the center, and 1976 on the other. Although the President and the Secretary have asked us to help other institutions and people in the country achieve our reading goals by the end of the decade, as an old organization man, I have moved that goal down four years. Let's do something by 1976, or go out of business.

We will have meetings of this Council several times a year, at various cities in the United States. We will have a Diretcor soon, and a staff of twenty-five people in the Massachusetts Avenue location. Later, we will have as many as twenty people out in the Regions working with States and local schools, for the payoff can only take place where the people are.

We've made a couple of assumptions about our new organization; one, that this is not going to be just a discussion group.

We are going to set priorities, you have helped today to do that. Each Council member will be assigned to a specific project area within the National Reading Center organization, and will be expected to perform voluntarily within that group, with a professional staff person on a specific project team. It will take awhile to match people and assignments. I hope we can be really underway by January of next year.

Another assumption of interest: We will emphasize classroom support projects. As the President said in his March 3rd Education Reform message, what happens outside the classroom is often as important as what happens inside—I heard our friend Mr. Al Capp say, perhaps rather immodestly, that he has eighty million readers a day.

He had a tremendous point, and he shared it with Doctor Lesser, you may remember, who said: "Let us have a cafeteria of all kinds of reading alternatives for everybody." Mr. Capp is right of course. Many people learn to read from comic books. Miss Chall says people in Italy and elsewhere learn to read occasionally from candy wrappers. I should think the cereal people would be glad if more of us learned to read from cereal boxes.

We discussed the prospects of new games of reading, simple lessons in newspapers. Those of us who have spent time in the ghettos of the larger cities said today that we cannot rely on "normal" distribution of reading materials. We must have lots of reading instruction on peanut butter jars and candy wrappers, cheap or free books. Well, we must stock a cafeteria of reading alternatives.

Now here are some of the things you said today ought to be among the priorities which this National Reading Center should get busy with.

I'll go through them very quickly; operate as a central agency to review and coordinate all efforts of the private sector and the government toward solution of this problem.

New approaches are required; not *just* supporting the present educational establishment, but breaking out with new things, helping it break through.

Boldly, you said failures in reading can be cut 50% right now, with what we know now how to do. You said let us focus a national campaign of information upon the successes we now enjoy in the educational system. We may be proud of many successes; we must help find ways of broadcasting information about those successes, and spread them to the millions who are not a part of them.

A high priority item: availability of materials, especially through libraries, in school rooms, in community centers, volunteer centers, wherever children and adults are, and where the reading need is the greatest.

I'm sure, with Brad Wiley's agreement—you pointed out that publishers must—you did not say "should"—cooperate.

We will try, you said, to develop public awareness of this problem in this country, involve the business community in a new national thrust; give them recession-proof ideas to use, ideas in business, self-interest.

We will support national efforts to get at parents *with* their children. And find new ways to teach more people how to teach reading, particularly in the inner cities and in the rural areas.

I was fascinated by Mr. Branscome's remark that in Appalachia, where he serves, they have 10% of the population and 40% of the illiteracy in our country. We must find ways of adapting to that need.

And, teacher education. We should you said, through this National Reading Council, encourage the States to establish reading instruction minimums for certification. There was talk of more accountability for achievement by teachers, as you recall.

This Council you agreed, must play an important role in coordinating research, and validate research where we can, so that we know what we're talking about, because the fuzziest thing in this whole iffy field of education is that we really don't know why we don't always succeed.

We suggested that some Agency such as USOE, among our many prospective partners, might develop a number of model demonstration projects, where schools, industries, colleges, community people can operate a saturation effort to eliminate illiteracy in the entire area of a city or a county.

And I think it was Mr. Capp, who was bold enough to suggest that we hold the three Presidents of the three commercial networks responsible for cooperating with the Council in making commercial television available for teaching of reading. I shall ask Mr. Capp to call all three of those gentlemen!

We must have you said, a pool of knowledge about reading volunteers; for the volunteer program will require good teaching of volunteers so that we don't have an outburst of citizen enthusiasm without an outburst of citizen effectiveness.

And finally, you said that we ought, as I'm sure we will, make recommendations to the President and to the Congress concerning the funding of reading-related projects, which will hopefully enhance the goals of this Council and the goals of this Administration.

Well, you accepted the President's and the Secretary's charge to serve as a catalyst for the Nation in producing reading achievement so that the right to read can become a reality by the end of this decade. I thank you for today. But we have not yet begun. At least I'm pleased to have spent this day with you and I look forward to our continued effort. Thank you.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1970

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Corps of Engineers Environmental Policy Act of 1970, a bill which would help to insure that a maximum regard is given to the protection of the environment in connection with all public works projects undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers. Joining me in sponsoring this legislation is my good friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. CRAMER).

As you know, the Corps of Engineers has a proud and distinguished history dating back to its official beginnings in 1802. It helped to chart the way in the exploration of the West, surveying and mapping for work on the early frontier roads, railroads and canals, and making the waterways of the Middle West safe for navigation. Following the Civil War it helped to physically reunite the divided sections of our country with projects benefiting all. And today the Corps continues to make a valuable contribution to the growth and development of this Nation through such projects as waterway improvements and flood control, disaster relief and beach erosion prevention, hydroelectric power and water supply developments, recreation facilities and pollution control.

The Corps of Engineers civil works division today is comprised of some 200 military personnel and 32,000 civilians working on 275 projects, costing over $1 billion annually. The Congress has already authorized another 452 projects.

As our country continues to develop and the need for such projects increases, we must take special care to insure that we do not inadvertently do irreversible damage to the environment in the process. My bill would provide that safeguard by defining the environmental policy for the corps, prescribing the duties and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Army as they relate to that policy, and creating a Corps of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board to assist in the implementation of that policy.

The terms of my bill are consistent with the objectives and requirements of the Environmental Policy Act of 1969 which, among other things, requires that Federal agencies file environmental statements on all projects having a potential impact on the environment. This measure would require that the advisory board review all proposed Corps projects and advise the Secretary of the Army on the environmental implications. It would require the Secretary in turn to include the comments and recommendations of the advisory board with all environmental statements required by law. In this way there would be the assurance that the board's independent judgments would be considered by both the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Management and the Budget. The Congress and the public would also have complete access to these statements.

The six-member advisory board would be appointed by the Secretary of the Army from a list of individuals proposed by the Council on Environmental Quality for terms of 3 years each. This arrangement would help to insure a board of high quality environmental expertise and independent judgment. I should point out in this regard that the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers, Lt. Gen. F. J. Clarke, has already taken the initiative on this by appointing a six-member ad hoc advisory board of high caliber environmental experts. In announcing this innovation back on April 2, 1970, General Clarke said, and I quote:

As we move to extend and implement these efforts, and as the environmental problems and issues attendant to our activity become more complex, I strongly feel the need for assistance from a group of advisors external to the Corps who could provide not only a broad range of knowledge, expertise and experience, but also a philosophy and perspective that has not yet been fully developed within the Corps.

General Clarke went on to say:

I expect this Board to be a working board and I plan to use it extensively. I expect that it will provide not only advice on specific policies, programs and problems, but perhaps more important, contribute to an enhanced mutual understanding and confidence between the Corps and both the general public and the conservation community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend General Clarke on taking this outstanding initiative. I cannot take pride in authorship since the idea for the board is his and the idea to give it statutory authority and responsibilities comes from the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and is contained in a similar bill (S. 4307). The important thing is that both the Corps of Engineers and Members of Congress recognize the need to give special emphasis to environmental considerations as we plan for the future. Progress and development need not be the antithesis of environmental protection and enhancement given proper planning and an orderly growth policy. With the closing of the frontiers, our central challenge and preoccupation should have been how to maximize resource development while minimizing environmental destruction within those frontiers. Instead, we too often proceed as if our frontiers were endless and our resources limitless. Only today are we beginning to realize how mistaken we were. Hopefully, it is not too late. Our serious intentions to make this a decade of the environment could well make the crucial difference.

I therefore offer this bill today as another small step in the right direction. The fact that the idea for this bill originated with the Corps indicates that this is not an indictment of past policy but rather an affirmation of present and future environmental concern. I would hope that other Federal agencies will demonstrate comparable concern and take similar initiatives for the preservation and enhancement of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include a copy of the Corps of Engineers Environmental Policy Act of 1970, along with a copy of General Clarke's statement of April 2, 1970, on the environmental aspects of Corps of Engineers activities:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Corps of Engineers Environmental Policy Act of 1970".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purposes of this Act are to declare a policy for the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army which will encourage a maximum regard for the protection and enhancement of the environment; to define the duties and responsibilities of Secretary of the Army through the Corps of Engineers in implementing this policy; and to establish in the Department of the Army a Corps of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board.

TITLE I

DECLARATION OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

SEC. 101. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy to be followed by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Corps") that, in formulating water resource development or management plans, impact on the environment shall be fully considered from the very initiation of preauthorization planning, and that early and continuing research, in cooperation with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies shall be undertaken to develop alternatives and measures which will enhance, protect, and restore the quality of the environment, and, in the case of unavoidable deleterious effects on the environment, minimize and mitigate such effects.

(b) The Secretary of the Army (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), before undertaking any major action or recommending or making a favorable report on legislation affecting Corps programs, which will significantly affect the environment, will, in consultation with other appropriate Federal, State and local agencies, assess the potential environmental impact in order that adverse effects are avoided, and environmental quality is restored or enhanced to the fullest extent practicable. Such assessment shall include, but not be limited to, a detailed statement on—

(1) the environmental impact of the action or proposed legislation,

(2) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the action be taken or the legislation be enacted,

(3) alternatives to the action or proposed legislation,

(4) the relationship between local short-term uses of a man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(5) any irreversible and irretrievable impact on the environment which may be involved in the action or the proposed legislation.

(c) The Secretary shall submit with all environmental statements to the Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive office of the President, the comments and recommendations thereon of the Corps of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board.

(d) The Secretary shall not approve any application for a public works project involving the Corps unless he finds in writing, after a full and complete review of the application and of any hearings held before the appropriate State or local public agency that—

(1) adequate opportunity was afforded for the presentation of views of all parties with a significant economic, social or environmental interest, and fair consideration has been given to the preservation and enhancement of the environment and to the interest of the area in which the project is located, and

(2) either no adverse environmental effect is likely to result from such project, or there exists no feasible and prudent alternative to such effect and all reasonable steps have been taken to minimize such effect.

(e) In the case of any project with respect to which the Secretary finds that no hearing has been held before the appropriate State or local agency, or, with respect to which the Secretary determines that the record of hearings before such appropriate State or local public agency is inadequate to permit him to make the findings required under subsection (d) of this section, he shall conduct hearings and make the findings required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection (d). Findings of the Secretary made in accordance with this subsection shall be made a matter of public record.

TITLE II

CORPS OF ENGINEERS ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 201. (a) There is established in the Department of the Army a Corps of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Board"). The Board shall be comprised of six members appointed by the Secretary for terms of three years each, except that—

(1) of the initial six members of the Board, two shall serve for terms of one year each, two for terms of two years each, and two for terms of three years each as determined by the Secretary at the time of appointment,

(2) a member shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed, and

(3) a member appointed to fill a vacancy in an unexpired term shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Each member of the Board shall be appointed from among at least two individuals proposed for such appointment by the Council on Environmental Quality, except that any individual serving on the effective date of this section as a member of the environmental advisory board to the Corps in the Department of the Army may be appointed as one of the initial six members of the Board. The Board shall

annually elect one member to serve as chairman. Members of the Board shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not exceeding the rate specified for grade GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 202. (a) It shall be the duty and function of the Board—

(1) to assist the Secretary in developing Corps environmental policies and procedures,

(2) to review, assess and evaluate all reports, hearings and other pertinent data on projects requiring an environmental statement and to submit to the Secretary a written report containing comments and recommendations on the projects, for inclusion in such statement as required by section 101(c) of this act,

(3) to conduct a continuing environmental review of all major ongoing Corps projects and to periodically advise the Secretary on any developments, deviations or alterations in or resulting from such projects which adversely affect the environment,

(4) to serve as the Secretary's liaison to the Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies and departments on matters of mutual environmental concern,

(5) to prepare a statement for inclusion in the annual report submitted by the Corps to Congress setting forth the recommendations made by the Board to the Corps, and the actions taken on those recommendations, together with such other comments as the Board shall determine to be necessary or desirable with respect to the operations of the Corps as such operations relate to environmental protection,

(6) to give special assistance to the Secretary in the implementation of sections 101(c) and (d) of this Act as they relate to the environmental aspects of project applications, hearings, and evaluations and recommendations regarding same.

SEC. 203. The Board is authorized to employ such officers and employees (including experts and consultants) as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

SEC. 204. The Board shall have access to any information in the possession of the Corps and may request the Corps to obtain or develop such information as it may require; the Corps shall make available to the Board such staff and facilities as may be required.

STATEMENT BY LT. GEN. F. J. CLARKE

We have scheduled this news briefing to discuss the entire Corps of Engineers' stewardship of the resources we deal with; and also the larger question of national resource goals and policies, and the proper relationship of resource development agencies to them. Our primary purpose is to deal with fundamentals. We propose to focus attention upon the total resource-management job, and the problems inherent in that job. Although there may be no major hard news, this is not a backgrounder; everything is on the record and for attribution.

WHO—OR WHAT?

We have done and are doing a lot for the country. But "doing" in the public works field changes the environment—something it is becoming harder and harder to be neutral about. For this reason at least, we expect and receive criticism. However, even our severest critics have not questioned our integrity or effectiveness. At the direction of Congress and the President we try to do the most good for most people. For this reason, we think it is important to make distinction between an agency and its mission. Often, we believe, the public's concern is not so much over who does the work, as over what is done. Frequently we are criticized for proposals with which we have had no connection, such as the Interior Department's proposed dams on the Lower Colorado River and elsewhere. I don't think objectors ever will be reconciled to those proposals simply by learning that they aren't ours, but somebody else's.

A classic controversy in the resource field is that between those who seek to preserve our resources and those who seek to develop them.

Some believe that future generations will be better served not by development construction but by preservation of the remaining natural environment. The developers believe that a very vigorous development construction effort in both the public and private sectors is needed to keep abreast of the tremendously accelerating material needs of our proliferating descendants. Their emphasis is on material necessities.

The Corps of Engineers' position—if I may briefly anticipate myself—is that both views have too much merit for either to be allowed to obliterate the others; that a truly responsive agency must be responsive to both; that with a reasonable amount of give-and-take, our country can meet both material and intangible goals together to an adequate and indeed a very large degree; and that without reasonable give-and-take, both are likely to suffer. We are actively pursuing this policy in our civil works program.

An agency that tries to serve both schools of thought is likely to come under attack by both—which may sometimes confuse issues. For example, those who attack a proposed Army Engineers flood control project by focussing attention on the *Army Engineers* aspect of the proposal, whether they realize it or not are evading the *flood-control* issue. And if they were to win their fight in such a way on such grounds, they would do so at the expense of leaving the flood problem unsolved, with possible great harm to the community.

You are aware of the things the Corps of Engineers has done in past generations in response to the demands of those generations. Today I want to tell you a few of the things we have done in recent years in response to the public's concern for the environment. To the extent that you may find, after hearing us, that we are being responsive, diligent, and sensitive to public demands—as we surely want to be—then to that extent you may agree that we should look beyond the various agencies for a solution to our resource-management problems and dilemmas. I believe we will find the roots of a good many of them to lie in the varying, sometimes competing and contradictory demands of different elements of the community itself.

RECENT CORPS ACTIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

In our own organization, to equip ourselves to respond adequately to environmental considerations, we have taken these steps among others:

Since 1966 we have issued at least 20 *new regulations* or guidelines to our field organizations requiring increased attention to esthetic and environmental values in project planning and construction. Among other things, the criterion of efficiency or at least cost is no longer overriding in our analysis; and our contracts now require contractors to operate in such a way as to preserve environmental values as fully as possible.

Early in 1966 we established special *Environmental Planning Sections* in each of our ten U.S. Divisions.

We have established within our organization an *Institute for Water Resources* to study long-range planning problems. One of its principal tasks is to study policy on environmental, ecological, and sociological issues.

We have *expanded our force* of landscape architects by 26 since 1965. We now employ 101 full-time landscape architects.

We have expanded our total force of biologists, foresters, agronomists, sanitary engineers, and other specialists in environmental sciences by 71 in the same period. We now employ 297 people in those categories, in addition to the 101 landscape architects. We also employ more than a thousand people, including clerical staff, in our recreation planning and recreation-resource specialty categories.

Meanwhile, we have taken such actions as these:

We have entered into *inter-agency agreements* with the U.S. Department of the Interior, aimed at giving that Department a much stronger and more direct voice in helping us make sound decisions on matters affecting the environment. Among other things, that Department passes on all applications for permits.

Our recommendations for *new project work* often stipulate that participating interests must take measures to protect the environment. For example, recommendations for new navigation projects now typically require the local interests to prohibit the deposition of polluted material into the channels and harbors involved.

We have carried out or participated in a number of *studies* related to *environmental* aspects of our work.

We have initiated a *Distinguished Design Awards* program, giving annual awards for superior performance in architecture, engineering, and landscape architecture in connection with our civil and military construction activities. The judges are eminent independent authorities in their fields.

We are engaged in a continuing program of *research affecting environmental matters*, either with our own staff, with other agencies, or by contract. Research subjects include the effectiveness of multiple outlets in dams in controlling the temperature of river water; a search for varieties of shrubbery and plants that can be safely used in landscaping levees; an examination of the effect on fish and wildlife of proposed diversions of water from the Mississippi River; ways of adjusting turbine blades so that small fish may run down safely through powerplants; studies with Harvard University in the field of environmental resource analysis and evaluation; and studies of the effects of engineering works on the coastal zone.

Over the past four years, we have made a number of proposals for alternative methods of *disposing of dredged materials* in the Great Lakes and other areas, and of disposing of waste materials.

We have carried on a study of possible ways to prevent further erosion of the American Falls part of *Niagara Falls*, should that be desired.

We have continued to refer cases of violations of applicable *water pollution laws* to the Department of Justice for prosecution. For example, in 1969 we referred 355 cases to the Department of Justice for possible prosecution—more than all other Federal agencies put together. Of these, prosecution was declined in 35 cases, 236 are pending action or trial; and there were 94 convictions, which resulted in fines totaling $63,000. In many other cases we succeeded in abating pollution practices without resorting to litigation.

We have consistently *supported legislation* aimed at preserving environmental values. Examples are the scenic rivers act, the Water Resources Planning Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act, the Shoreline Study Act, and many others.

We have awarded or financed a number of *contracts* to Universities and others dealing with environmental improvement *not necessarily connected with our own projects*. Examples are those to develop a classification system for types of scenery or landforms, to inventory Eastern landforms, and to develop the concepts of the environmental corridor.

On many major projects we engage *architectural consultants* to assist us with esthetic design aspects.

We have taken the initiative in development of planning procedures that explicitly recognize environmental enhancement as a national objective which together with the other national objectives of national and regional development and improvement of societal well-being form the basis for formulating plans. This is potentially one of the most significant steps ever attempted in devising plans responsive to meeting the essential needs of a growing community that includes provision for preserving and enhancing environmental values. We are currently working with the Water Resources Council to further the development of techniques to implement this most important approach.

SOME SUMMARY STATISTICS

Let me wrap up this subject with a few summary statistics:

The Corps of Engineers has built and operates some 300 reservoirs or reservoir-type water impoundments—300-odd, out of the 3,600-odd listed in the American Registry of Large Dams built by all entities, public and private, in this country. These Army reservoirs were justified and built for flood control, water supply, and related purposes; 49 of them have powerplants. But they have also been planned and are being managed by the Corps of Engineers in such a way that——

One hundred and fifty fish and wildlife management areas, many in semi-arid areas, with a combined area of nearly 1½ million acres have been established around them.

Four hundred State, county, and municipal parks have been established at these lakes.

The lakes make more than 4 million acres of water surface, and an equal area of land along more than 30,000 miles of shoreline, available for public outdoor recreation.

Recreational attendance at the 300-odd lakes last year was 254 million—more than the attendance at all national forests combined, or all national parks, more than at most professional sports combined. An uncomputed but probably at least an equal number in addition made recreational use of Corps harbors, navigation pools, and waterways.

Upland game of all kinds is benefited by areas made available for refuges, State game preserves, demonstration projects, and the like.

We have done all this within our Congressional and Executive authorizations, while also providing projects that have created millions of jobs; provided water supplies for cities and farms; provided all the harbors through which this Nation carries out its trade and commerce with the rest of the world; provided the inland water highways which carry a sixth of its domestic freight; and many, many other benefits.

I hope this summary will demonstrate that the Army Engineers are an agency which is responsive to the public in all aspects of its desires and needs, tangible and intangible. We think the record shows that we care enough to, and know how to, provide essential tangible services while also enhancing the environment, through planning and resource-management concepts that are not one-sided in either direction, but aimed at providing a full, well-rounded service to the American people.

At present we are moving energetically to carry out our new obligations under the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*. We have re-alerted our field offices to our policy of full support for both the letter and the spirit of the Act, and are preparing guidelines to ensure that all work now under way is finished in full compliance with it. For example, section 102 of the Act requires us to include in all our major project and survey reports detailed statements covering five specified points concerning the environmental impact; and section 103 requires us to review our present authority, and if necessary propose changes in that authority, to bring it in line with the objectives of the Act. This is being done.

RESPONSIVENESS TO TANGIBLE NEEDS

As a responsible agency, we cannot overlook the tangible material needs of our society—not while we have a population explosion that is adding the equivalent of a town of 7,500 to our Nation every day—a city of 50,000 every week—a metropolis of a quarter of a million every month; whose population is doubling every 40 years, whose economic enterprise is doubling every 20 years, whose water use is doubling every ten years or less, and whose recreational use of water is doubling every six years.

The Corps of Engineers must respond to the wishes our people expressed in the market-place and the employment agency and the obstetrical wards of hospitals, as well as to those they express in meeting-halls and demonstrations. It is not up to us to take sides in the competition between material and non-material public desires. To us both are equally legitimate—in fact, both are two sides of the same coin of wise resource management—and we strive to serve both, each with due consideration and regard for the other. Today we have to consider all the public's demands, just as we have always had to serve the varying demands of each generation, each in its turn, as they emerged.

As recently as 1961, the most authoritative word on water-resource matters was the very exhaustive report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. The projections in that report were made by Resources for the Future, Inc. The report, in effect told the Nation that by 1980 it would need about twice as much reservoir storage space as it had in 1960—94 million more acre-feet reserved for flood control; about 315 million acre-feet to increase the low-water flows of principal rivers; and some $13½ billion dollars worth of other water-resource development works, the whole adding to a total of more than $28 billion needed for investment in water-resource developments alone to keep up with the material needs of the growing population.

Today the preservationist interest has made a dramatic surge and the development interest has been thrust into the background. But the needs revealed by the Senate Select Committee have not disappeared. Less than a year and a half ago, the interagency Water Resources Council published its first national assessment of the Nation's water resources. It showed that of the 18 major regions into which the continental United States is divided, 9 face major or severe water-supply problems, and others face equally serious water-quality or flood or other water-related problems. We could be leaving a heritage of great trouble for future generations to cope with if we neglect these material development needs. This too is something to consider in shaping our resource-management policies.

We of the Corps of Engineers are absolutely convinced of, and completely committed to, the proposition that this Nation can meet both kinds of demand to a very large degree. But cooperation is essential to the achievement of both objectives, while conflict can do nothing but obstruct both. That is why we believe that the best, the only realistic, way to protect environmental concerns is to see that material needs are also adequately provided for in any resource-management planning.

NEED FOR MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Conflicts of the kind I have been talking about have always existed. They are endemic to any kind of public-works program. Up to now we have always been able to resolve them more or less peacefully and amicably through our democratic processes and institutions, and get on with the job of serving the public and meeting its demands. But up to now we have had a reasonably united, reasonably optimistic and forward-looking society.

Today we are living in a society showing increasing signs of frustration and disunity. In such times, all controversies become more heated, opposition becomes violent, and the agreements, compromises, and cooperation that can lead to constructive action become very hard to achieve.

One of the reasons why we are meeting with you, today is that we believe both we and the public need all the help that you, as the public's eyes and ears and to a degree its voice, can give in reaching informed, well-considered decisions on a very complicated topic which has many ramifications that people do not yet always foresee. The housewife in her all-electric kitchen with its unmetered water faucets (if she lives in New York City) needs help in realizing that, with resources as with money, you don't get something for nothing. Everything you demand is going to cost you something else you will have to give up in order to get it. We don't yet know what the various proposals for improving the natural environment will cost us, in mony and in terms of other values and advantages we will have to forego. But we should start thinking, studying and discussing the subject so that when we do commit ourselves to courses of action, we can be as certain as possible that we have made wise decisions that balance preservation and development of our resources which will serve the best interests of this and future generations.

THE ISSUES OF 1970

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the October 12, 1970 New York Times. I feel that this editorial states precisely what is wrong with the approach of various administration officials now on the campaign trail. They just are not discussing the issues. Creating fear, anxiety, and frustration among the electorate is no way to face the tremendous problems now before the United States. It just points out that the administration does not have any answers.

The editorial follows:

THE ISSUES OF 1970

Vice President Agnew and many other Republican party leaders are involved in a major political effort to win control of the House and Senate in November through the exploitation of fear, anxiety, and frustration.

Instead of offering proposals aimed at solving the very real domestic problems before the country, they are shouting at scapegoats, working up emotions to a more intense pitch, and exacerbating the mistrust of one group of Americans for another. What are these problems? They are the conduct of foreign policy, the management of the Government's relationship with the economy, and the promotion of social justice under law. With a war in Southeast Asia and a major crisis in the Middle East, an economic recession at home and widespread disillusionment over the responsiveness of American political in-

stitutions, public men do not lack for serious subjects to talk about.

But these are not the subjects that the Vice President and his colleagues seem to want to discuss. They are hammering away at something loosely called "the social issue." This amorphous topic includes crime, campus disorders, drug addiction, moral permissiveness, and various kinds of violence. This bundle of concerns includes some aspects of human behavior which are outside the domain of politics. Whatever parents may think of moral permissiveness, how many of them really look to political leaders to tell them how to raise their children? Can even a polysyllabic Vice President influence what kind of music is popular with young people or how long they should wear their hair? Or their skirts?

Other concerns such as crime and drug addiction are genuine problems but they are not, strictly speaking, "issues." To have an issue, there have to be two sides. But no responsible man in either party is pro-drugs, pro-crime, or pro-violence.

To make it seem as if there is an issue, Vice President Agnew has to invent the other side by distorting the opinions of his liberal opponents and has to torture logic to connect cause to effect.

The "social issue" falls apart when its components are analyzed. The truth is that no one knows why there has been an increase in crime and in drug addiction. The rate of both have continued to go up during the first twenty-one months of the Nixon Administration, and doubtless they will continue to go up after every one of the Administration's anti-crime and anti-drug bills have passed, dubious and irrelevant as some of them are. This is not to say that society or government is helpless to do anything, but rather that crime and drug addiction are enormously complex and stubborn problems and that effective solutions are going to take a long time, a lot of money, and patient experimentation. With social maladies as with physical illness, beware of the quack who promises cheap, easy cures for baffling afflictions.

Vice President Agnew, G.O.P. National Chairman Morton, and lesser party orators link associated social ills to "Democratic permissiveness." But revolutions in manners and morals have always taken place outside the boundaries of politics. Were the bobbed hair, short skirts, and hip flasks of the jazz age youth of the 1920's attributable to the permissiveness of Calvin Coolidge? Are the campus rebels of the 1960's whose personalities were formed as children in the 1950's to be attributed to the Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower?

The "social issue" is one of those great nonissues which periodically roll across the public scene for a few years and then vanish leaving only a few bad memories and a headache. It is remarkably similar to that great nonissue of the early 1950's—domestic Communism. In the Congressional campaigns of sixteen and eighteen years ago, G.O.P. orators first inflated and distorted the Communist issue and then told audiences that the Republican Administration of that day was kicking out Communists and "security risks" by the hundreds. Terroristic violence, on or off the campus, and Communist espionage are both problems for police experts using counterintelligence methods. A Weatherman or some other political fanatic may be as difficult to track down today as a Communist spy in 1950 but in neither case are windy speeches of any help.

It is not an accident that the Vice President, and President Nixon too, while piously protesting that they do not want to curb academic freedom, keep focusing hostile public attention on the universities. From the progressiveness of LaFollete to the New Deal of Roosevelt and the New Frontier of Kennedy, the universities have been the staging ground of every liberal reform movement.

An Administration which wants to protect existing vested interests and usher in a new era of reaction and passivity can more easily achieve its purpose if the university professors, the television news commentators, and the critical newspapers are discredited and, if possible, a little intimidated. An Administration which has to cope with an unpromising war in Southeast Asia, which is more effective at raising unemployment than ending inflation, and which has inadequate programs for the nation's cities is naturally eager to distract attention to long-haired youths, rock music, permissive parents, the "drug culture" and other scapegoats. The Administration's political motives are as understandable as they are unattractive; its divisive campaign strategy must not be allowed to divert attention of the country—and of responsible candidates of either party—from the real issues of 1970.

A REPLY TO THE SCRANTON REPORT

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial entitled "A Reply to the Scranton Report," the Chicago Tribune writes that what needs to be done is to distinguish between dissent and violence, something the report fails to do.

The Tribune quotes Jerris Leonard, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, as saying that the Federal Government is "not in the business of keeping peace on the campus." At a meeting of the Council of Community College Boards, Mr. Leonard further stated that:

The primary responsibility for maintaining order in our colleges and universities rests with administrators, faculty, and you, the trustees.

I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point.

A REPLY TO THE SCRANTON REPORT

Jerris Leonard, assistant attorney general for civil rights, has provided the administration's first formal reply to the Scranton commission's report on campus unrest. Speaking at a meeting of the Council of Community College Boards in Chicago, he said that the federal government is "not in the business of keeping peace on the campus."

"The primary responsibility for maintaining order in our colleges and universities," he said, "rests with administrators, faculty, and you, the trustees. And the plain truth is that in many cases those have not had the foresight to respond to the legitimate needs of their students, or the guts to stand up to the illegitimate and illegal activity of a small percentage bent on tearing down every one of our institutions."

No doubt Mr. Leonard will be accused of passing back to the universities the buck that the Scranton commission had passed to the administration by calling on the President, as its first recommendation, to exercise his "reconciling moral leadership."

The buck belongs where Mr. Leonard has put it. The Scranton commission's report fails to distinguish adequately between dissent and violence; it seems to suggest that to stop violence it is necessary to remove the causes of dissent. Removing the causes of dissent has been the goal of democratic governments for as long as they have existed. To remove them would be to create a Utopia, and it is a delusion to think that this can be brought about now or perhaps ever. There is always going to be dissent.

The commission is probably right in saying that the war is the chief cause of unrest on the campuses today; but to suggest that the President should end the war in order to end the dissent is begging the question. The issue is not whether to end the war but how to end it, and polls show that most Americans are satisfied with the way the President is going about it. Does the Scranton commission want the government to alter its policies to meet the objections of a minority of the people? If so, it is preaching the submission to special interest minorities which is abhorrent to most of us and to the liberals above all.

What, then, is the President to do? He can't remove the causes of dissent, he can't appease the dissenters, and neither must dissent be stifled. What is called for, clearly, is to stop confusing dissent and violence. The very name of the commission contributes to this confusion, because "unrest" is a vague sort of word halfway between the two, one that suggests that violence is an inevitable manifestation of dissent. In parts of its report, the committee itself doesn't seem to be quite sure what it is trying to stop.

It is violence that must be stopped, not dissent. The commission has made several concrete and sensible suggestions for dealing with violence, but they all call for action by college administrators or local officials—not by the President. To put the primary responsibility on the President, whose moral leadership means little to the terrorists, is to divert attention from what has to be done.

A VIEW OF THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP ABROAD

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, of the articles on President Nixon's recent European trip, one of the most interesting was by Richard Starnes of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

According to Mr. Starnes, the climax of the trip was in Ireland when the President met with the press, holding them spellbound as he talked about the purposes and accomplishments of his journey.

Mr. Nixon said he had found a high degree of confidence in the American Government among the world leaders with whom he had spent time. Mr. Starnes writes that the President said:

The United States' greatest asset in foreign policy is that no foreign leader fears the United States has designs on dominating any country or interfering in their affairs. This is a tremendous asset for us.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD Mr. Starnes' view of the President's trip which appeared in the Washington Daily News on October 5, 1970:

NIXON LAYS THE CHARM ON THICK

(By Richard Starnes)

CASTLE DROMOLAND, COUNTY CLARE, IRELAND.—Possibly the most important thing to emerge from President Nixon's exhausting eight-day European trip which ends tonight is that he has learned to wear the cloak of power with easy grace.

In his meetings with Tito he charmed the Yugoslavian bear. Tito, an old revolutionary who was never an easy mark, made it clear that he approved of the American President—if not all his policies.

Mr. Nixon himself later made plain his plan to use to the fullest the avenues of communication he opened with the unchallenged leader of the nonaligned world.

SESSION WITH REPORTERS

But for reporters following the President's hectic journey, the climax and the most impressive display of the President's grasp of world problems came last night at this thrice rebuilt 16th century Irish castle which is now a very, very posh hotel. Here, for the first time during the trip, Mr. Nixon met the press en masse and held it spellbound while he talked about the purposes and accomplishments of his journey the length and breadth of Europe.

The President's main points were:

The United States will not unilaterally dismantle NATO. Any reductions in American commitment to European defense must be done bilaterally. That is on a give and take basis with the Soviet Union.

The U.S. Sixth Fleet's position of preeminence in the Mediterranean, now being challenged by Russia, will be maintained even if it means adding more ships and men.

Among the leaders he talked to, Mr. Nixon found strong support for the American peace initiative in the Middle East, and the initiative will be pursued in spite of the death of President Nasser of Egypt.

The United States "has many friends" among world leaders, and the President found much better understanding of this country's Vietnamese policy.

The President's performance for newsmen followed a two-hour session with his Vietnam negotiators, Ambassador David K. E. Bruce and Philip Habib. The negotiators received new instructions, and the White House said the U.S. negotiating position has changed since the President last met with them in July. However, spokesmen refused to give details of the changes.

This invited speculation that the United States soon will make some move to counter the package of "peace initiative" proposals offered by the Viet Cong last month.

White House sources said today President Nixon will address the nation this week on the Vietnam war and America's efforts to bring peace. White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler said: "We hope if at all possible to make progress in bringing the conflict in South Vietnam to a conclusion thru negotiations."

Altho Mr. Ziegler refused to confirm or deny reports that Mr. Nixon would make a major Vietnam announcement, other officials privately confirmed plans for the address. Speculation centered on announcement of a speed-up in the rate of U.S. troop withdrawals.

President Nixon looked tired as he neared the end of his closely-scheduled 12,000-mile journey. But he spoke forcefully and persuasively to reporters at a reception he gave for them in this refurbished ancient keep. When he had finished his on-the-record remarks the President spent several minutes moving among the 150 or so journalists, joking with old friends, displaying considerable knowledge of their technical problems and talking about their home towns.

APPRAISAL OF TRIP

In his remarks for the record Mr. Nixon emphasized that his trip would have to be appraised "not immediately but in weeks and months that follow."

The purpose of the trip, he said, "was to strengthen the structure of peace in the world, and particularly in the Mediterranean area.

The President noted that economic and political stability were essential in the area. "But above all there must be military stability (in an area) where violence can arise." He added:

"That's why I visited the Sixth Fleet. The Sixth Fleet's mission is to deter irresponsible elements in the Middle East. It is essential that the Sixth Fleet continue to have that capability."

Altho the President spoke candidly about the uses of power, the tone of his talk with reporters was moderate and well-informed almost to the point of being scholarly.

This year, he noted, "marks a period in which Spain is moving economically into the front ranks of Europe." He predicted that the "economic and political isolation of Spain is drawing to an end," adding: "This is healthy and constructive."

Without directly alluding to the aging Spanish chief of state the President made plain that he had noted Franco's obvious frailty in his visit to Madrid when he said he had been "impressed by the young vigorous new leaders" who were arising in Spain.

Mr. Nixon was clearly pleased with the results of his trip to date. Speaking without notes, he never missed a beat for about 20 minutes, ticking off countries and issues as if he had memorized them.

With obvious pride he said he had found a high degree of confidence in the American government among the world leaders he had spent time with. "The United States' greatest asset in foreign policy," he said, "is that no foreign leader fears the United States has designs on dominating any country or interfering in their affairs. This is a tremendous asset for us." He added:

Even old hands at the business of President watching were impressed. One foreign reporter, not notably friendly to the President, openly admired Mr. Nixon's performance. "You may not like the man," he said, "but you must admire this. It was a real tour de force."

CAMBODIA PUSH REAPS REWARD

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in light of the success of the Cambodian operation, Joseph Alsop has written a column dealing with the discrepancy in the civilian and military estimates of the tonnage of arms the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong were getting through Sihanoukville.

The civilian estimate was 8,000 tons a year; the military, 15,000. Now it has been ascertained that the Cambodian supply system was providing the enemy with 21,000 tons a year which was more than enough to supply III and IV corps.

I know all my colleagues will be interested in this aspect in the background and results of the Cambodian incursion, and I therefore insert Mr. Alsop's column, "Cambodia Push Reaps Reward," in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 6, 1970]

CAMBODIA PUSH REAPS REWARD

(By Joseph Alsop)

The Cambodian episode has so far receded that it is barely mentioned any longer. But simply as a study in the ways of modern government, it is worth reporting how new figures have now proved the extreme shrewdness of President Nixon's decision to invade Hanoi's Cambodian sanctuaries.

The decision was based, to begin with, on two related considerations: first, the value to Hanoi of the sanctuaries themselves, and second, the even greater value to Hanoi of the Cambodian supply system which was continuously replenished by Communist ships unloading at the port of Sihanoukville.

The question of the Cambodian supply system, in turn, had long before touched off one of those bureaucratic comedies in which the U.S. government seems to specialize. In brief, the civilian side of the government did not wish to believe that such a system even existed; hence it long refused to do so, despite the solid evidence produced by the military in Vietnam.

Finally, about 2½ years ago, the evidence became too strong to overlook. But naturally, since the mere fact of the Cambodian supply system had been so long denied, the next step was to downgrade its importance by every means possible.

Even last year, therefore, our government had two competing estimates, both official, of the tonnages of arms the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong were getting through Sihanoukville. The civilian estimate was a maximum of 8,000 tons a year. The military estimate, made by the U.S. headquarters in Saigon, was 15,000 tons a year.

The difference was important. The lower estimate gave the Cambodian supply system relatively marginal importance, whereas the higher estimate meant that almost enough arms were being brought in through Sihanoukville to nourish the entire war effort of the enemy in the lower half of South Vietnam. In consequence, the difference caused a sanguinary bureaucratic war, which raged between Washington and Saigon for month after disputatious month.

Even after the invasion order was given, the difference still had its effect. The lower estimate was in truth the basis for the nonsensical reports from Saigon that Hanoi was rapidly organizing a "substitute" for Sihanoukville, by expanding the supply lines running through Laos. There was much quoted, to prove that the Cambodian adventure would not have decisive effects.

By now, however, the enormous masses of enemy documents taken in Cambodia have finally been analyzed. The arms deliveries through Sihanoukville have been meticulously traced. And the result has been to prove that the Cambodian supply system was actually providing the enemy with more than 21,000 tons a year!

Here you see the effect, on even the most sober judgments, of wanting to believe what you want to hear. But here you also see why the Cambodian adventure has in fact been even more decisive than its few defenders dared to hope at the outset.

With more than 21,000 tons of arms a year coming in through Cambodia, the enemy had far more than enough to supply all his units in III and IV corps. But with the supply flow stopped—as it was instantly stopped when the sanctuaries were invaded—the units in III and IV corps were left without any supply at all.

The result has been what anyone but a certain sort of U.S. senator would naturally expect. In the rich delta provinces of IV Corps, for instance, three South Vietnamese divisions of fine quality had had their work cut out for them before the Cambodian invasion.

They were making progress, but it was fairly slow progress, in part because Hanoi had sent five North Vietnamese regiments into the delta to brace up the locals. Now, however, only remnants of two North Vietnamese regiments continue to hang on there; and their early expulsion can be confidently expected.

The chief American in IV Corps, Col. John Paul Vann, has no record of excessive optimism. Yet he now believes that his corps area will be able to get on without one of its three South Vietnamese divisions before this year ends, and will be able to spare another

division early next year. Meanwhile, the enemy's strongest and most ancient redoubts in the delta are currently being seized and held.

Altogether, when you reflect on the past impact upon policy of the bureaucratic comedy above-described, this is a cautionary tale.

ELBURT F. OSBORN CONFIRMED BY U.S. SENATE AS THE NEW DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that Elburt F. Osborn, vice president for research, the Pennsylvania State University, has been unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate as the new Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Dr. Osborn is eminently qualified for this position, and I wish to commend President Nixon and Senators SCOTT and SCHWEIKER from Pennsylvania for their recommendation of Dr. Osborn.

I see a new era in the troubled field of coal mine safety and health standards. Properly administered, the new coal mine safety law, passed by the Congress and signed by the President, can open up a whole new atmosphere in mine safety.

I believe Dr. Osborn can and will properly and ably administer this law for the benefit of the coal miner and the coal industry.

I include his biography in the RECORD at this point:

BIOGRAPHY OF ELBURT FRANKLIN OSBORN

Born: Kishwaukee, Winnebago County, Illinois, August 13, 1911.

Married: Jean McLeod Thomson, Canada, August 12, 1939.

Children: James F. Osborn, B. 1942 and Ian C. Osborn, B. 1946.

Education:

West Chicago High School 1924–1926.

Roosevelt High School, Chicago, Illinois 1926–1928.

Crane Jr. College, Chicago, Illinois 1928–1929.

DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana 1929–1932, B.A.

Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 1932–1934, M.S.

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 1934–1937, Ph.D.

Employment:

Teaching Fellow, in geology, Northwestern University 1932–1934.

Teaching Fellow, California Institute of Technology 1934–1937.

Instructor in geology, Northwestern University 1937.

Geologist, Val d'Or, Quebec 1938.

Petrologist, Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington 1938–1942.

Physical Chemist, Division 1, National Defense Research Committee, Office of Scientific Research and Development 1942–1945.

Research Chemist, Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York 1945–1946.

Professor of Geochemistry and Chairman of the Division of Earth Sciences, College of Mineral Industries, The Pennsylvania State University 1946–1952.

Associate Dean, College of Mineral Industries, The Pennsylvania State University 1952–1953.

Dean, College of Mineral Industries, The Pennsylvania State University 1953–1959.

Vice President for Research, The Pennsylvania State University 1959–.

Professional Societies Membership:

American Association for the Advancement of Science.

American Ceramic Society.

American Chemical Society.

American Geophysical Union.

American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers.

Canadian Ceramic Society.

Geochemical Society.

Geological Society of America.

Geological Society of Washington.

International Association of Geochemistry and Cosmochemistry.

International Association of Volcanology and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior.

Mineralogical Society of America.

Mineralogical Association of Canada.

National Council of University Research Administrators.

Society of Economic Geologists.

Western Pennsylvania Conservancy.

Principal Professional Offices and Committees:

American Association for the Advancement of Science Council 1964–1968 (Representative of American Ceramic Society); 1960–1961 (Representative of Society of Economic Geologists).

American Ceramic Society — President 1964–1965; President Elect 1963–1964; Vice President 1962–1963; Edward Orton, Jr. Memorial Lecturer for 1970; Long Range Planning Committee 1970; Honorary Members Committee 1966– , Chairman 1970– ; Engineering Committee 1967– ; Continuing Education Committee 1966– ; Trustees Nominating Committee 1964–1967, Chairman 1964–1965; Publications Committee 1958–1963, Chairman 1960–1963; 1968– , Chairman 1970– ; Board of Trustees 1962–1965, 1958–1961; Executive Committee 1962–1965, 1958–1959; Technical Advisory Committee, National Bureau of Standards 1954–1958, Chairman 1957–1958; Basic Science Division, Trustee 1957–1960, Chairman 1951–1952.

American Geological Institute—Member, House of Representatives 1968– ; Director 1956–1959.

American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers, Inc.—Hal Williams Hardinge Award Committee 1969– .

Geochemical Society—President 1967–1968; Vice President 1966–1967; Councilor 1958–1960.

Geological Society of America—GSA Representative to U.S. National Committee on Geochemistry 1968– ; Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of By-Laws 1961–1963; Councilor 1959–1962; Policy and Administration Committee 1956–1958.

International Mineralogical Association—Representative of Mineralogical Society of America 1961–1964.

International Union of Geological Sciences—National Committee Member 1961–1964.

Mineralogical Society of America—President 1960–1961; Vice President 1959–1960; Chairman, 50th Anniversary Celebration Symposium: "Mineralogy and Petrology of the Upper Mantle," November 1969; Representative to the American Geological Institute 1968– ; Associate Editor American Mineralogist 1953–1955; Councilor 1950–1953.

National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, National Research Council—Committee on Engineering Aspects of Environmental Quality 1970– ; Executive Committee, Division of Earth Sciences 1969– ; U.S. National Committee on Geochemistry 1968– ; Committee on Mineral Science and Technology, Chairman 1966–1970; National Materials Advisory Board 1969–1970; Materials Advisory Board 1965–1969; Committee on Basic Research Advisory to the U.S. Army Research Office in Ceramics 1960–1963; Division of Chemistry and Chemical Technology 1960–1963; Advisory Panel to the Metallurgy Division of the National Bureau of Standards 1958–1964; Advisory Panel to the Mineral Products Division of the National Bureau of Standards 1958–1962, Chairman 1958–1959; Committee Advisory to Geophysics Branch of Office of Naval Research 1947–1950.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grand Colleges—Special Senate Committee on Mineral Resources 1970– , Chairman 1970– ; Council for Research Policy and Administration; Water Resources Committee 1965– .

National Science Foundation—Advisory Panel for Physical Sciences Facilities 1960–1964; Advisory Panel on Course Content Improvement Programs 1960–1961; Divisional Committee for Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 1955–1959, Chairman 1957–1958; Earth Sciences Panel 1953–1955.

Pennsylvania Research Corporation, Secretary, 1959– .

Society of Economic Geologists—Vice President 1965.

Honorary Societies—Keramos; Phi Beta Kappa, President, Penn State University Chapter 1951; Phi Kappa Phi; Phi Lambda Upsilon; Sigma Xi, The Committee on National Lectureships 1969– ; National Executive Committee 1961–1964; President, Penn State University Chapter 1952.

Boards—The Institute for Medical Education and Research, The Geisinger Medical Center, Board of Directors 1969– ; Earth Sciences Advisory Board, Stanford University 1969– ; Pennsylvania Science and Engineering Foundation, Member of Board 1968– ; Pennsylvania Health Research Institute, Board of Directors 1966– ; SIRIMAR Corporation, La Spezia, Italy, Board of Directors, Vice-Chairman 1961–1963; The Geisinger Medical Center, Board of Directors, Danville, Pennsylvania 1962– ; University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Board of Directors 1959–1967 (PSU Representative at Corporation Members' Meeting 1967–).

Honors and Awards—Member National Academy of Engineering 1968; Doctor of Science (honorary) Alfred University 1965; Fellow American Association for the Advancement of Science; Fellow American Ceramic Society; Fellow American Geophysical Union; Fellow Geological Society of America; Fellow Mineralogical Society of America; Honorary Life Member Canadian Ceramic Society 1965; Edward Orton, Jr. Memorical Lecturer for 1970, American Ceramic Society; National Science Foundation, Senior Post Doctoral Fellow, Cambridge University, England 1958; American Iron and Steel Institute Regional Technical Meetings Award Medal 1954; War-Navy Certificate of Appreciation June 1, 1947; War Department Certificate of Appreciation November 30, 1945.

Publications—See Separate Listing.

Other Organizations—Centre Hills Country Club; Cosmos Club; Delta Tau Delta, Faculty Advisor, Penn State University Chapter 1953–1958.

PUBLICATIONS OF E. F. OSBORN

With Behre, C. H., Jr., and Rainwater, E. H. Contact ore deposition at the Calumet Iron Mine, Colorado. *Econ. Geol.* 31, 781–804 (1936).

Structural petrology of the Val Verde Tonalite, southern California. *Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer.* 50, 921–950 (1939).

With Schairer, J. F. The ternary system pseudowollastonite - akermanite - gehlenite. *Am. J. Sci.* 239, 715–763 (1941).

The system $CaSiO_3$-diopside-anorthite. *Am. J. Sci.* 240, 751–788 (1942).

The compound merwinite, ($3CaO\text{-}MgO\text{-}2SiO_2$) and its stability relations within the system $CaO\text{-}MgO\text{-}SiO_2$ (preliminary report). *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 26, 321–332 (1943).

Silicate chemistry and petrology. *The Compass* 25, 247–249 (1948).

Cellular structures in glass as related to structures in lava. *J. Geol.* 57, 73–78 (1949).

With Roy, R. The system lithium metasilicate-spodumene-silica. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 71, 2086–2095 (1949).

With Ervin, Guy. X-ray data on synthetic melilites. *Am. Mineral.* 34, 717–722 (1949).

With Roy, D. and Roy, R. Phase relations and structural phenomena in the fluoride-model systems LiF-BeF_2 and NaF-BeF_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 33, 85–90 (1950).

With Roy, D. and Roy, R. Compositional and stability relationships among the lithium aluminosilicates: Eucryptite, spodumene, petalite. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 33, 152–159 (1950).

With Shairer, J. F. The system CaO-MgO-FeO-SiO_2: I, Preliminary data on the join $CaSiO_3$-MgO-FeO. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 33, 160–167 (1950).

Segregation of elements during the crystallization of a magma. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 33, 219–224 (1950).

Forsterite refractory made from natural magnesium silicates. U.S. Pat. No. 2,516,249 (July 25, 1950).

With Ervin, Guy. The system Al_2O_3–H_2O. *J. Geol.* 59, 381–394 (1951).

With Muan, A. Fundamental investigation of steel plant refractories problems: I, Phase relations in the system $2CaO \cdot SiO_2$–$CaO \cdot SiO_2$–$2CaO \cdot Al_2O_3 \cdot SiO_2$–FeO. Year Book, *Am. Iron and Steel Inst.*, 325–360 (1951).

Hydrothermal synthesis of forsterite, U.S. Pat. No. 2,590,566 (March 25, 1952).

Book review of "Principles of Geochemistry" by Brian Mason. *Chem. Eng. News* 30, 3124 (1952).

With Roy, R. and Hill, V. G. Polymorphism of Ga_2O_3 and the system Ga_2O_3–H_2O. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 74, 719–722 (1952).

With Hill, V. G. and Roy, R. The system alumina-gallia-water. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 35, 135–142 (1952).

With Tait, D. B. The system diopside-forsterite-anorthite. *Am. J. Sci.* Bowen Vol., 413–433 (1952).

With Roy, R. Studies in the system alumina-silica-water. Problems in clay and laterite genesis symposium, *Am. Inst. Mining Met. Eng.*, 76–80 (1952).

Andrew Carnegie, geochemistry and refractories. Regional Tech. Meeting, *Am. Iron and Steel Inst.*, 103–114 (1952).

With Roy, R. Some simple aids in the hydrothermal investigation of mineral systems. *Econ. Geol.* 47, 717–721 (1952).

Fluoride models. *Ceramic Age,* 41–45 (Nov. 1952).

With Counts, W. E. and Roy, R. Fluoride model systems: II, The binary systems CaF_2–BeF_2, MgF_2–BeF_2, and LiF–MgF_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 36, 12–17 (1953).

With Roy, R. and Hill, V. G. Polymorphs of alumina and gallia. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 45, 819–820 (1953).

Subsolidus reactions in oxide systems in the presence of water at high pressures, *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 36, 147–151 (1953).

With Roy, D. and Roy, R. Fluoride model systems: III, The system NaF–BeF_2 and the polymorphism of Na_2BeF_4 and BeF_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 36, 185–190 (1953).

With Roy, D. and Roy, R. The system MgO–Al_2O_3–H_2O and influence of carbonate and nitrate ions on the phase equilibria. *Am. J. Sci.* 251, 337–361 (1953).

With DeVries, R. C., Gee, K. G., and Kraner, H. M. Optimum composition of blast furnace slag as deduced from liquidus data for the quaternary system CaC-MgO-Al_2O_3-SiO_2. J. Metals, 3–15 (Jan. 1954).

With Ricker, R. W. Additional phase equilibrium data for the system CaO-MgO-SiO_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 37, 133–139 (1954).

With Lamb, V. A. Rifled gun barrel with tapered chromium bore wall. U.S. Pat. No. 2,687,591 (Aug. 31, 1954).

With Roy, D. and Roy, R. Fluoride model systems: IV, The systems LiF-BeF_2 and PBF-BeF_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 37, 300–305 (1954).

Phase equilibrium studies of steel plant refractories systems. Regional Tech. Meetings, *Am. Iron and Steel Inst.*, 145–177 (1954).

With DeVries, R. C. and Roy, R. The system TiO_2-SiO_2. *Trans. Brit. Ceram. Soc.* 53, 525–540 (1954).

With Roy, R. The system Al_2O_3-SiO_2-H_2O. *Am. Mineral.* 39, 853–885 (1954).

With DeVries, R. C. and Roy, R. Phase equilibria in the system CaO-TiO_2. *J. Phys. Chem.* 58, 1069–1073 (1954).

The mineral industries undergraduates speak. *Min. Ind.* 23 (4) 1 (1954).

With DeVries, R. C. and Roy, R. Phase equilibria in the system CaO-TiO_2-SiO_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 38, 158–171 (1955).

With Maun, A. Phase equilibria at liquidus temperatures in the system MgO-FeO-Fe_2O_3-SiO_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 39, 121–140 (1956).

Importance of the spinel phase in the steel industry. Regional Tech. Meetings, *Am. Iron and Steel Inst.*, 135–150 (1956).

Significant changes during the past 50 years in education in the mineral industries fields. *Min. Ind.* 25 (6) 1–3 (1956).

The mineral industries need young men. *Min. Ind.* 26 (2) 1–2 (1956).

With DeVries, R. C. Phase equilibria in high-alumina part of the system CaO-MgO-Al_2O_3-SiO_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 40, 6–15 (1957).

With Sand, L. B., and Roy, R. Stability relations of some minerals in the Na_2O-Al_2O_3-SiO_2-H_2O system. *Econ. Geol.* 52, 169–179 (1957).

With Flaschen, S. S. Studies of the system iron oxide-silica-water at low oxygen partial pressures. *Econ. Geol.* 52, 923–943 (1957).

Fossil Fuels. *Min. Ind.* 27 (1) 4, 5, 8, Oct. (1957).

Complete specification relating to refractory brick. British Patent No. 819,777 assigned to Bethlehem Steel Co., Oct. 29 (1957).

With Glasser, F. P. Phase equilibrium studies in the system CaO-Cr_2O_3-SiO_2 *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 41, 358–367 (1958).

Presentation of the Mineralogical Society of America award to Rustum Roy. *Am. Mineral.* 43, 344–345 (1958).

With Glasser, F. P. The system MnO-SiO_2. *Am. J. Sci.* 256, 398–412 (June 1958).

Role of oxygen pressure in the crystallization and differentiation of basaltic magma. *Am. J. Sci.* 257, 609–647 (1959).

Presentation of Arthur L. Day medal to Edward C. Bullard. *Geol. Soc. Amer.*—Proc. Vol. 1958–59, 91–92 (1960).

With Glasser, F. P. The ternary system MgO-MnO-SiO_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 43, 132–140 (1960).

With Roeder, P. L. Effect of oxygen pressure on crystallization in simplified basalt systems. *Rept. XXI Session Int. Geo. Congress, Part XIII, Petrographic provinces, igneous and metamorphic rocks,* 147–155, Copenhagen (1960).

With Muan, A. Phase equilibrium diagrams of oxide systems. *Am. Ceram. Soc.*, Columbus, Ohio (1960).

Reaction series for subalkaline igneous rocks based on different oxygen pressure conditions. *Am. Mineral.* 47, 211–226 (1962).

Addendum note to reaction series for subalkaline igneous rocks based on different oxygen pressure conditions. *Am. Mineral.* 47, 1480–1481 (1962).

With Muan, A. Phase equilibria as a guide in refractory technology. *Am. Ceram. Soc. Bull.* 41, 450–455 (1962).

Experimental investigation of the oxygen pressure and crystallization phenomena of basalts and andesites. Int. Assoc. of Volcanology. Int. Symposium on Volcanology, Abstracts, Science Council of Japan (1962).

With Fudali, R. F. and Muan, A. Oxygen fugacities of basaltic and andesitic magmas. *Special GSA Papers,* No. 68, Abstracts for 1961, 179–180 (1962).

With Dines, E. A. (U. Pittsburgh), Gallagher, R. T. (Lehigh U.), Mitchell, D. R., and Spackman, W. *Coal in Pennsylvania—Recent developments and prospects.* A report of the Panel of Technical Advisors on Coal Marketing to the Joint State Government Commission, General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 17 pp. (1962).

Chrome silica brick. U.S. Patent No. 3,082,-105 assigned to Bethlehem Steel Co., March 19 (1963).

Scientific and Engineering Research Needs. Statement before Committee on Interior and Insular Affair. House of Representatives, 88th Congress. *H.R. 2683.* September 30, 1963.

Some experimental investigations bearing on the origin of igneous magmas of the earth's crust. *Estudios Geologicos* 19, 1–7 (Dec. 1963).

With Muan, A. Physical chemistry of steel-plant refractories. *Electric Furnace Steelmaking* 2, 215–281 (1963).

Experimental investigations of the oxygen pressure, water content, and order of crystallization of basalts and andesites (in Russian). *The Chemistry of the Earth's Crust* 2, 75–87. Publ. Acad. Sci. U.S.S.R. (1964).

With Hamilton, D. L. and Burnham, C. W. The solubility of water and effects of oxygen fugacity and water content on crystallization in mafic magmas. *J. Petrology* 5, 21–39 (1964).

With Ulmer, G. C. Oxidation-reduction reactions and equilibrium phase relations at 1300° C for the spinel solid series $FeCr_2O_4$-$MgCr_2O_4$ and $FeAl_2O_4$-$MgAl_2O_4$. *Am. Ceram. Soc. Bull.* 43, 301–303 (1964) (Abstract).

A series of short contributions as follows:

(a) Design, a vital component.

(b) The society's role in continuing education.

(c) The society's finances.

(d) The society's publications.

(e) Program for the annual meetings.

Am. Ceram. Soc. Bull. 43: (7) 505; (8) 5a; (9) 633; (10) 679–680 (1964). 44: (4) 281 (1965).

Present developments and future of earth science research. Proc. NSF Grad. Earth Sc. Ed. Conf., Atlanta, Ga., Jan. 25–26 (1965).

With Muan, A. Phase equilibria among oxides in steelmaking. xx + 236 pp. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass. (1965).

With Yang, Julie Chi-Sun. Cementitious product. U.S. Patent No. 3,202,522 assigned to Johns-Manville Corporation, August 24 (1965).

With Roeder, P. L. Experimental data for the system MgO-FeO-Fe_2O_3-$CaAl_2Si_2O_8$-SiO_2 and their petrologic implications. *Am. J. Sci.* 264, 428–480 (1966).

Comment on Note "Hydrothermal Silica Transforations." *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 49, 677 (1966).

With Roeder, P. L. Fractional crystallization trends in the system Mg_2SiO_4-$CaAl_2Si_2O_8$-FeO-Fe_2O_3-SiO_2 over the range of oxygen partial pressures of 10^{-11} to $10^{-9.7}$ atm. *Bulletin Volcanologique,* Tome XXIX, 659–668 (1966).

The future of ceramics and the American Ceramic Society. *Am. Ceram. Soc. Bull.* 46, 913–915 (1967).

With Speidel, D. H. Element distribution among coexisting phases in the system MgO-FeO-Fe_2O_3-SiO_2 as a function of temperature and oxygen fugacity. *Am. Mineral.* 52, 1139–1152 (1967).

With Roeder, P. L., and Glasser, F. P. The system Al_2O_3-Cr_2O_3-SiO_2. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* 51 (10) (October 1968).

Statement of Dr. Elburt F. Osborn, Vice President for Research, Pennsylvania State University. *National Mining and Minerals Policy Hearing Before The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs United States Senate Ninety-First Congress First Session On S. 719 A Bill To Establish A National Mining and Minerals Policy July 9, 1969.* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 70–74 (1969).

The complementariness of orogenic andesite and alpine peridotite. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 33,* 307–324 (1969).

With Members of the Min. Sci. & Tech. Comm. Mineral Science and Technology: Needs, Challenges and Opportunities. *Nat. Acad. Sci.* (1969).

Experimental aspects of calc-alkaline differentiation. Proc. Andesite Conf., July 1–6,

1968; Eugene and Bend, Oregon. *Bull. 65, Dept. Geol. Min. Ind., State of Oregon,* 33–42 (1969).

With Eggler, D. H. Experimental data for the system MgO - FeO - Fe_2O_3 - $NaAlSi_2O_6$-$CaAl_2Si_2O_8$-SiO_2 and their petrologic application. *Abs., Trans. Am. Geoph. U.,* 50, 337 (1969).

Genetic significance of V and Ni content of andesites: Comments on a paper by Taylor, Kaye, White, Duncan and Ewart. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 33* 1553–1554 (1969).

With Roeder, P. L., and Ulmer, G. C. Phase equilibria at solidus temperatures in the quaternary system CaO-MgO-Al_2O_3-SiO_2 and their bearing on optimum composition of blast furnace slag and on slag properties. *Bull. Earth Min. Sci. Exp. Sta., Penn State Univ.,* 85, 1–22 (1969).

With Gee, K. H. Phase equilibria at liquidus temperatures in a part of the system CaO-MgO-Al_2O_3-SiO_2: The System $Ca_2MgSi_2O_7$-$Ca_2Al_2SiO_7$ - $CaMgSi_2O_6$ - $CaAl_2Si_2O_8$. *Bull. Earth Min. Sci. Exp. Sta., Penn State Univ.,* 85, 23–51 (1969).

With Muan, A. Addendum note to Part II occasioned by papers of E. D. deWys and W. R. Foster on the system diopside-anorthiteakermanite. *Bull. Earth Min. Sci. Exp. Sta., Penn State Univ.,* 85, 53–56 (1969).

With Gee, K. H. Phase equilibria at liquidus temperatures for a part of the system CaO-MgO-Al_2O_3-Ti_2SiO_2 and their bearing on the effect of titania on the properties of blast furnace slag. *Bull. Earth Min. Sci. Exp. Sta. Penn State Univ.,* 85, 57–80 (1969).

Statement of Elburt F. Osborn, Professor of Geochemistry and Vice President for Research, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa. *Resource Recovery Act of 1969 (Part 3) Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution Of The Committee On Public Works United States Senate Ninety-first Congress Second Session on S. 2005 A Bill To Amend The Solid Waste Disposal Act In Order To Provide Financial Assistance For The Construction of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities, To Improve Research Programs Pursuant to Such Act, and for Other Purposes February 20, 23, 24, and 25, 1970.* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1738–1774 (1970).

Presentation of the 1967 Arthur L. Day medal to Orville Frank Tuttle. *Geol. Soc. Amer.*—Proc. Vol. 1970, 93–95 (1970).

Mineral Science and Technology in the United States: An Appraisal. *Canad. Mining and Metallurgical Bull.,* 698(63):667–672 (June 1970).

The remarkable development and precarious future of basic ceramic research in the United States—a case history. *Orton Memorial Lecture, Delivered before the 72nd Annual Meeting of the American Ceramic Society, May 4, 1970. Am. Ceram. Soc. Bull.* 49, 702–706 (1970).

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROTECT THE ECOLOGY OF ESTUARINE AREAS BY REGULATING DUMPING OF WASTE MATERIALS, TO AUTHORIZE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYSTEM OF MARINE SANCTUARIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to regulate the dumping of waste materials of all kinds into our coastal waters and the oceans and to authorize the establishment of a system of marine sanctuaries where dumping and all other intrusions by man will be prohibited.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member, has held extensive hearings during the past 3 months dealing with various aspects of ocean dumping and the protection of the marine environment. The Oceanography Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) began this series of hearings with an in-depth investigation into the circumstances surrounding operation "Chase," the Army's nerve gas disposal program. As a member of the Oceanography Subcommittee, I participated in all of these hearings. The hearings clearly demonstrated the need for further legislation to prevent the use of the oceans as a convenient dump for unwanted military hardware. Those hearings also clearly pointed up the failure of a number of Federal agencies to recognize their responsibilities under the Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Although we were unsuccessful in our efforts to reverse the decision of the Army to dump its nerve gas into the Atlantic, the hearings of the Oceanography Subcommittee provided a solid foundation of testimony in support of vigorous action by the Congress. Hopefully those hearings also demonstrated to the executive agencies involved the seriousness of their failure to abide by the spirit as well as the letter of the Environmental Policy Act.

More recently, the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee, on which I also serve, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), has held hearings on a variety of bills dealing with the question of ocean dumping and disposal of various forms of refuse and the byproducts of a modern technological society. A number of distinguished ecologists testified at these hearings in support of immediate legislative action to curb the ever-increasing tendency of the United States and American industry to regard the oceans as a convenient and cheap disposal area. While witnesses from the various departments of the Federal Government generally recognized the need for legislative action, they declined to comment upon the merits of various bills then before the subcommittee on the grounds that the Council on Environmental Quality had been directed by the President to study this problem and to prepare recommendations for legislative action.

Shortly after the conclusion of our hearings, the Council submitted its report on dumping to the President who, in turn, has forwarded that report to the Congress, together with a statement endorsing the findings of the Council. Although it was expected that the Council's legislative recommendation would accompany its report, only a broad outline of these recommendations was, in fact, submitted to Congress. In view of the extreme urgency of the problem, I deeply regret the decision of the administration to withhold its legislative recommendations until the convening of the 92d Congress. In view of the fact that we shall be returning in November, I have drafted legislation which I hope will be given serious consideration by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the subcommittees upon which I serve. Although this bill is in no way the final definitive answer to the question of how best to legislate in this area, I believe it does offer certain desirable features which are not found in any of the legislation now before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few additional minutes to explain the provisions of this legislation. It is clear that the dumping of dredge spoil constitutes the largest single element in the growing volume of refuse being dumped into the oceans. Most dredge spoil is dumped relatively inshore, where it may contaminate valuable breeding grounds for shellfish and fish species generally. In view of this, it seems entirely logical to relate the problem of ocean-dumping to the broader problem of preserving certain eco-systems within the coastal zone areas. The legislation which I have introduced, therefore, has a twofold purpose. On the one hand, it prohibits the dumping of waste material into the oceans, our coastal waters, and estuarine areas, except under authority of a permit issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and on the other hand it authorizes the designation of marine sanctuaries where no dumping of any kind and no industrial activity, principally extraction of minerals, may be carried on.

While a number of bills currently being considered by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee provide for the designation of safe areas where dumping may be conducted, it seems to me more reasonable to concentrate on determining which areas of our marine environment are most valuable and setting them aside as sanctuaries. This approach is somewhat analogous to the wilderness system, which attempts to preserve in their natural state the most valuable of our remaining untouched land areas.

I have chosen as a vehicle for this legislation the act of August 3, 1968, which declared as a national policy the concept that the estuarine areas of the United States are of great value to America and must be protected and conserved for the future of this Nation.

Section 1 of the bill amends the policy declaration of the 1968 act to recognize the fact that our estuarine areas are being subjected to severe ecological degradation through unregulated dumping in the oceans and in the coastal waters of the United States. This section further provides that portions of the Nation's tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, and seaward areas should be preserved as marine sanctuaries.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 6 of the 1968 act to prohibit disposal of waste materials without a permit from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Disposal is defined in the bill as the placing, releasing or discharging by any means whatsoever. Waste material is defined so as to include all solid and liquid industrial byproducts, chemicals, sewage, sludge, dredging spoils, debris, and so forth.

Section 3 of the bill adds a number of new sections to the 1968 act which provide the machinery for enforcement of

the dumping prohibition and for the designation of marine sanctuaries. The first of these new sections authorizes the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue dumping permits under such terms and conditions as he determines necessary to insure that the dumping or disposal will not damage the ecology of the marine environment. It provides minimum guidelines for the Administrator in arriving at a determination with respect to the potential harm of a proposed dumping activity, and prohibits outright the dumping of radioactive wastes, toxic industrial wastes, and chemical and bilological warfare materials. This section also establishes standards for the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes which may be disposed of under a permit. Finally, this section authorizes the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to prohibit the dumping or disposal of any other waste material which he determines may damage the ecology, and in making such determination he may rely upon whatever indicators currently are available to him regardless of the fact that such indicators may not be conclusive.

The second new section of the act proposed by my bill establishes fines for unauthorized dumping ranging from a minimum of $2,000 up to $10,000 for the first offense, and from a minimum of $10,000 to a maximum of $25,000 for each succeeding offense. It further provides that any vessel or barge engaged in dumping in violation of the act shall be forfeited. This section also provides for enforcement of the act by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Coast Guard, and the Corps of Engineers, acting jointly. Each of these agencies has unique resources and expertise which should be brought to bear upon this problem. The legislation also empowers the Coast Guard to stop and search vessels in our territorial waters and in the contiguous zone to determine whether they are engaged in unauthorized dumping activities or related transportation activities.

The third new section of the act authorizes the Secretary of Commerce acting through the newly-established National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in conjunction with the Secretary of Interior, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality, to designate as marine sanctuaries those areas which the Secretary determines should be preserved or restord for their recreation, conservation, ecologic, or esthetic value. This section directs the Secretary to make an initial designation of marne sanctuaries within 2 years following the date of enactment of the legislation, and requires him to submit an annual report to the President and Congress reviewing his activities under this act. Adequate funds are authorized for the conduct of necessary studies leading to the designation of marine sanctuaries. The Secretary of Interior may not renew any license or permit for marine mining activities within an area under study for designation as a marine sanctuary, nor may the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency issue or renew any permit for dumping in any area under study.

The final proposed sections of the 1968 act make it clear that this act supplements the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and the National Environmental Policy Act and provides definitions of the various terms employed in the act.

The final section of the bill provides that the requirement for a dumping or disposal permit shall become effective 120 days after the date of enactment of the legislation. This should provide adequate leadtime for the Environmental Protection Agency, the Coast Guard, and the Corps of Engineers to establish their enforcement procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that any legislation of this type which bans outright or places severe restrictions upon an existing practice will cause a degree of disruption, both to Government and to business. In view, however, of the extreme need for this legislation, I believe that the ensuing disruption of customary practices is justified, and that the American people who have of late become so aware of the dangers confronting the quality of our environment will support such legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in the midst of change. Every facet of our society is being forced to respond to transformation wrought by science, technology, and education. Businesses, universities, and civic groups are all subject to continuous modifications. Even the individual citizen finds himself caught up in the throes of sociological reform. There is now a rising insistence that Government must also adapt itself to this period of rapidly increasing technology.

The Congress of the United States has not come to grips with this fact of modern life. Since first coming to Washington, I have been vexed by Congress' inept process for solving imminent problems. The legislative body of our Government has updated its operations only once in its history and that reorganization took place almost 25 years ago.

Since that time we have passed into a nuclear age and Congress shares responsibility for an increasingly wide range of social and scientific activity. Rapid technological advancement, once seen as the measure of human progress, is now also viewed as a monster, capable of destroying our environment. This is an era of social unrest, and citizens are questioning the very effectiveness of our system of Government. Federal spending has more than tripled in this time. Yet Congress continues to deal with these problems under a structure that was revised 25 years ago. Congress has not brought its methods, approaches, and structures into conformity with the dynamics of change.

In light of this, we were none too soon in passing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. In fact, this bill should be recognized as one of the most significant pieces of legislation which the Congress has acted upon this session. It marks substantial progress toward the overall goal of effecting a responsive and efficient representative government.

There can be little question that this legislation is long overdue. The Congress recognized the need for organizational reform 5 years ago when it created the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress—purposed to study the workings of the Congress and directed to present methods for modernizing the Congress to meet the needs of the times. After months of study and testimony, this committee set forth its recommendations and since that time both bodies of the Congress have passed legislation founded on these recommendations. The time lapse between the date of the joint committee's recommendations and the passage of this legislation in recent weeks illustrates the outdated legislative process. The very fact that it has taken some 60 months for the Congress to complete action on a matter that it marked for action 5 years before is evidence of the need for reform. Debate on this legislation stretched over a 2-month period in the House of Representatives, with actual debate time amounting to some 11 days. This speaks for itself. The Congress finally has shown its concern for operating responsively in a time when changes are taking place so rapidly that it must be equipped to act readily.

Probably the most important element of this legislation is the amendment providing for the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. This committee will exercise continuous watchfulness over the organization and operation of the Congress and will serve as the innovator of improved methods for more efficient operations. Events of the past several decades illustrate the value of such a committee. The social, economic, and technological upheavals of the past few years display the need for Congress to reequip itself continually with machinery fitted to the times. This committee will make such continual revisions possible by constantly evaluating the legislative process and its relevance to the problems of the times. The function of this body is vital to strengthening the role of Congress so that it can contribute effectively to changes in our society. This is not a radical rejection of that which exists. Rather, it is a recognition of outdated operations and the desire to improve those operations.

Another key facet of this legislation provides for more open discourse with the public about a Representative's role in the legislative process. The House overwhelmingly passed an amendment to allow votes which are taken in the Committee of the Whole to be made public.

We are all aware that the foundation of our democratic government is based on representation by the people. Most legislation is written and rewritten in committee. One of the major functions

of the legislator is his scrutiny of proposed legislation in committee and the public has a right to know of his activities. At the very least, it is a hoax to piously invoke rules and regulations in the name of democratic process to hide our votes from those we are representing. Is the public honestly served when they are purposefully kept unaware of our individual actions on legislation which is enacted to serve them? How can these citizens disagree with our actions and make this disagreement known when we are operating under a protective shield of unpublished voting records? This is a policy that has in fact denied the American public the opportunity of participation in a vital part of the legislative process, and it contradicts the very basis of our democratic government. If we are to reach the public and strengthen our image, we must do so by creating an atmosphere of openness. Then and only then can we hope to drive away the cloud of misunderstanding and negativism that separates us from those we represent.

This legislation includes provisions for increasing the role of the minority party in the legislative process. Certainly the right to challenge and perfect pending legislation as it passes through committee is necessary to achieve effective legislation. In this vein, the House has made provisions for committee staffing for members of the minority party in order that they can more thoroughly and adequately review the various legislative proposals before them in their particular area of expertise. It is imperative in the overall consideration of legislation that many views and judgments come together to accomplish an end result of relevant and useful legislation. The bill also provides for debate time—to be divided between those favoring and those opposing—on conference reports. This is a fair practice of making available as much as possible both areas of judgment to all Members before they cast a vote on a proposal. Also included in the legislation is a provision for witnesses called by minority members at committee hearings. A greater balance of all concerns is being achieved through these means.

Mr. Speaker, the task is not complete. I do not assume that we have adequately dressed ourselves for effective operations over the next few decades. We have made a significant beginning and have included in that step provisions for continual revision. I feel that we have strengthened and improved the legislative process, and I am hopeful that this will lead to a more responsive and relevant Government for all the people of the United States.

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, with the cosponsorship of Congressman HAWKINS and the firm support of the Nixon administration, H.R. 19446—the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970—a bill to provide emergency assistance to school districts which are encountering problems incident to desegregation.

President Nixon has emphasized the urgent need for this emergency legislation as a result of the profound changes which will occur during this school year as a consequence of the administration's school desegregation efforts.

Prior to the 1969–70 school year, only 5.2 percent or 164,273 of the Negro students in the 11 States of the South were attending unitary or desegregated school systems.

Today, however, there are in effect court orders or HEW-approved voluntary plans which will mean that by the 1970–71 school year 58.9 percent, or 1.8 million Negro pupils, will be attending desegregated systems. These existing orders and plans cover a total of 396 school districts.

This massive desegregation effort will necessitate significant alterations and substantial additional costs for many of the school systems involved. The need for additional funds will vary from one district to another, depending upon the special problems and resources of the districts prior to desegregation.

During the desegregation process, some will require training of teachers and staff; some will need guidance, counseling, and other personal services for the children; some will require minor remodeling and repair of existing facilities; some will need to carry out special administrative activities for rescheduling students and providing information to parents and members of the community.

It is for these special needs and as a part of an overall effort to facilitate the process of desegregation and make desegregation a lasting and beneficial program that President Nixon has urged Congress to pass this legislation.

We all recognize that this difficult and complex problem can not be solved merely by the expenditure of large amounts of Federal funds. At the same time, it is evident that additional Federal financial assistance to school districts engaged in programs to desegregate their schools can make a significant contribution to making the process an orderly one and insuring that the desegregated school districts will offer quality education to students of all races.

President Nixon recognizes that this demonstration of quality education in desegregated schools is essential if we are to prevent resegregation of our schools which would make our victory a pyhrric one and would bring us full circle with the problem of segregated education.

The Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 is also a carefully conceived plan to encourage our Nation's school districts to desegregate voluntarily. The bill emphasizes that districts with suitable voluntary plans shall be given priority second to none in the consideration of grants.

Thus, the bill offers an incentive to school districts to desegregate according to careful planning, and it offers special encouragement to voluntary desegregation.

Further, we recognize that desegregation is a nationwide problem in need of nationwide assistance in its solution. This bill insures that any school district in the Nation which is carrying out a desegregation program will have an adequate opportunity to obtain assistance under this legislation.

At the same time, the bill reflects an awareness on the part of the Nixon administration that funds must be concentrated in the areas of greatest needs incident to desegregation so that the financial assistance will have a significant effect upon the problem.

Beginning this school year, the Nation is witnessing a major movement in the effort to end racial segregation in our country's schools.

It is our hope that the result of our efforts will be a higher quality of education for all our Nation's children. This legislation should make a significant impact upon the effort to insure that greater educational quality—and truly equal educational opportunity—becomes a reality.

FORTY-TWO YEARS ON GUARD PROTECTING THE NATION'S FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged and it is a great honor to be afforded this opportunity to express to you, sir, and call to the attention of our other colleagues in the House the sentiments so poignantly stated in the lead editorial of the Paterson News, one of New Jersey's prestigious newspapers, under date of Wednesday, September 30, 1970, as follows:

MCCORMACK'S WARNING

John McCormack has served in Congress for 42 years—under one-fourth of the men who ever lived in the White House—and as Whip and Speaker of the House for 30 years—longest of any man in the leadership of either major party in the history of Congress. For 14 months, after the assassination of President Kennedy, he was next in line for the presidency. He used to ask himself in those days about foreign developments, "Well, what would you do, John?"

In a copyrighted interview with U.S. News and World Report, McCormack issued a warning for the American people, a warning born of his long and close observation of our relations with other governments. In the 30s, he said he saw what appeasement did, when Britain and France let Hitler get away, first with the Rhineland—thinking he'd be satisfied—then Austria, saying "Well, we can live with him."

Today, McCormack finds a tendency in America to "misread the significance of international communism and its designs upon our country." And, he adds, "Arrogant aggression, whether under Nazism or under international communism, isn't something Americans can ignore and live with."

McCormack exploded the popular belief that communism has mellowed as more and more people say, "We can live with commu-

nism." As for himself, he said, "I can live with the Communists if they will leave other countries alone. But the Soviet and Chinese Communists are just as much bent on world domination today as they ever were. There may be tension between the two, but they can get together overnight, and they'd both like to see the world dominated by communism, with America isolated. Then they could fight it out to see who would be the No. 1 Communist nation."

If John McCormack does nothing else for the nation he has served so long and so well, his warning would be a great epitaph to a unique career. It should bring us back to the realities around us, not let the surface evidence blind us to the dangers through which we live.

The foregoing editorial bears witness and testimony to the great pride we all share in the wisdom of your leadership, your impeccable ethics, and the integrity of your sincerity of purpose in a lifetime of service to your fellow man.

With the overview of history now evolving, our Nation's resolve to peace and freedom should never be misinterpreted or considered to be a capitulation to worldwide Communist domination. The substance of this real threat in this highly precarious time in history, by no means, can be underestimated particularly when we take into consideration that the express goal of the Communists has been and continues to be to establish communistic governments under their domination throughout the world. In this time of national soul-searching, as we agonize over our decisions, I personally believe we must be ever-vigilant to recognize the evils of those who would choose a course of political expediency, attempting to manipulate the public conscience of our country for their own short-term political favor. It is abundantly clear that the fast moving, unprecedented events affecting the very health, safety, and well-being of our Nation, both internationally and domestically, are of such magnitude and complexities that they literally gnaw at the very roots of our representative democracy.

As history is recorded, America is indeed fortunate to have had the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House, on guard for 42 years protecting the Nation's freedom.

OPPOSITION TO ABORTION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the root of opposition to the legalized killing of the unborn known as abortion is, as it has always been, the conscience of God-fearing men and women, both Christian and Jews. The principal organized opposition to abortion in recent years has been furnished by the Roman Catholic Church, which now speaks in the United States through its National Council of Bishops.

In view of this fact, any diminution in the firmness, outspokenness, and vigor of the Catholic bishops' opposition to abortion is sure to be taken as evidence that our traditional conscience on this issue is changing and dying out, and need no longer be taken very seriously by the elected representatives of the people. Mere vague general declarations of continued opposition are not enough to dispel this impression.

Just prior to the semiannual meeting of the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States last April, an editorial appeared in the national Catholic magazine Triumph, urging that the bishops take a much stronger stand against the rapidly spreading legalization of abortion. Triumph's recommendations were not then heeded. But since then there have been some signs of increasing firmness on this issue by the bishops. Many of us will be watching with great interest to see just what kind of position they take and what kind of action they recommend on abortion, at their next national meeting which will take place here in Washington in November. Excerpts from the Triumph article follow:

LIBERTY II

America's—any people's—moral standards are intimately connected with its political standards. The moral ideas a people holds, its views of right and wrong, will be reflected in its laws, its politics. But the other side of the coin, though not so often noticed, is just as plain: what a people believes politically will help shape its morality.

No one can be surprised that a pro-abortion politics has gained favor in a country in which a large majority of the population no longer takes seriously Christian teaching on life, sex, the family; in which, indeed, anti-Christian views are actively promoted in nearly all of its communications media, nearly all of its schools. Still, abortion is far from universally approved; few Americans as of now would wish to destroy their own young, and most probably think it wrong, or at least unpleasant, for others to do so. How, then, explain the precipitous crumbling of civil opposition to the liberty to kill?

"I have always abhorred the idea of abortion," said John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii, a Catholic who attends 6:30 Mass every morning before work. "I believe it a gravely sinful act. I have considered abortion carried out any time after conception to be the taking of human life." What is more, the Governor wished his people to know, the Burnses had been faithful to their convictions in their private lives. Thirty-three years ago Mrs. Burns, a polio victim, was urged by every doctor in sight to abort a child; she steadfastly refused; she lives today, as does her child, himself a father of two children.

So what would Governor Burns do with the "abortion on demand" bill which the Hawaii legislature had placed on his desk? He would not sign it; but neither would he veto it as he had been urged to do "by a number of my fellow Roman Catholics who do not appear to understand precisely the separate roles of state authority and Church authority." A governor, Burns explained as he permitted the bill to become law, "must never let his private political and religious convictions unduly influence his judgment as governor of all the people."

John Burns, American, was certainly right about that. It is a central precept of American politics that religion is a private affair, and that to extend its influence to the public realm is a violation of religious liberty. John Kennedy, American, took the same position ten years before on birth control. John Courtney Murray, S.J., American, had even earlier contrived a theoretical justification of the position: by baptizing the American concept of "religious pluralism" Murray and his followers sought to make the Catholic Church into an American church. They do seem to have had a remarkable success. All of America's household goddesses and gods—liberty, democracy, pluralism, separation of Church and state—remain firmly on their pedestals; and all the altars are now to be freshened with the sacrificial blood of children.

In the premises, what is the present duty of the Catholic bishops of America? That they have a responsibility—the chief responsibility—seems plain enough. After all, it is the famous profession, the astonishing boast, of the Catholic Church through all the centuries that to her uniquely has been confided the Patrimony of the Poor. Others may step forward to aid the poor, acting in her name as it were; but the burden is hers before Heaven: if others claim impotence or weariness or distractions by other concerns, she never can. And of course there will never ever, be any poor who are poorer than unborn children, who are not yet favored with even the power to cry, to as much as murmur a protest against an attack on the single possession they have: life. The poor we will always have with us, but now there is this poor who is to be denied even the opportunity to share the inheritance of the earth. If mother, father, doctor, nurse, the whole of society's mores, the whole of its civil authority, if all conspire to destroy this child, who—what—is left to defend him except the Church of the Poor?

The Church acts formally in such matters through her shepherds: her bishops. How have the American bishops responded to the campaign to persuade the American civil authority to withdraw its protection from the unborn? The record shows that they have opposed the campaign. But the record also shows that they have done so less vigorously, less consistently, certainly less conspicuously than they have begged funds from that same civil authority for their failing school system.

To be sure, the record shows occasional bright spots. The lead story of the March 13 *Catholic Virginian*, the official organ of the Diocese of Richmond, relates that Auxiliary Bishop Timothy Harrington of Worcester made a spirited appearance before a committee of the Massachusetts legislature to protest the liberalization of murder. But the same story relates that the Virginia legislature was about to adopt a policy authorizing murder (it did later in the week), and that meanwhile a Senate hearing was to be held; there was no mention of the attendance of the Bishop of Richmond, John J. Russell. Bishop Russell, of course, is opposed to abortion; he has said so, and the parish bulletins in his diocese advised you "to contact your State Senator." But this bishop was not raising hell, and his flock, and his fellow citizens knew that his Church was not raising hell. So why should they?

Maybe the torch lighted in Massachusetts would rally the faithful? A difficulty was that the Primate of Massachusetts, Richard Cardinal Cushing, had just been quoted in *Life* magazine (Feb. 27) to the effect that anti-abortion laws are not only unnecessary but undesirable: "Catholics do not need the support of civil law to be faithful to their convictions, and they do not seek to impose by law their moral views on other members of society." Of course this good man is a hopeless eccentric: quoting him is as cruel as stealing candy from a child; but the fact is that not a single American prelate stepped forward to repudiate Cushing's announcement.

And so it has gone. Where the bishops are not silent, they are discreet, polite, very proper participants in the American political order. At their last semi-annual meeting, in

November, they issued a statement on abortion, advising the country that killing babies was a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Which, since everything else seems to be, it probably is; but the point was not likely to interest the reigning breed of judges, let alone arouse the population. Let us agree that a ringing invocation by the Catholic bishops of the real authorities—the law of God, the natural rights of the innocent, the Christian and all civilized tradition—would cut no ice whatever with America's anti-life regime (although it would add a nice adornment to the record). But if the bishops cannot appeal effectively to the finer instincts, there should be no problem at all in reaching the regime's baser instincts. After all, they do have political clout, as does anyone who can speak plausibly for a quarter of the population—yes, there are Catholics who are tolerant of baby killing, but they are offset by a still considerable number of non-Catholics who are not, who would be quite happy to have *some* spokesman for their sentiments. What if the American bishops were to rise to the defense of innocent children with something like the urgency, the militance, the determination—the seriousness—with which innocents are being attacked by CBS, the Cowles and Luce publications, the New York *Times*, the Washington *Post*, the Women's Lib, the ACLU, Judge Bazelon, Senator Packwood, Dr. DuBridge, Dr. Egeberg, whoever has spoken last for the Nixon court? What if our shepherds were to become *fierce*?

What if they do not? Well, there is likely to be a judgment. It is a safe estimate of the next few years that the American civil authority will have authorized the slaughter of more innocents, within a shorter period of time, than the German civil authority did under Hitler. This will not be our bishop's fault. The extermination of several million Jews was not the German bishop's fault. But some questions will be asked, which will be somewhat more difficult to answer in the American case than in the Germany.

The failure of the German bishops to intervene vigorously against Nazi genocide is explained on several grounds: a) they were not apprised, or at least not reliably, that the atrocities were taking place; b) to the extent they were, they were helpless to oppose them—what could be more futile than denouncing the Gestapo? and besides c) they had the agonizing pastoral obligation to avoid inviting a comparable persecution of Catholics.

May we agree that none of these explanations will be available to the American bishops? Knowledge of the American abortion mania could not be more widespread, more detailed. Mobilizing voter blocs, vigorous use of the media protests, demonstrations—far from being ineffective in America—are *the* way of getting things done in our pluralistic democracy. And while persecution of Catholics may come sooner than anyone thinks, America at the moment is a paper state compared with Hitler's: at worst, a Church Militant on the abortion issue would run the risk of losing the government's financial favors.

There is a further ground of comparison. The Jewish innocents were, for the most part, able-bodied men and women who could at least put up a struggle in their own defense. The American innocents are too poor even to do that.

This is hard talk to the bishops, because we wish to hear hard talk from them at their April meeting in San Francisco: not the usual jeremiads, but a fighting declaration of war against the whole abortion establishment—most definitely including the American civil authorities, legislative, judicial and executive, who are fast establishing the most sordid of crimes as high national policy.

FNMA AND HOUSING STARTS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last month the president of the Federal National Mortgage Association, A Oakley Hunter, addressed the Mortgage Bankers Association of Michigan. This talk by one of the Nation's leading mortgage investment officials is thought provoking to say the least.

In his speech Oakley Hunter said some things that have needed to be said for some time, and as president of FNMA, Hunter is in the unique position of knowing really what is going on in the field of housing.

Under his leadership FNMA has done an outstanding job this year, and almost single handedly has seen to it that the FHA and VA housing starts are up at a point in time when conventional housing starts have dropped drastically.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure his remarks will be of interest to all my colleagues and, therefore, Mr. Hunter's speech in the RECORD at this point, together with an excerpt from the Washington Evening Star of September 18, 1970, which comments on Hunter's talk:

REMARKS BY ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER, PRESIDENT, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, TO THE MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1970

The present mixed conditions in the mortgage market remind me of a fox hunt that a Maryland gentleman farmer recently put on to impress a British visitor. The host was very concerned that the hunt be properly executed, and understandably was shaken on the morning of the hunt to find that his lead hound—who was a female—was "in season." In his excited condition he thoughtlessly gave the order to go ahead and run the female hound even though she was in heat.

Later, as he and his guest viewed the hunt through binoculars, he asked the Britisher what he thought of an American fox hunt.

"Jolly good," the guest replied, "but it's the first time I've ever seen the fox running fifth."

We who are associated with housing and home finance may recognize an analogy in this story—housing, which we feel should be close to the front, somehow has gotten shuffled farther back in the pack.

Are we making as much headway as we should in achieving our housing goals? Are we providing the right kind of housing for the right kind of people at the right place at the right time?

In short, are we doing the job?

Unfortunately, I am afraid, most of us who earn our bread in housing-related industries will have to answer "no" if we are going to be honest. However, also in the interest of honesty, we must say that a great many people in a great many places are working diligently and much serious effort is being put forth, to *try* to achieve our goals. The effort notwithstanding, we are still falling short.

This is not anybody's fault. It is everybody's fault. We simply have not developed the national will to provide enough housing. We've licked polio. We have put men on the moon, and in a twinkling of an eye we can solve mathematical problems which would have taken our grandfathers a lifetime to work out.

I submit that the reason we have not developed a national will to solve our housing problems is that too many of us have looked at housing only from our own narrow perspectives. Each sector defends its own position as being fair and responsible under the circumstances—circumstances over which it alleges it has no control. It bemoans its profit margin which it claims is hardly commensurate with its investments and risk.

We have a habit of absolving ourselves of responsibility and blaming the high cost of housing on others. The mortgage lender blames labor costs, while the labor union blames money costs. The homebuilder says the cost of the housing shell has not gone up nearly as much as the cost of land. Actually the housing problem is a result of a combination of factors of constraints, e.g., financing costs, restrictive labor practices, raw land costs, utilities, street and other land improvements, property taxes, failure to utilize new materials and construction techniques, and building and planning codes which preserve the status quo with respect to land utilization and building methods and materials. If these and other constraints are to be alleviated and we are going to achieve our housing needs, we must adopt some new attitudes toward housing.

For one thing, we must stop looking at housing as a castoff on the economic junkheap—something we put money into only if we've got a surplus. We must believe it is at least as important for people to have a decent home as it is for them to have a 400-horsepower car that will go 100 miles an hour, and we must be at least as concerned about providing decent housing as we are about prohibiting the sales of half-filled boxes of non-nutritious breakfast cereal.

It is not my purpose to attempt to analyze the reasons why we have not determined that housing is important, but to suggest some ways in which we in the financial community might do a bit more to develop this national concern and to suggest some areas in which we will some day have to manifest our interest.

For openers, it is possible that we should no longer look upon an investment in residential mortgages in the same way in which we look upon an investment in an office building or a shopping center. Perhaps investors should inject an element of patriotism into counting-house formulas and decide that even though a residential mortgage may bring a smaller return than some other form of investment, our long-range interests will be better served if we are a well-housed nation than if we are not. Moral concern for the quality of human life is going to have to be injected into the cost factor of profit equations.

This attitude could substantially improve the quality of mortgage money flowing into the homebuilding industry from a variety of sources—a subject in which we at Fannie Mae are intensely interested. But it has been said that even if there were an almost unlimited supply of mortgage money, and if all of the homebuilders in the country were operating at the limit of their present capacity, we still would not be able to produce 2.6 million housing units a year.

This implies, of course, that new technology is going to have to be developed before we can physically produce the number of housing units we need.

But when we talk about producing 2.6 million new housing units a year, we are immediately confronted with the question of land use, because in many parts of the country it is easier and more profitable for the developer to build mile upon endless mile of monotonous single family residences than it is to develop planned unit developments or cooperatives or condominium apartments with higher density. Since we are

probably going to run out of land eventually anyway, would it not be better to evolve some sensible land-use policies now—before the nation is covered coast-to-coast with subdivisions?

In the course of this—either in this generation or the next—we may have to discard the notion that every American should have his own home on a plot of ground all his own. As was recently suggested by the President's Council on Environmental Quality, we may have to change our life style.

After all, the traditional American home reflects our frontier heritage. Our normal home with a border of ground around it is only a miniaturized descendant of Granddad's farm. In Europe, where land has long been at a premium, the traditional home is more often an apartment than a single-family dwelling. We cannot indefinitely continue thinking in unrealistic terms—the American population is increasing daily but the amount of American land remains the same. There are limits to our resources, and we had better start thinking in realistic terms before we are merely forced to by necessity.

In the suburbs of Washington, D.C., we have seen local jurisdictions adopt ordinances prohibiting the construction of more housing simply because the sewage treatment facilities in the area were not capable of serving more people. In most cases, these prohibitions turned out to be temporary because the pressure for the new developments was just too great for the local governments to withstand. But this will not forever be the case. As the construction of more houses (and the freeways to serve them) covers more of the earth and lowers the quality of life in America, the pressures will continue to mount.

Evidence of the increasing concern over maintaining the quality of the environment is on every hand, as must be obvious to all Americans. Unfortunately, we are on a national environmental binge exuding too much emotion and too little reason. But even after the publicly aroused environmental passions cool, the serious environmentalists—and they number among them some of the leading public officials and social and physical scientists in the world—will still be with us, and they will have a much stronger reservoir of public support than they have ever had.

If preservation of the environment is important in the United States, surely we in the housing industry should not be bashful about pressing our claim that one of the most important elements in our individual environment is our home—the place where we enjoy the fruits of our labors and take our rest from our daily toil.

In the past, the housing industry could generally count on widespread support for its endeavors. Nobody could be against home and mother. Now, however, it appears that the Women's Lib may bring about the downfall of mother and the environmentalists may launch an assault—directly or indirectly—against the home, unless ways can be found to provide the housing we need without destroying the land.

All of us may seem remote from the carpeted halls of the national financial centers, but it seems to me that if we honestly believe the traditional American economic system is primarily responsible for much of the progress we have made in the world, we should be sensitive to forces in our society who have come to view all of what we have to say with skepticism. We cannot lead a double life—one as respected members of the financial establishment, cut off from the problems of the streets and subdivisions, and another as a pseudo-citizen play-acting at reform and community action.

As we go about our workaday lives making daily judgments in the management questions which come before us, we must involve ourselves in the new mood of American life. We must take into account—every day—the little issues which combine to make the big issues—the things like nonreturnable soft-drink bottles and tenants' organizations and consumerism.

And in the housing area, we must support the housing industry with our money and with our national energy, not because it is profitable, but because it is good for the country and because it is an essential element in our national policy.

The lack of national resolution to produce enough housing is not to be attributed to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This department—the traditional whipping boy for critics of our housing production figures—has been doing yeoman service in raising housing starts, especially in the important area of assisted programs. Under the leadership of Secretary Romney these starts have more than doubled in two years, and the estimated number in 1970–71 is the largest increase yet:

1967–68	122,000
1968–69	161,900
1969–70	265,300
1970–71 (est.)	401,600

(Includes public housing, rent supplement, 221(d)(3) BMIR subsidy, 235, 236, and rehabilitation loans and grants.)

For over 20 years I have been associated in one way or another with HUD and its predecessor HHFA—during the Administrations of Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and now the Nixon Administration. Without being partisan or critical, it is my observation that no one in any of these administrations has been a more concerned and more dedicated champion of more and better housing for all Americans than Secretary Romney.

I know whereof I speak, because in addition to FNMA's daily working relationship with HUD on virtually the full range of FHA residential mortgage programs, FNMA holds almost $1 billion of mortgages in these assisted programs. So you see that we have a definite interest in the quality of the administration of these programs.

The Housing Act of 1949 set out the objective of providing "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American." Twenty years later the Housing Act of 1968 admitted that the earlier objective had not been met, and it set a timetable for finally achieving that goal within 10 years. And although we missed our first year's production goal by 30%, the new tools created by the '68 Housing Act are beginning to prove their worth.

The private FNMA, as you know, is one of the products of that legislation. Just a few years ago FNMA was an obscure government agency that had been lurking in the corriders of different government departments since 1938. Now, however, it is a private corporation wholly owned by its shareholders and in terms of assets ranks ninth among all U.S. corporations. It holds the largest mortgage portfolio in the world—just shy of $15 billion today—and last week was even mentioned by Wall Street as a glamor stock. She's come a long way since her portfolio first hit $1 billion in 1957. And, if I may say so, it's a good thing for the mortgage market in the last couple of years that she has grown up as rapidly as she has.

Before FNMA left the Federal Government in 1968 it moved against trends in the market, as it does now, but because of the constraints imposed on it by the federal budget the weight it swung was not sufficient to make a real difference in the national mortgage market. Under present circumstances, though, we are able to play a much greater role than ever before in supporting the market and the FHA statistics bear me out. In the credit crunch of 1966 when FNMA was under the federal budget, FHA–VA and conventional housing starts both fell drastically—about 40%. But in 1969, when a similar credit squeeze occurred again, there was a substantial difference between the figures on government-backed and conventional housing starts. Conventionals again fell drastically—about 40%—but FHA–VA starts increased about 37%. The main difference between the rates of starts was a result of FNMA's freedom to support the market to the extent that it has—$6.6 billion in 1969, and almost $4 billion thus far in 1970. This figure takes on even more significance when you realize that over 95% of these commitments have been resulting in actual purchases.

FNMA is trying to do its part. In the last four months we have issued $1 billion of mortgage-backed bonds. This instrument lets us tap major new investment sources that never before invested in mortgage credit. Also, under the authorization of the recently signed Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 FNMA will begin purchasing conventionally financed, as well as government-backed, mortgages by January 1971. And although our initial involvement may be slight—relative to our FHA–VA activity—this legislation provides us with an important new flexibility in helping us meet our national housing goals.

As further evidence that FNMA plans to continue its role as bulwark to the mortgage market under all economic conditions, the corporation was listed on the New York and Pacific Coast Stock Exchanges on August 31. Gentlemen, we're here to stay.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 18, 1970]

Big Shifts Seen Needed To Bar Housing Crises

(By Phillip M. Kadis)

Changes in life styles, technology and investment attitudes by business are needed to solve the nation's current housing problems and head off future housing crises, a top mortgage investment official says.

A. Oakley Hunter, president of the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA), told a meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association of Michigan in Detroit yesterday the nation is not achieving its housing goals because it has not developed the national will to do so.

"We must believe," he said, "that it is at least as important for people to have a decent home as it is that they have a 400-horsepower automobile, and we must be at least as concerned about providing decent housing as we are about prohibiting the sale of half-filled boxes of non-nutritious breakfast cereal."

ALL SECTORS AT FAULT

Hunter said all sectors of the housing industry shared the blame.

"Each sector defends its own position as being fair and responsible under the circumstances—circumstances over which it alleges it has no control," he said. "It mourns over the financial returns which it claims are not commensurate with its investments and risks."

He suggested that "for openers" the financial community could aid in developing national concern about housing by no longer viewing investment in residential mortgages as a rival of mortgage investment in commercial properties.

"Perhaps investors should inject an element of patriotism into counting-house formulas and decide that even though a residential mortgage may bring a smaller return than some form of investment, our long-range interests will be better served if we are a well-housed nation than if we are not," he said.

BETTER TECHNOLOGY NEEDED

Hunter said improvements in technology are necessary so that it would no longer be

"easier and more profitable for the developer to build mile upon endless mile of monotonous single family residences than it is to develop planned unit developments or cooperatives or condominium apartments with higher density."

As a corollary to changes in technology, he said, "we may have to discard the notion that every American should have his own home on a plot of ground all his own."

He said the typical single family home "with a border of ground around it is only a miniaturized descendant of Granddad's farm."

Hunter said FNMA had tried to do its part to bolster housing starts by issuing $1 billion in mortgage-backed bonds in the last four months.

He said recently enacted legislation will enable the corporation, which left the government and went public this year, to buy conventionally financed mortgages as well as FHA–VA loans.

The legislation, he said, "provides us with an important new flexibility in helping us meet our national housing goals."

ALCOA-MASSENA OPERATIONS SETS NEW SAFETY RECORD

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in the occupational health and safety of the many men and women who are employed by the various industries of our Nation.

It is with this in mind that I take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a letter written to the employees at the Massena, N.Y., operations of the Aluminum Co. of America by Mr. Richard I. Else, the operations manager at that plant. I join with him in congratulating the men and women at the Massena operations who, on September 23, established a new record for Alcoa and the aluminum industry for accident-free operations by completing more than 5 million man-hours of accident-free work.

This is an achievement that reflects the wonderful spirit of all the personnel at the Massena operations. It shows the respect and concern they have for each other and the great pride they have in a job well done. The workers and their families and friends can truly be proud of this accomplishment.

Again, I congratulate the men and women of Alcoa's Massena operations and wish them continued good health and many more hours of safe work.

The letter follows:

ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA,
Massena, N.Y., September 23, 1970.

FELLOW ALCOAN: We, the men and women of Alcoa's Massena Operations, have achieved a distinguished and admirable status today—Wednesday, September 23. We have established a new record for accident-free operations in the 82-year history of the Aluminum Company of America! In this achievement we have surpassed the previous record of 4,955,909 man-hours of safety which was set in 1937–1938 by our sister plant, Alcoa's Tennessee Operations!

I take this immediate opportunity to share with you the deep feeling of pride and satisfaction which comes with the knowledge that we at Massena Operations have reached this unprecedented safety record. Our achievement is truly a result of mutual understanding, concern and cooperative effort on the part of all of us. It is further evidence of the spirit of teamwork which has characterized the job effort of all the men and women who have been members of the Massena organization since we commenced operations nearly 70 years ago.

It is my wish, as it also must be yours, that we will be able to continue our accident free performance for many days to come. However, it seems most appropriate and necessary that I extend to each of you my heartfelt congratulations on your performance to date. I am sure that all of us, our families and our friends throughout this area share the personal pride and satisfaction we have gained through our safe work. May these continue to be ours far into the future!

Again, I extend to you my congratulations and best wishes for good health and happiness as we continue our safe and productive work in the days ahead.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD I. ELSE,
Operations Manager.

PORNOGRAPHY REPORT A FARCE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the recent findings of the President's Commission on Pornography and Obscenity, which reportedly includes a recommendation to legalize all pornography for adults, is a true study of liberal incompetence. It is an affront to intelligent, decent, concerned Americans.

Quoting a Life magazine estimate, "pornography is a billion-dollar-a-year industry." It is making strides because of postal regulations that allow obscene material to pass through the mail at discount, junk rates, and past decisions of the Supreme Court that have allowed pornographers off the hook and back into business.

Fortunately, the majority of Americans would not sit idly by and allow this pornographic faux pas to pass as a serious study into the dangers of smut.

A recent article in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, contains timely comment on this important subject:

PORNOGRAPHY REPORT: HOW TO TWIST FACTS

If the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography intentionally set out to whitewash the nation's lurid pornography trade, as its critics have charged, then its report issued this week makes sense.

That is the only conclusion one may draw from its recommendations, which were roundly condemned in a minority report by three commission members and many other responsible Americans who have studied the findings before their official release. President Nixon's administration already has disavowed the commission's findings. Vice President Agnew did so agree in Salt Lake City last night.

Latter-day Saints in particular, as they gather for General Conference, should be aware of the misleading nature of this report, which runs contrary to all teachings on moral cleanliness and the sanctity of marriage.

What are some of these fictions propounded by the report? And what is the truth?

The commission declares that "Extensive empirical investigation, both by the commission and by others, provides no evidence that exposure to or use of explicit sexual materials play a significant role in the causation of social or individual harms such as crime, delinquency, sexual or nonsexual deviancy or severe emotional disturbances."

Actually the commission ignored many of its own studies which showed otherwise. Among these was an intensive study of 365 city jail inmates, college students and seminarians done by Davis and Braucht. Their report concluded that "exposure to pornography is the strongest predicator of sexual deviance among the early age of exposure subjects."

Even more reprehensible were the committee's recommendations. It asked that all forms of pornography for adults be legalized. It also suggested that laws against pornography for children should cover only graphically defined obscene pictures. Written erotic material, it declared, should not be banned legally because written material inappropriate for children is too difficult to define.

Does that mean, one might ask, that legalizing obscenity and pornography will somehow improve the country's morals and decrease sex crimes? In opting for the "Danish solution" to pornography—dropping practically all legal barriers—the commission declared that sex crimes including rape have decreased 50 to 60 per cent in Denmark since the increase in erotica there. What they fail to mention is that laws governing sex crimes also have been considerably liberalized."

Dr. Victor Cline, University of Utah psychology professor, concluded after a careful study of the commission's report that its writers have made three errors: They cite data to prove a point from a "worthless" study; they don't tell the reader the study is flawed, and they present only that evidence which favors their view and fail to cite contrary findings.

The evidence is overwhelming, and every American who stands for decency will reject the commission's findings for what they are: A twisting of the facts that can please only the smut peddlers.

SLOVENIAN FESTIVAL DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 24, 1970, thousands of Americans of Slovenian descent living in the city of Chicago will celebrate the 52d anniversary of their independence gained from the Austro-Hungarian Empire on October 29, 1918.

They will also be celebrating the 20th anniversary of consecutive broadcasting, representing 1,000 hours of broadcast time for Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, producer of the Slovenian radio program. Dr. Leskovar is also president of the Slovenian-American Radio Club which annually sponsors the Slovenian Day program. I want to congratulate him on the celebration of his 20th anniversary as producer of this outstanding radio program as well as for the many fine contributions he has made to the civic life of our community over the years.

The other capable officers of the Slovenian-American Radio Club are: Frank Mikec, vice president; Mary Foys Lauretig, secretary; Alma Helder, treasurer;

Stephanie Osterman, recording secretary; Roman Possedi, Sr., sergeant at arms; auditors: Otmar Tasner, Michael Fleischhacker, Minka Grasich; cultural narrator, Frank A. Schonta; director of special events, Corinne Leskovar; directors: Joseph Osterman, Fred Orehek, Anna Tasner, Frank Karner, Frances Maxwell, Anton Skamperle, Ludvik Jelenc, Jerome Soukal, Ursula Krzisnik, and Frank Gerzel.

The celebration of Slovenian Festival Day will begin at 7 p.m. in Saint Stephen Hall; 1835 22d Place. Over 1,500 people will attend the affair where they will be singing, dancing, and traditional Slovenian foods.

Highlighting the show will be Cleveland's 35-member dance troupe, the Kres bonfire folk dancers. Suplying music will be the six-piece Vesili Vandrovci, Happy Wanderers orchestra. Also participating in the festivities will be 15 well-known Slovenian band leaders.

Miss Maria Krajnc, princess for the evening will read a proclamation issued by Mayor Daley, proclaiming Slovenian Day in Chicago. She will read the proclamation both in English and in Slovenian.

Also scheduled to perform is Miss Maria Pirih, a veteran of the Slovenian Festival, who was recently chosen first-place talent winner in this summer's State Fair in Springfield, Ill.

Another highlight of the evening will be a discussion of "the pre-Slovenian influence on Jefferson's draft of the Declaration of Independence."

From the beginning of American history, the Slovenians have contributed a great deal to the advancement of our culture and our way of life. They are dedicated, loyal, and hard-working people, and they have achieved high and honored positions in public life.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, Congressman from the Eighth District of Minnesota and presently the ranking Democratic Member of the Public Works Committee, next year will become chairman of the Public Works Committee. This is one of the most powerful committees in the Congress of the United States. I know all Slovenians share with me great pride in this singular honor that has come to a Slovenian-American.

The Honorable Ludwig J. Andolsek, Commissioner of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, has, over the many years, performed distinguished and notable public service.

And I am sure all of us remember the distinguished public service career of former U.S. Senator Frank Lausche of Ohio who retired from the Senate at the conclusion of the 90th Congress.

Slovenia forms one of the six South-Slavic groups, known as People's Republics, which make up today's Yugoslavia. Presently Slovenia has a territory of about 8,000 miles and a population of over one and a half million. Throughout their history, which goes back more than 1,000 years, the courageous Slovenians have always fought for freedom and self-determination, and therefore, they have never been totally submerged in the sea of other peoples which surrounds their country.

As Congressman for the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, where many thousands of Slovenian-Americans reside, I take great pleasure in congratulating and extending best wishes to the Americans of Slovenian heritage who reside in my district as well as to all those across our Nation who are joining in this celebration of Slovenian Festival Day.

Hon. Vito Marzullo, the alderman and committeeman of the 25th ward, which is an important part of the seventh district and where many hundreds of Slovenians reside, joins me in extending his greetings to the Slovenians on this happy occasion. In the coming year, may the Slovenian people experience abundant peace, well-being and prosperity.

ACLU'S JUDGE GESELL, NEW CENSOR FOR CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we have now been treated to a classic example of judicial nonrestraint; that is, Judge Gerhard Gesell's restraining order against the Government Printing Office forbidding the printing of a speech by a Member of this House, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Some members of our Federal judiciary have become as destructive of our system of Government and society as the terrorists who bomb buildings and the hijackers who kidnap hostages. One group would destroy free speech, free press, and separation of constitutional powers unless it has the official sanction of some judge—the other would destroy civilization itself.

Judge Gesell's eagerness to define what he calls academic freedom for one group would deny free speech to others—but more importantly, it is officious bureaucratic meddling into the rights and prerogatives of committees and Members of the Congress of the United States.

Today, enjoining the printing of a committee's study may tomorrow result in forbidding the printing of the testimony of a Government witness—next an injunction against stories in the Washington Post or the New York Times. Gesell's action sets a dangerous precedent—if allowed to stand or if given credence.

It is the height of absurdity to consider that an inferior court judge—a court created by Congress—would now seek to set himself up as a censor of Congress—so restrictive of free speech and free press that he would misuse discretionary powers of his court to enjoin elected Members of Congress from performing their duty to their people and their country. The creature would now attack his creator.

Think of it—one of our Members, elected by his people—in order to perform his duty, must resort to the well of this House, and then have his speech denied availability to the rest of his colleagues as a result of the printer being enjoined from printing.

Those who scream loudest for free speech are the first to deny free speech.

What is it that Judge Gesell fears by free speech? That should the people obtain all of the facts, they will be able to decide the issues for themselves?

Perhaps, while we are on the subject of Judge Gesell, it might be fitting to remind our colleagues just who this controversial man is. Gesell was the author of the infamous and revolutionary Gesell report in 1963, which aimed at destroying military effectiveness and has been highly successful. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 26, page 34759. Most agree that his judicial appointment was but a political payoff for Chairman Gesell's revolutionary blueprint.

In November of last year, the same Judge Gesell ruled that Congress could not prohibit the murder of unborn babies when he struck down the District of Columbia's abortion law. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 25, 1970, page 4956.

Last week Judge Gesell released a heroin addict engaged in trafficking narcotics, because he could not decide what was meant by the word, "trafficking."

Now, again in league with his old comrades of the American Civil Liberties Union, the judge misuses his court to suppress truth and to deny the facts to our people so they can be informed citizens.

I compliment the House Committee on Internal Security and especially the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) for his courageous dedication and fearless resolve to see that the people receive the findings of their committee's report.

Truth cannot long be suppressed and the people will find out.

Judge Gesell has only given added publicity to the report and again disclosed his partiality to the ACLU cabal.

Mr. Speaker, I include several related newsclippings:

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 14, 1970]

ICHORD TO DEFY COURT BAN ON HOUSE REPORT

A federal judge has ordered a congressional committee not to make public today the names of college and university speakers it claims are linked to radical organizations.

But Chairman Richard H. Ichord of the House Committee on Internal Security said he would file the report with the House at noon today as scheduled. "No court is going to interrupt the legislative process of filing a report," he said.

U.S. District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell yesterday issued the temporary restraining order at the request of the American Civil Liberties Union. He said it would remain in effect for two days and then a full hearing would be held to judge the case on its merits.

Gesell said he was aware he had no authority to order individual congressmen on the committee not to disclose the names, but he could order their staff and the Government Printing Office to hold up the publication. He said he only was forbidding the committee as a whole from distributing the list nationwide and he asked for cooperation.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1970]

RULING FAVORS ADDICT: USE OF HEROIN MADE DISTINCT FROM SELLING

(By Peter Osnos)

U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell yesterday dismissed narcotics charges against a heroin addict on grounds that the man intended to use the drugs himself.

The ruling is believed to be the first based on a U.S. Court of Appeals opinion in July that mere possession of drugs by an addict should not make him subject to criminal penalties.

While adopting the Appeals Court position, Gesell expressed concern over major sections of the Court's finding that he said "need clarification." He asked that a higher court's elaboration be expedited.

Gesell's view is shared by other local judges and lawyers who acknowledged the significance of the appellate court opinion, but do not know how it should be handled in practice.

For example, the Appeals Court distinguished between those addicts who possess narcotics for their own use and those who "traffic"—buy and sell—narcotics. The traffickers, said the court, should be subject to criminal prosecution.

Gesell said yesterday that there is considerable uncertainty as to what constitutes trafficking.

"It is a matter of common knowledge," he wrote, "that most addicts sell narcotics from time to time to finance their habit, or trade heroin for the favor of food or lodging, or give drugs to friends facing withdrawal.

"If acts of this type constitute trafficking, the possession exemption . . . will prove nearly meaningless." Gesell said the Court must spell out a standard for degrees of trafficking—the persistent peddler versus the occasional one.

On another point, Gesell said that the courts may be required to hold two-part trials in narcotic cases when a defendant claims to be exempt from prosecution on the grounds he is not a trafficker.

To prove that he is not a trafficker, a defendant would have to admit that he is an addict. The two-part trial would be necessary to avoid the chance that this admission could be used against the defendant in eventually determining his guilt.

Gesell noted that to handle routine heroin cases with two-part trials "would be a serious obstacle to efficient judicial administration."

The judge voiced additional concern that some addicts, because they are exempt from criminal prosecution, may not be eligible for treatment under the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act. That act requires that an addict be convicted of an offense.

Gesell's ruling came in the case of Cortez Ashton, a Washington man charged with "sale or possession" of heroin, who stated that he had been an addict off-and-on since 1950. When arrested, Ashton was found with one gram of heroin, testimony said. Ashton is being held in jail despite the ruling because he has been charged with bail jumping in an unrelated case.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM WYOMING CONCERNING STUDENT UNREST

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsletter to my district, the State of Wyoming, I solicited comments on the subject of student unrest.

I have had samples of these comments published in two previous CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS and include several new contributions to the subject:

My husband and I have both worked and struggled to acquire our college educations! We returned to college after our marriage and starting our family. It would have been impossible without federal government financial aid. It is indeed sad to think of how many young people will not receive help due to the expenses incurred through violent displays of behavior. We shudder to think of the way we would have felt and the effect a pause in our college careers would have cost us in lost time had we still been in school during these "strikes". We are new Wyoming residents but we are impressed with your concern and desire in this area.

Mr. and Mrs. GERALD JOHNSON.

BURLINGTON, WYO.

I feel that our Colleges and Universities should have the authority to discipline any and all students and the right to expell those who will not be disciplined. I Believe deeply our Court Systems are leaning over backward with the radicals to the point they are jeopardizing the rights of decent people. I say crack down—why should not the legal profession, Courts and Law Enforcement Personnel work together not opposite and (2) Let's have disciplinary measures.

W. H. NICKS.

RIVERTON, WYO.

I think when students are involved in disorders on the campus of the colleges of our country then any federal aid to those students should be cut off and the ones responsible for the disorder should be brought to trial and made to pay for the damage and punished for violating the rights of the other students.

Mr. HARRY L. BISHOP.

CASPER, WYO.

No hindrance to those who wish to learn. No rioting, no picketing, only peaceful negotiation and reasoning at any schools. More education on TV-on communism, on lives of individuals who pull off riots, on how the public can help itself. Courts are so concerned with criminal rights that concern is gone for our citizens' rights and protection.

DELLA RAE FRENCH.

ARVADA, WYO.

My concern is for the great majority who want an education and are denied the right, speakers who are denied the right of freedom of speech by "dissenters." If there are grievances, let them be presented and listened to and discussed and acted on in a decent, dignified manner. And let's persuade Newscasters to give equal time to worthwhile things being done by our young people.

Mrs. ESTHER LUCK.

WHEATLAND, WYO.

There is only one way for students, and others to avoid the dangers of campus riots: Stay away from riots. It's that simple.

ROBERT BLACKMORE.

CASPER, WYO.

"There is no excuse for violence! Stronger action must be taken, and facts faced regardless of political jockeying."

Mr. and Mrs. H. A. TAYLOR.

PINE-DALE, WYO.

School administrators need a tougher attitude toward trouble makers and rules to help deal with destroyers of public property. Trouble makers should be expelled as we would have been when I attended school. Laws should be passed and enforced swiftly to deal with trouble makers.

Rev. R. D. NECKER.

CHEYENNE, WYO.

There are far bigger leaders than the average American can imagine behind this so called young people unrest. The young people know more about our Communist infiltrated government (both state and federal) than the older people do. But they do not know exactly where it all will end. I would not accept that as an American way of receiving an education.

LOREN G. WHETHAM.

NEWCASTLE, WYO.

In a day and hour as now, when young people have the greatest opportunity known to man to further education and knowledge, why is it even permitted for a percent of the campus population to destroy this valuable privilege? I have children approaching college in a few years, and it is frightening to let them be brain-washed with anarchy instead of properly educated.

RAYMOND STOKES.

NEWCASTLE, WYO.

My views are that we are only buying time when we compromise with the rioting students regardless of what it takes to restore order, it better be done at this time, rather than wait and destroy our whole society.

CARL E. and JEWELL B. LEE.

LOVELL, WYO.

Violence and other forms of law-breaking on college or university campuses cannot be condoned, regardless of the "cause" for which students may be working. We must protect the rights of the majority of students attending school to get an education. I am convinced that a strong stand on the part of school administrations, both before and after could squelch much of the violence.

EDWIN K. GLOW.

CHEYENNE, WYO.

I too was a student at a college—and was on the faculty of several of them. Part of the problem is definitely the attitude of certain faculty members. I feel that all who teach the young in public-supported schools should take an oath of allegiance to this country, and state under oath that they belong to no organization which advocates forceful overthrow of this country.

LOUISE F. VOELKER.

CHEYENNE, WYO.

College administrators are much too permissive. Trouble makers should be told (and enforced) to go elsewhere if they do not like the status quo. If the 95% of students who are serious about an education allow the troublesome 5% to disrupt things to the point that college must shut their doors, then the 95% deserve to lose the privilege of an education.

PHILIP N. SHOCKEY.

CASPER.

My views on the campus problem are that we must be more severe not only with the dissident student, but also with the weak-kneed faculty member. Also a tougher attitude with the agitator that travels from place to place. The right of dissent is open to all in the proper channels but not through violence or destruction of property, or by obstructing the rights of others to learn.

V. L. HERZEELLE.

CASPER.

Our forefathers sacrificed to establish institutions of learning. Now, on the grounds that these institutions are imperfect, some students wish to destroy them. They, like parasites, would kill their host. They would kill their means of growth—and ours. I share your views that education is a privilege to be extended to those who would use it to build up our nation.

Mrs. MARGARET LAFOLLETTE.

BYRON.

Controlled dissent is a basic in a democratic society but those that infringe on the rights of others should not be permitted.

FRED B. BIESTAMAN, Jr.

WILSON.

I do not feel any group, regardless of their age, color or student classification, should

be allowed to riot, destroy or act in any unlawful manner. I feel they should be treated just like any other lawbreaker. If they are trying to destroy property, they should be stopped with whatever force is necessary.

Mrs. W. C. STUCKEY.

WHEATLAND.

I think we must all support stronger action against disruptors along with mandatory expulsion from our tax supported institutions with the slightest reason for cause and with prejudice. There must be more support given to the majority of students that are interested in getting an education and less support given to sympathetic groups.

Capt. J. D. MAXTED.

CASPER.

I think any student that takes part in a riot on campus should be expelled and the ringleaders and agitators given a very stiff jail sentence.

MILLARD N. MITICH.

NEWCASTLE.

I believe a university is a facility of higher learning, provided for use by young people to obtain a better life for themselves. I do not profit from any universities, but I do, through taxes, pay my share of the bill. Going to school is a privilege which is being ridiculed. I believe the simple answer is expulsion—it worked before, and will again.

WILLIAM R. HERRON.

CASPER.

I understand that France has passed a law that students must pay for all damages they cause or go to jail for long terms. This was mentioned on the radio program Life Line and it was stated that it is working for France so it should be investigated and we should adopt this plan also if it works. Also according to high Japanese officials visiting this country, the arrests of students involved in campus unrest and violence in Japan is 10 times more there than the arrests in this country where there has been a lot more trouble.

PAUL CHAMPENDALE.

CASPER.

I am for peace—however, I believe in human dignity at home, as well as in Vietnam. Our young people have a right to push for peace through demonstrations but only if they are respectful of the rights of others. We cannot hope to gain an honorable peace without maintaining a standard of actions that young and old can have an honest pride in.

Mrs. LESLIE H. WILLIAMS, Sr.

LANDER.

We must have law and order, on campus, in the city streets or in the country. Without it we will soon have nothing left. We must give our law enforcement agencies power and authority back so that they command respect. Our judiciary must back up these agencies as well as the victims of crimes, not the criminal as is done in nearly all cases of late.

ERIC W. RAECKE.

LANDER.

It has always been my deep feeling, when I went to college and even more so now, "that going to college is a *privilege*, not a right."

WILLIAM G. KERN.

CASPER.

College students who participate in violent campus disorders should be denied government assistance of any kind. The taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize revolution. Violence against duly constituted authority cannot be tolerated. If change is desired it can be accomplished peacefully through elections. I sincerely believe that if violence on and off the campus continues there will be a violent backlash by the so-called silent majority that could lead to a police state.

JAMES M. CALEB.

CASPER.

Campus unrest thwarts the pursuit of happiness and should be severely dealt with.

Mrs. JEANNE MEER.

HANNA.

I will have children college age in 5 years and unless our campuses are more organized, I refuse to send them. I do not think anyone connected with SDS should be allowed on campus. I think our leaders are too lenient with students involved in campus disorder.

Mrs. MARGARET WEBER.

CHEYENNE.

I think all states should be responsible for the control of their campuses.

J. E. GORRELL.

CASPER.

I think any student that takes part in destructive demonstrations on campus should be *permanently* kicked out of the college. It should go on his records why he was kicked out. I think the sooner this problem is stood up to, the sooner it will be resolved.

SANDY BUCHANAN.

CODY.

If our elected officers carried out and performed their jobs here in Congress as we were led to believe at election time, and if our officers would take in consideration the good of the people instead of pork barrel projects and silver pocket lining, college unrest would not be what it is. Let us stand up and be counted!

MIKE A. ZAMORA.

RAWLINS.

GILMORE BROADCASTING AND POLITICAL ADVERTISING

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's veto of S. 3637, which amends the Federal Communications Act limiting the amount of funds which can be spent on political advertising in the electronic media, makes quite apropos a letter on the subject I received some time ago from Mr. Jim Gilmore, Jr., president of the Gilmore Broadcasting Corp., which firm owns television and radio stations in Missouri, Indiana, Virginia, and Illinois.

In his letter to me, Mr. Gilmore discusses the policy of the Gilmore broadcasting stations regarding rates charged political candidates and points out that Gilmore stations provide all political candidates with the least expensive rate—the end rate—for all broadcast time charges in every time classification without distinction.

Although I supported S. 3637 when it was before the House of Representatives for consideration, I recognized its inadequacy, and even unfairness, as a control of political advertising expenditures. I, therefore, can understand Mr. Gilmore's resentment about this kind of legislation which singles out the broadcasting industry and ignores the rest of our communications media.

I wish to commend, as I am sure will my colleagues, Mr. Gilmore, the Gilmore Broadcasting Corp., and its executive vice president, Mr. Hamilton Shea, for the public interest and concern they have shown by the policy they have voluntarily adopted. I am sure the political candidates in the listening and viewing area of the Gilmore stations are likewise very appreciative of the cooperation extended to them by Gilmore Broadcasting Corp.

Mr. Speaker, since I think my colleagues would be interested in the full text of the Gilmore letter, it follows:

GILMORE BROADCASTING CORP.,
Kalamazoo, Mich., August 27, 1970.

The HONORABLE GARRY BROWN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GARRY: As you are so very aware, Congress has again been delving deeply into the affairs of broadcasters. Since it is an election year, it's only logical that the issue now being questioned is the fairness of political broadcast rates. The end result of Congress' investigation appears to be a bill that will establish the "end rate" (the least expensive) for all political candidates.

With respect to these Congressional developments, I would like to bring to your attention the action and reaction of the Gilmore Broadcasting Group to this issue. In the fall of 1969, administration and sales executives of the Gilmore Broadcasting stations which include: KODE–TV/AM, Joplin, Missouri; WEHT–TV, Evansville, Indiana; WSVA–TV/AM/FM, Harrisonburg, Virginia; and WREX–TV, Rockford, Illinois, discussed in depth the problem of political time charges. As a result of the consensus from that meeting, Hamilton Shea, executive vice president of the Gilmore Group authorized the Gilmore stations to provide all political candidates with the least expensive rate (the end rate) for all broadcast time charges in every time classification without distinction. In short, since approximately one year ago, all seven of the Gilmore stations adopted a rate policy Congress is now considering.

Other broadcast groups have adopted similar policies and it's our opinion that broadcasters across the United States are acting in a responsible and intelligent capacity on this particular issue, as well as many other very important issues. A Congressional edict was not necessary for broadcasters to effect these changes and frankly, I would much rather see the National Association of Broadcasters and individual broadcast industry leaders set these important policy guidelines, rather than the government. It's undoubtedly a much healthier and more American way approach to business.

I strongly resent and am personally disturbed to see any kind of legislation that singles out the broadcasting industry and ignores the rest of our communications media: newspapers, magazines, billboards and others.

I certainly hope the action the Gilmore Group took on this issue and the positive manner in which other broadcasters have responded will leave a lasting impression on Congress. To me, it is indicative of the responsive and intelligent leadership that exists in the broadcasting industry today.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JIM GILMORE, Jr., *President.*
Gilmore Broadcasting Stations.

ATTACKS ON POLICE MUST BE STOPPED

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we are all well aware, law enforcement officers have become prime targets for lethal attacks by organized and violent extremists.

The recently released FBI Uniform Crime Reports for 1969 detail the extent of this trend with stark clarity. In 1969, a record high of 84 law enforcement officers were murdered. This is a 34-percent increase over 1968, when 64 officers were slain. And for the years 1960–69, 561 law enforcement officers were killed by criminals.

The evidence on the extent of police murders and police assaults for the first 8 months of this year indicates that this ominous trend is mounting. In New York City, for example:

Jan. 1–Aug. 31:

	1970	1969
Wounded by gunshot	34	11
Cut or stabbed	44	33
Human bite	96	50
Punched	217	250
Kicked	154	54
Struck with object	158	89
Assaulted making arrest	152	101
Miscellaneous injuries	130	3
Total	985	591

Three New York policemen have been killed by attackers this year, compared with none in the same period of 1969.

FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover put the issue squarely in focus. In a statement issued earlier this month, he said:

The law enforcement officer today bears a heavier burden, faces more frustrations, and is second-guessed more than ever before. The public asks more and expects more of the present-day policeman because the public need for protection is greater. When a policeman is assaulted or slain, the criminal significance of the incident extends far beyond the victim officer. It extends to the door of every law-abiding citizen.

Mr. Speaker, residents of the Texas Panhandle and the State of Texas are vitally concerned about this problem. And I believe law-abiding citizens everywhere share their deep feelings. To translate this concern into effective Federal action, I have introduced two bills which are designed to bring the full force and effect on Federal law directly to bear on anyone who assaults or kills a State or local law enforcement official, firemen, or judicial officer.

I believe that Federal action is needed in this area for two reasons. First, since modern transportation systems have made it possible for individuals to assault or murder police officers and flee to other States, knotty jurisdictional problems are created which often greatly encumber the criminal justice system. These procedural problems can be cured through appropriate Federal legislation. Second, Federal legislation would constitute a congressional declaration that the assaulting and killing of State and local law enforcement officials is a special type of crime that causes grave national concern and demands prompt national action.

The first of my bills contains several main provisions: A new Federal offense would be created for those who travel in or use interstate commerce facilities to kill or feloniously assault, or conspire to kill or feloniously assault a local law enforcement officer or fireman engaged in the performance of his official duties. A rebuttable presumption is created that facilities of interstate commerce were used if the person who kills or feloniously assaults a local law enforcement officer or fireman is not arrested within the State where the offense occurred within 24 hours. This clause, known as a presumptive clause, is comparable to that found in the Federal kidnaping statute. The term "law enforcement officer" is defined to include Federal, State, or local public employees who are responsible for the enforcement of any criminal law, the administration of criminal justice, or the enforcement of any punishment imposed by the criminal justice system. Traditional jurisdictions of State courts will not be disturbed by this bill. And violations will be tried in the jurisdictions where they occurred.

The second bill is a simple and basic amendment to the laws covering Federal law enforcement officers. This bill broadens existing laws to include State law enforcement officers, firemen, and judicial officers. Penalties for violations under this bill are also the same as those existing in the present law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these two bills, taken together, provide a framework within which the House of Judiciary Committee can hammer out a set of clear and strong laws designed not only to deter those who would otherwise assault or kill State or local law enforcement officers, but to punish harshly those who do commit such reprehensible crimes.

I urge my colleagues to give their prompt attention to these proposals. Justice demands that we protect those individuals who are working as guardians of the public health, safety, and welfare. Justice demands that wrongs committed against our society be punished.

The needs of our Nation's law enforcement officials cannot go unmet. Congress must act on this issue before adjournment.

THE SENATE AND THE FARM BILL

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has compounded injustice to wheat farmers by refusing to settle the fate of the farm bill before the election recess of Congress. The action of certain Senators first in physically barring farm bill conference papers from the Senate floor and of Senate leadership later in refusing to consider the bill further until after election day is an outrage perhaps without precedence in congressional annals. That a tiny band of Senators excessively beholden to cotton interests can get by with playing politics with the financial fate of wheat farmers is a sad commentary on our legislative system, and particularly on the institutional authority of the anachronistic seniority tradition. No wonder many Americans hold the Senate in low esteem and question its ability to cope with the challenges of modern society.

Congress should never have voted to delay the wheat referendum beyond the original statutory deadline of August 1, but once this action to delay was taken, the Congress assumed a special obligation to move expeditiously to dispose of the farm bill proposal. Frankly, I do not like the farm bill and voted against it, but I like even less the prolonged uncertainty which the 91st Congress, particularly the Senate, has inflicted upon wheat farmers.

I dislike also the financial burden which this delay has inflicted upon all taxpayers. The Department of Agriculture now has no choice but to begin the expensive process of planning a referendum of cotton growers—an expense which would have been avoided completely had the Senate met its responsibility today.

COUNTRYSIDE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 8041, which would establish a Countryside Development Commission to study the economic problems of countryside America, I was very pleased to receive a recent letter from Mr. G. B. Gunlogson, founder of the Countryside Development Foundation, regarding this legislation and the urgent need for a more orderly development of the countryside. The ultimate answer to the urban crisis confronting us today is to revitalize America's countryside and establish a public policy regarding the distribution of our population. Mr. Gunlogson's comments are timely and important and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

REMARKS OF G. B. GUNLOGSON

ON RURAL POVERTY

(a) The poverty in many parts of the countryside stems mostly from lack of economic diversification. Historically, the countryside has been the producer of raw products from farms, forests, and mines. Farm products have been the most extensive of these. Their value has been a rapidly shrinking share of the nation's total economy.

(b) Furthermore, technology and mechanization have wiped out millions of jobs in the countryside. The man-hours moved to the big cities to make machines and to process the products from the land. Concentration and larger operating units grew. There are now 3 million fewer farms than thirty years ago.

(c) The bottom fell out of the fragile economy in thousands of small towns when local farms were abandoned and a few jobs were lost. Stores closed up—hope and initiative vanished. Like all single-economy communities, these towns were poorly prepared to cope with these changes. Single economy tends to have a degrading effect on a community. It limits opportunities and tends to discourage imagination, initiative, and ventures in other directions.

(d) Conversely, when a new payroll is created in a small community, the multiplying effects are greater and more far-reaching than in a big city. I have seen a plant that employed only 30 people come into a small town, and in three years the community had changed almost completely. For every one of the original jobs, several new ones had been created. These factors are important in our efforts to create job opportunities anywhere.

ON RURAL TO URBAN MIGRATION

The underlying factors influencing migration have been commented on. More detailed discussion of these conditions are included in the accompanying material.

ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(a) The first approach, in my opinion, would be to get away from the term Rural. The term is ambiguous and is out of date when applied to most of the country. The strategy should be to develop a total countryside concept. This total countryside includes more than 98 per cent of the United States in land and natural resources. It includes some 16,000 towns and small cities that are more or less identified with the land economy. Some of these may be 15,000 in population or even larger. This economy should become better integrated. By diversification and industrialization supplementing agriculture or the land economy, the potential can be greatly expanded.

(b) The future development will center in the towns. If we travel around the country, we can see how various town-land relating enterprises and a new style of living are developing. Farming may also benefit from these changes in many ways beyond the social gains. Thus, we may see a growing number of backward country towns become prosperous Town and Country communities.

(c) Despite past economic handicaps, there have been vast physical improvements made in the countryside during the last 30 years. This includes more than highways, power, and communications. New schools, health and recreational facilities are widespread. Actually, the record of literacy and high school attendance in much of the countryside is higher than in most big cities.

(d) Developing the countryside and creating job opportunities go hand in hand. The process is one of communication and promotion. There are about 6,000 places well situated to accommodate new industry, various businesses, housing, and more people far more economically than is possible in megalopolitan areas.

(e) The promotional effort must be at two levels—national and local. There is a great deal of local activity here and there which could be far more effective if a better job could be done at the national level. The problem is much the same as in business. If the product or service can be made better known nationally, it becomes easier to sell to the dealer and in turn for the dealer to sell the consumer.

(f) *New tools are needed.* Publications oriented to the needs of this total countryside and its markets would be of incalculable value and no doubt could become highly profitable for the publishers. General news or service letters offer other opportunities for communication and profit.

A non-profit association—a sort of countryside Chamber of Commerce—would provide much needed voice and representation. It would help stimulate the business community in this area of development.

A bill has been introduced in Congress, H.R. 8041. If passed, it would help focus public attention on countryside opportunities and values.

The need has never been greater to open up the vast body of America for new economic opportunities and to improve the human environment and quality of life. Various studies and polls show that an increasing number of people would decentralize population and industry by orderly development of thousands of smaller cities across the land. Industry is already showing the way. Hundreds of plants are being opened in country towns. A growing number of leaders in government regard the countryside movement as a national priority.

HUNGER IN AMERICA—1 YEAR LATER

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in May 1969, the burning social issue of the day was hunger and malnutrition among certain Americans. Suddenly thrust upon the collective social consciousness and conscience, this newly discovered problem was discussed and debated in every forum. A select committee of Congress was created to investigate it. Television specials, some raising more questions than they answered, spotlighted the worst examples to be found in America.

On May 6. 1969, President Nixon summed up the obvious feelings of many by saying:

That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable.

He then went on to promise to the American people something that many doubted he would be able to deliver. He stated:

The moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself, for all time.

And he pledged to set out doing just that.

Today, hunger is no longer the headline-maker it used to be. Today, we are more concerned about disposing of empty cans and abandoned cars than feeding hungry mouths. Such are the strange times in which we live. Nevertheless, 1 year later it is appropriate for us to see what has happened to hunger in America.

The Nixon administration quietly set about on an ambitious and extensive program to increase greatly the number of needy people receiving Federal food aid. It has met with phenomenal success, accomplishing almost as much in 1 year as in the previous 40 years of Federal food-aid programs.

Take, for example, the counties which had no Federal food-aid program whatsoever in May 1969. President Nixon pledged to have a program operating in each by July of this year. Some were skeptical. President Johnson had made a similar pledge and had been unable to carry it out. Until the new administration came to office, these counties had proved to be strangely but effectively resistant to Federal food-aid for their poor. Although the commodity distribution program was immediately available at no cost to any county willing to distribute the food to those in need, the political leadership in many counties had refused to do so in May 1969.

Six days after the President promised to get a program operating in every county in the country, on May 12 I listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the 425 counties which at the time had no Federal food-aid program. Alongside each county, I listed the number of hard-core poor people needing food, together with the amount of farm payments being paid to farmers not to grow food in that very county. For many sections of the country, the listing proved to be very embarrassing, and for the administration it proved to be an effective tool to encourage those counties to institute a food-aid program.

Today, I am glad to report that President Nixon has virtually met his goal. Only 10 counties still do not have a Federal food-aid program in operation or under planning. Of the 3,129 counties and independent cities in the Nation, 1,927 are operating or initiating food stamp programs and 1,150 have set up commodity distribution programs. In 42 areas, the food stamp program operates in part of the counties while commodities are available in the rest.

The funding of these food-aid programs, and the participation in them by those eligible, have also shown spectacular increases.

Since the President's message, funding for food assistance programs has doubled, while funding for school lunch and other child nutrition programs has increased by more than 50 percent. Participation in family food programs has increased nearly 60 percent, and food stamp participation has more than doubled.

The following table summarizes the increased funding that has been provided for food and nutrition programs:

	Fiscal year—			
	1968	1969	1970	1971
Food stamps	185	250	610	1,250
Commodity distribution	205	285	295	312
Child nutrition	503	621	685	1,005
Total	893	1,201	1,633	2,645

Participation in both the food stamp and commodity distribution programs has increased significantly and the benefits available to each participant have likewise increased. In the food stamp program participants now get more for their money. Additional commodities are available in most counties where that program operates. The following table shows the sharp increases in family food program participation:

	June 1969	July 1970
Food stamps	3.2 mil	6.7 mil
Commodity distribution	3.7 mil	4.1 mil
Total	6.9 mil	11.0 mil

On May 14, 1970, President Nixon signed into law H.R. 515 amending the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts. The new amendments require States to prepare plans to extend the school lunch program to every school in the State.

All children from families with incomes below a poverty level—$3,720 per year for a family of four—determined by the Secretary of Agriculture will receive school lunches free or at a substantially reduced price.

In order to carry out the new amendments, President Nixon sent a budget amendment to the Congress on July 1 requesting an additional $217 million for the school lunch program in the current fiscal year. With these added funds and the $104 million provided for the special milk program, the child nutrition budget for 1971 will top $1 billion—twice the level of fiscal 1968.

President Nixon, Secretary Hardin, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture are to be commended for keeping a pledge made to the American people just over 1 year ago. The political consequences of failing to do so would not have been severe. Those who would have been around to report it are now too busy worrying about the environment to notice, and it is a fact that the poor and the hungry seldom make their votes felt at the polls in November.

Nevertheless, the Nixon administration, without fanfare, has made family food aid programs universally available to all Americans in need; oftentimes in counties which had initally rejected their efforts. With dogged determination the administration has already accomplished much of what it set out to do.

More importantly, now that hunger is no longer a newsworthy issue—a headline grabber—the Nixon administration proposes nonetheless to finish the job that it began—to put an end to hunger in America itself, for all time.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE D. LONG

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1970

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

MELVIN C. BATES, OF DUNDALK, IS KILLED AT 20 IN VIETNAM

Sgt. Melvin C. Bates, Jr., of Dundalk, was killed in action in Vietnam August 29, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Funeral services for Sergeant Bates will be held at 1 P.M. Friday at the John J. Duda funeral establishment, 7922 Wise avenue, Dundalk.

He was killed in an explosion while moving to an offensive position during the night. He was 20 years old.

Sergeant Bates attended Dundalk Senior High School and joined the Army paratroopers in 1968. He had served for a year in Vietnam but had volunteered for an additional six months duty there when he was killed. He was a member of the 173d Airborne Infantry Division.

He lived in the 6800 block Roberts avenue in Dundalk.

He is survived by his father, Melvin C. Bates, Sr., and a sister, Bonnie Bates, of Dundalk.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to provide grants and loans for persons who have buildings or structures registered in the National Register in order to preserve such historic properties, and for other purposes.

While the historic preservation program now established under existing law is an indication of and a start on a national commitment to preserve significant elements of our past, it simply is not broad enough scope or application to accomplish that goal. In the 4 years that the National Historic Preservation Act has been on the books, appropriations totaling $32 million have been authorized. Yet only $1.3 million of that sum has ever actually been appropriated.

Compared to other Western nations, this sum is pitifully small. England, for example, spends more than 6 million pounds annually on the preservation of historic buildings under the purview of the Historic Buildings and Ancient monuments Act. In addition, private donations support the work of the national trust which maintains old historic homes and gardens and even villages as a private organization, relying on voluntary contributions and the receipt of property as a gift in lieu of estate taxes. France, too, spends several millions in pursuit of similar historic preservation.

The recent destruction of an 18th century farmhouse in my district is an instructive example of the inadequacy of existing statutes.

A large corporation acquired property in Westchester County to build its world headquarters. On a corner of that land stood a farmhouse built in the late 18th century. While not a unique stucture, the building incorporated several features peculiar to the Colonial period and nonexistent in contemporary architecture. The Westchester County Historical Society and a number of other local groups made persistent efforts to secure the funds necessary for the building's upkeep and to find a new location for it, since the corporation indicated it would be willing to move the structure. I tried to assist these interested citizens by attempting to secure Federal or State historical preservation funds.

And then one morning, while all these public-spirited efforts were in progress, a bulldozer appeared and demolished the farmhouse.

I shared the disappointment of local citizens at this unnecessary destruction and made plain my belief that it is a Federal responsibility to provide an appropriate mechanism for preserving such evidence of our national past.

The legislation I have introduced is one way of making it more difficult for the bulldozer to prevail over the preservation of our American heritage. This would be accomplished by providing Federal grants and loans for the restoration and preservation of historic structures to make them suitable for private occupancy or commercial use—to make them living historic sites rather than museums.

Specifically, my bill would:

First. Make funds available to counties to survey old buildings and structures and to have included in the National Register those which are "significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, or whose lasting beauty of design and landscaping—including trees—have significantly enhanced the quality of American life." This will substantially expand the National Register which now contains some 1,100 properties as a result of Federal and statewide surveys. But more importantly, it recognizes some of the more intangible qualities of our American past; it recognizes, for example, that it is the large maple on the front lawn of an 18th century house which gives the house its charm and its character and that the maple ought to be preserved along with the house. In short, my bill emphasizes the esthetic quality of our American heritage, the way a building looks and feels as well as the presence in it for one night of George Washington or Abraham Lincoln.

Second. Provide that if the owner of such property agreed to have his property recorded in the National Register a restrictive covenant would be included in the deed which would prohibit alterations in or destruction of the property without the written approval of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Third. Make the owners of National Register property eligible for matching grants and low-interest loans to restore the structure in order to preserve, directly or indirectly, the salient historical features and make it suitable for private occupancy or commercial use.

Fourth. Permit the Secretary of the Interior to seek a court order restraining any attempt to alter or destroy a National Register property in the event that such alteration or destruction has not been approved by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

A survey made by the National Register recently indicated that the States could match $2 million annually for 5 years for survey and planning, and that they could match the following figures for projects: fiscal year 1972, $28 million; fiscal year 1973, $34 million; fiscal year 1974, $41 million; and fiscal year 1975, $46 million. My bill makes authorizations based on these estimates.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of a Nation is to a large extent measured by the use of its past to give stability to its present and to forge its future. There is some quality of strength, some feeling of continuity that is derived from contemporary use of homes and buildings that were the shelters and mainstays of our forebearers. Surely a large corporation, a community, a nation gains very little from destroying these links with our past; there is much more to be had from their restoration and constant use.

AGRICULTURE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1970

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve the joint House-Senate conference report on the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1970.

The agreement the conferees arrived at was the product of 3 weeks of meetings. It represents what appears to be a workable compromise between the farm bill the House passed and the farm bill the Senate passed.

The main provisions of the conference report are as follows:

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATION

First. Establishes an annual ceiling of $55,000 per crop on payments to producers of upland cotton, wheat, and feed grains.

Second. The limitation imposed considers all payments made for price support, set-aside, diversion, and public access, as well as marketing certificates.

Third. The Secretary is authorized to adjust set-aside acreage and is directed to issue regulations necessary to insure fair and reasonable application of this title.

TITLE II—DAIRY

First. Amends and extends the authority for the dairymen's class I base plan in Federal milk market order areas and provides that any area coming into the program during the next 3 years could continue to have it in effect up to December 31, 1976.

Second. Suspends the operation of the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream and permits the Secretary to set lower support prices on butter.

Third. Extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the Armed Services and Veterans Hospitals.

Fourth. Provides authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers and dairy processors who, through no fault of their own, have their milk contaminated by and condemned because of the presence of pesticides and residues.

TITLE III—WOOL

First. Extends the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, through December 31, 1973.

Second. Continues the present incentive price of 72 cents per pound for shorn wool and 80.2 cents per pound for mohair for each year of the extension.

TITLE IV—WHEAT

First. Suspends marketing quotas and acreage allotments for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Second. Provides domestic marketing certificates to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption—about 530 million bushels annually.

Third. Sets the face value of these domestic certificates at the difference between the wheat parity price—currently $2.83 per bushel—and the average price received by farmers during the first 5 months of the wheat marketing year—which starts on July 1.

Fourth. Provides for a "preliminary" payment to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. This payment would be the amount estimated by the Secretary to be 75 percent of the value of the domestic certificate. The balance of the payment—if any—would be paid in December. If the Secretary's estimate were too high, no refunds by farmers would be required.

Fifth. Continues the cost of certificates to wheat processors at 75 cents per bushel.

Sixth. Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans to participating farmers from $1.25 per bushel to 100 percent of the parity price for wheat.

Seventh. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which wheat farmers, in order to be eligible for loans, certificates, and payments under the program, must set aside or divert from the production of wheat and other crops an acreage determined by the Secretary. The 1971 set-aside would be 13.3 million acres. The 1972 and 1973 set-aside could not exceed 15 million acres.

Eighth. Authorizes payments to participating farmers for any additional set-aside acreage for permitting public recreational access.

TITLE V—FEED GRAINS

First. Establishes a voluntary feed grain—that is, corn, grain sorghum, and barley—program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

Second. Provides that price-support payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base will be the difference between the higher of not less than $1.35 per bushel, or 70 percent of the parity price—for corn—and the average market price for the first 5 months of the marketing year—which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum and July 1 on barley. In no event, however, would these payments be less than 32 cents per bushel for corn—with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley.

Third. Authorizes the Secretary to set nonrecourse loans at $1 per bushel to 90 percent of feed grain parity prices.

Fourth. Authorizes addition set-aside and public recreational access payments.

Fifth. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which participating farmers would be required to set aside or divert feed grain or other cropland in order to become eligible for feed grain loans and payments.

Sixth. Provides for a "preliminary" payment of 32 cents per bushel on corn to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. If the difference between the average market price and $1.35 were more than 32 cents during the first 5 months of the marketing year, an additional payment would be made. In no event would refunds by farmers be required.

TITLE VI—COTTON

First. Provides a guaranteed support of 35 cents per pound—middling 1-inch basis—on the estimated production from 11.5 million acres for the 1971 crop and an equivalent amount for the 1972 and 1973 crops.

Second. Provides participating cotton farmers with loans and payments. The loan would be 90 percent of the estimated world price for 2 previous years. The payment would be the difference between 35 cents and the average market price for the first 5 months following the beginning of the marketing year—which begins August 1—but in no event less than 15 cents per pound. No refunds by farmers would be required in the event market prices were greater than 20 cents per pound. Small farmers would be eligible for 30-percent bonus on payments.

Third. Authorizes payments to participating farmers on acreage made available to the public for recreational purposes or on additional voluntary set-aside acreage.

Fourth. Provides for a set-aside of cropland—not to exceed 28 percent of the cotton allotment—as a condition of eligibility for benefits under the program.

Fifth. Establishes a voluntary program under which marketing quotas, penalties, and acreage restrictions would be suspended for 3 years.

Sixth. Requires participating farmers to plant cotton to receive payments, with two exceptions: if unable to do so because of natural disaster or other condition beyond producers' control; if not less than 90 percent of allotment is planted.

Seventh. Provides for cotton research and promotion program.

Eighth. Allows the sale of cotton allotments within a State, permits the lease of allotments within a State, and provides for the release and reapportionment of allotments during the 3-year life of this legislation.

Ninth. Authorizes anniversary-type loan program under which the Secretary shall, after being presented with warehouse receipts reflecting accrued storage of not more than 60 days, make nonrecourse loans for a term of 10 months from the first day of the month the loan is made.

TITLE III—PUBLIC LAW 480

Extends the provisions of Public Law 480—the food for peace program—which authorizes donations and long-term dollar credit and foreign currency sales of U.S. farm commodities to underdeveloped nations.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

First. Continues the cropland conversion and greenspan—long-term land retirement programs—at an authorized appropriation level of $10 million annually for each program.

Second. Extends permanently the exemption from marketing quotas for boiled peanuts.

Third. Permits farmers or other land owners who do not desire to hold an allotment on any crop under a Government program to voluntarily relinquish it—this would be a permanent provision.

Fourth. Establishes an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

Fifth. Permits producers to plant, harvest, and bale hay grown on wheat, feed grain, and cotton set-aside acres and

store for future emergency periods declared by the Secretary. The Secretary could also make loans for baled hay storage facilities.

Sixth. Amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide that funds appropriated for section 306—association loans and grants—and for direct real estate loans to farmers and ranchers shall remain available until expended. Also provides that unused authorizations for appropriations under section 306 shall carry over from year to year.

TITLE IX—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Commits Congress to a sound rural-urban balance and provides for various reports on planning assistance, technical assistance, government services and utilities, and financial assistance. Also requires a Federal policy that new offices and facilities be located, insofar as practicable, in communities of lower population density.

Other provisions include:

A program for class I base plans in Federal milk orders, an extension of the National Wool Act, an extension of the food for peace program, and several Senate amendments dealing with rural development, Farmers Home Administration loans, and harvesting of hay on set-aside acreage. The bill also sets up a new set-aside program for producers of cotton, wheat, and feed grains, and authorizes a $10 million per year experimental land retirement program.

Major items in the conference substitute which were not incorporated in the House-passed bill included a $1.25 floor on wheat loans during each of the next 3 years, a maximum wheat set-aside of 15 million acres, a 70 percent of parity floor on feed grain target price, a cotton research and promotion program, a bonus provision for small farms, a maximum cotton set-aside of 28 percent, and a congressional rural development policy and mandatory report provision to the Congress as to the implementation of such policy.

The conference agreed to exclude mandatory advance payments; small farm bonuses on wheat and feed grains; an extension of the 1965 Food and Agriculture Act for the 1971 wheat crop; a referendum on wheat; and a continuation of cotton marketing quotas.

Mr. Speaker, the new farm bill produced by the House-Senate conferees maintains Government assistance to our Nation's farmers for the next 3 years at about the same level as is currently being provided. This assistance is both needed and warranted; for as I said when the House bill was being debated:

For over three decades, the Federal Government has been actively and intimately involved in American agriculture. As a natural and predictable result of this involvement, the farm economy has become greatly dependent upon Federal assistance for survival. Accordingly, the Federal Government has a clear obligation to help maintain the well-being of this segment of the Nation, in much the same fashion as it assists other segments of society.

In closing, I would like to make one crucial point. The bill before the House today is by no means a perfect bill and it by no means solves all the major problems of the farmer. I personally think the farmer is entitled to a better range of assistance than is provided under this bill. However, if Congress fails to pass a farm bill before the 91st Congress adjourns, the farmers of this Nation will be forced to rely on old laws more appropriate for the thirties than for the seventies. For this reason, I urge my colleagues not only to approve the new farm bill, but to use their good offices to expedite action on the bill in the other body. Unless both bodies of Congress act promptly, almost 2 years of diligent work by the House Agriculture Committee, the Department of Agriculture, and concerned farmers and farm organizations will be for nought. Moreover, the ultimate victim of congressional action will be the American consumer who is the real beneficiary of the Government farm program. It is this program that enables the agricultural sector to produce the greatest variety of rich and wholesome farm products in the world at a cost to the American consumer that is lower than at any other time in our Nation's history.

HIGH INTEREST RATES, HIGH BANK PROFITS, AND THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days, nearly all of the large commercial banks have issued earnings reports reflecting some of the most swollen profits in the history of banking. These fat earnings reports come on the heels of the big banks' refusal to roll back high interest rates. The banks have been willing only to toss the American people a tiny morsel in the form of a one-half of 1 percent reduction in the prime lending rate. There has been no announced reduction of interest rates to the consumer, the farmer, the workingman, or the small businessman.

The earnings figures plainly show that the banks could reduce interest rates sharply with no harm to their stockholders. Using the banks' own figures, it is now apparent that interest rates could be moved back to the 6 percent level existing at the time President Nixon was elected.

Last month, Chase Manhattan National Bank spent thousands of dollars in full-page newspaper advertisements implying that their poor earnings position prevented them from lowering interest rates. Last week, Chase Manhattan announced a net earnings increase of 56.6 percent for the third quarter of 1970. I am sure that no one has the funds to buy a full-page ad to point out this huge profit increase and to reveal the massive discrepancies in the bank's advertising campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that any other industry or labor union would have been called on the carpet if they had increased prices, profits, or wages by a whopping 56 percent. Yet, we have only a deafening silence concerning Chase Manhattan's earnings figure.

The American people desperately need lower interest rates and last week I wrote President Nixon urging that he take official note of the swollen bank profits and that he take action which would require the banks to lower their interest rates. A public discussion by the President concerning these high bank profits and high interest rates would leave the banks no choice. This public attention would require them to lower their interest rates to all types of borrowers, not just to the big corporations and other prime customers.

Mr. Speaker, the President and his economic advisers have been strangely silent about the banks and their profits and the high interest rates they have imposed on the American people. In recent days, many of the President's economic advisers have journeyed around the Nation discussing the economy in rosy terms, but saying not a word about these earnings figures that are flowing from the big banks. It is regrettable that the President and his advisers do not speak out on this subject. I can assure them that the American people—both Republicans and Democrats—want lower interest rates and they want both the Congress and the executive branch to do everything within their power to bring about a reduction in the cost of money.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's silence makes them a party to the high interest policies of the big banks. They cannot escape the blame for the onerous interest charges that have brought about high unemployment, high prices, and a deteriorating economy.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of my letter to President Nixon urging him to do something for the people in this area:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Undoubtedly you are aware of the tremendously high profits being reported almost daily by the large commercial banks. These are profits that have been exacted from the American people through the highest interest rates in the history of the nation.

Only this morning, Chase Manhattan National Bank, the nation's third largest financial institution, reported a profit gain of 56.6% for the third quarter of 1970. Morgan Guaranty Trust reported a 34% increase and First National City Bank, a 32.8% gain. Similar profits are being reported for the other large money center banks.

Mr. President, these profit figures are unconscionable and are far out of line with the earnings being reported by other business and industrial concerns.

It is unconscionable for a large bank like Chase Manhattan to increase its profits by 56.6% at a time when most Americans are unable to buy a home because of high interest rates. Such profit figures are unconscionable in an economy where 4.3 million people are unemployed and with the unemployment rate rising daily. It is unconscionable for the large commercial banks to report 30% to 50% increases in earnings at a time when the taxpayers are saddled with a bill for $20 billion in interest on the national

debt each year. These swollen profits are unconscionable at a time when school districts and local governments are unable to finance the most basic facilities because of the high interest rate burdens.

These figures, Mr. President, cry out for a definite action to bring about a rollback of interest rates. It is obvious that bank earnings can take a substantial rollback of interest rates without great harm to the banks or their stockholders.

Last month, the large banks grudgingly reduced the prime lending rate from 8% to 7½%. In light of the profit figures being released, it is obvious that this ½ of 1% decrease was only a token effort. The earnings plainly indicate that a rollback to 6% would be possible immediately.

As you recall, Chase Manhattan, which announced the 56.6% increase in profits, is the same bank that ran full page advertisements in the major newspapers around the nation last month implying that it could not reduce interest rates because of its poor earnings position. The 56.6% increase in profits raises a most serious question about the credibility of this giant banking institution.

Mr. President, I do not believe that your office would allow to go unnoticed a 50% wage increase demanded by a labor union or a 50% profit increase by any other industry. In such an event, I am sure that you would call out your economic advisers and, at a minimum, issue one of your "Inflation Alerts."

The large banks will continue to report swollen profit figures—exacted from the people—so long as they believe that no pressure will be brought to bear on them by the Executive Branch. To strengthen your hand in such a situation, the Congress last year passed Public Law 91–151 giving you the fullest stand-by credit control authority. This stand-by power would most certainly back up any public statement which you made calling on the banks to roll back their profits and the high interest rates they are charging the people.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge that you use your great office to bring about fair play and justice for the American people in the area of interest rates. The big banks are watching your office closely. If you do not act, the American people can only expect a prolonged period of high interest rates with the big banks continuing to reap swollen profits at the expense of this great nation.

Respectfully,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Mr. Speaker, the Chase Manhattan National Bank recorded a 56.6-percent increase in net earnings, but they are not alone. Another of the Wall Street giants—Morgan Guaranty—recorded a 34-percent increase; Bankers Trust, 27 percent; First National City, 33.7 percent; Continental-Illinois, 17 percent; Cleveland Trust, 28.9 percent; so it goes, on across the country, record earnings. These earnings will continue to skyrocket and by year's end, 1970, many will surpass the record profits recorded by so many banks only a year ago. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in the October 12 edition of the American Banker concerning the large banks' profit figures:

LARGE BANKS' PROFIT UP DESPITE HIGHER COSTS

(By Stanley Strachan)

NEW YORK.—The strong earnings performance of money-market banks in the third quarter was in line with analysts' expectations and the outlook is for another good quarter despite the prime rate reduction.

Some of the third-quarter increases reported by New York City banks reflected unusually large profits in bond trading accounts—profits which cannot be counted on for the fourth quarter.

But as they were in the July-September period, the money center banks will be in the position of matching their earnings performance against an unusually weak quarter—the final three months of 1969.

The nine-month earnings gains chalked up by the New York banks have come despite sharp increases in salary costs as well as interest paid. The higher salaries undoubtedly result from the inflation that has permeated the economy, but the figures hold out strong hope that costs can be controlled to a greater degree in 1971 when earnings comparisons will be made against the stronger 1970 performance.

Chase Manhattan Bank NA, which posted a 37.1% gain in net operating income and a 56.6% gain in net income for the third quarter of this year compared with the same three months of last year, recorded a 9.3% gain in NOI for the full nine months.

Chase achieved this strong result despite a $15 million increase in salaries and a $6 million increment in employee benefit costs.

Over-all Chase costs for staff in the nine months ended Sept. 30 were $156.4 million, up from $135.4 million in same period a year ago.

During the same three quarters, the bank's interest paid rose to $409.4 million from $341.7 million, with the largest increase coming in the "other borrowed money" category which includes Eurodollars and commercial paper. These funds cost Chase $93.3 million over the nine-month period, compared with $35.3 million in the 1969 period.

Another example of a strong earnings performance in the face of increased expenses was that of J. P. Morgan & Co., which was up 19.9% for the three quarters.

Morgan's salary costs rose to $59.1 million from $43.5 million, while other employee benefits costs were up to $14.1 million from $12.7 million.

The bank's interest cost rose to $210.8 million from $179.2 million over the nine months.

But for Morgan the key to its big gain in net operating income was in its bond trading account. During the first nine months, the bank earned $31.7 million from its trading account, compared with only $6.9 million in the same period of 1969.

The $24.8 million increase in trading account profits was 45% of Morgan's total operating income increase of $54.4 million in the three quarters.

The Chase and Morgan gains were exceptional, but the performance in the third quarter by the seven largest New York banks was strong across the board.

These banks averaged 19% higher net earnings in the quarter, compared with year-ago levels. Although analysts expect some of the banks will not be able to match their July–September performance, they look for others to pick up the slack and for the seven-bank average to be about the same in the fourth quarter.

For the full year, at 25 major banks, M. A. Schapiro & Co., Inc., is forecasting net operating income after provision for loan losses of $1.31 billion, up 7.4% from the $1.22 billion earned in 1969.

The projection is made in the firm's Bank Stock Quarterly, released Monday, which notes that "banks which have been dependent on high-cost borrowings are now benefiting from the return flow of deposits and the greater availability of Federal Reserve credit."

The decline in loan income from the lowering of the prime rate "is already being met, at least in part, by the generally lower cost of funds and the modest expansion of loans and investments," Schapiro says.

THE HIGH COST OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the terrorism and violence that mark the opening of the 1970's in the United States show that some misguided Americans have given up hope in our system of democracy. They seek, through bombings, kidnaping, and murder, to overthrow the governmental institutions and processes that we, as a nation, have evolved over the past 200 years. They claim, falsely in my view, that the injustices of our society cannot be corrected through our established processes. Rather, they say, our institutions must be overthrown and new ones created that will guarantee liberty and justice. Theirs is the path of despair, followed by violence and then chaos.

Although I totally reject this view of our society, I do believe that I share the view held by many thoughtful Americans, a view that our democracy is on trial. We face a battery of problems that are putting our institutions to the test. Can they respond quickly enough to meet the challenge of environmental destruction? Can they exercise the foresight to control the most dangerous arsenal of arms that has ever existed? Can they guarantee the rights of individuals in a mass society? The answers to these questions are yet to be arrived at. Our actions will determine the answer. We must strengthen and if necessary modify our institutions and processes so that we can meet the challenge of our times.

The central theme of our system is representative democracy. This is the great experiment to which we have committed ourselves. We strive for the greatest possible public participation in our institutions of government. We cannot, like the citizens of a Greek city state, all join in the deliberations of the problems of the day. But we can, and do, elect men and women to represent our views in these institutions. Every year thousands of local and State government representatives present themselves to their constituents for approval or rejection. Every year, under the best circumstances, the issues being considered by these institutions are debated by the candidates and discussed by the electorate. Every 2 years 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives go before approximately 500,000 Americans to defend their record. Every 4 years Americans go to the polls to cast their vote for President, the Chief Executive of our Nation.

Although we all acknowledge that there are imperfections in this process of considering and then electing men to represent us, we also know that it is the principal means of keeping our Government responsive to the wishes of the public. There is probably no more responsive governmental body in our Nation than the U.S. House of Representatives. The men elected in the competitive congressional districts give us a

fairly accurate test of the mood of the American public every 2 years. We may not like the mood or the views of the public. But nevertheless it is the public view. Unfortunately the public is willing to tolerate injustice in our society, to demand less than the utmost in the search for peace. This public view can only be changed by leadership and education.

What should continually surprise us is the concept that in a nation of more than 200 million people we are still embarked on the experiment of representative democracy. This has only been possible because of the changes in technology. With the latest technology of modern communications, television and radio broadcasting on a national scale, newspapers printing news from every corner of our Nation make it possible for the citizen to see, if he wishes, the actions and deliberations of his representatives. President Nixon, for example, was accompanied by about 400 representatives of our news media when he traveled to the Mediterranean and Europe recently. Our public was able to see the Chief Executive arrive in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, on the same day that it happened. The public is able to sit in on the deliberations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when it debates our involvement in the Indochina war. The Representative often appears on local television and radio programs or is interviewed by the press so that his views are made known to his constituents. Representative democracy in our Nation today is very much a product of our evolving communications media.

Although in the day-to-day conduct of government our communications process appears to work reasonably well, this is not the case during election campaigns. With the growth in the size of the electorate and with the increasing emphasis on electronic means of communication, television and radio, elected Representatives now face problems that they have never faced before. Public opinion polls show that more pepole rely on television for information on current events than on any other form of communication. As a consequence the elected Representative seeks increasingly to present his views on television. Because of the rule of equal time, the candidate is restricted in the number of appearances that he can make on this medium. Television and radio stations seek to allow the candidates to appear but the amount of time is limited and the format, the half-hour or 1-hour debate, does not attract as many viewers as a 5- or 10-minute spot each evening during prime time might.

The result has been the emergence of the spot political announcement, a 30- or 60-second advertisement presenting the candidate with an overly simplified message. Today, a candidate for statewide election in one of our larger States must spend $1.5 or $2 million on radio and television ads in order to carry his message to the public. When there is a primary as well, an additional $1.5 million must be added. A candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives may spend $100,000 to $200,000 for television and radio in a closely contested race. What does this mean today? It means that a candidate for the U.S. Senate or for Governor in California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York or Texas must have more than $1 million in order to run an effective campaign. And despite the comment in President Nixon's veto message, this amount of money is spent on television and radio, not in newspapers or on billboards. It is false to say that if the money were not spent on television it would be spent on other campaign media.

Congress recognized the threat to our institutions of Government in the rising costs of television campaigning. Members recognized that soaring costs would throw them increasingly into the arms of the big financial contributors, obligating them to those who contributed the great sums of money needed to campaign today. Congress recognized that there is no greater threat to the principle of representative democracy than that of high cost campaigning.

The bill that the Congress passed to limit the amount of money spent on television for campaigns and to change the equal time principle is not a perfect bill. I believe that in time we would have to modify it to make it a more effective instrument of campaign spending control. But it was a first step. It was a move to change the most serious attack on our electoral process.

I was shocked, therefore, when President Nixon vetoed this bill. This action seems to prove the allegation that the Republican Party is the party of financial interests rather than a party representing all citizens. President Nixon's veto also flies in the face of his announced efforts to eliminate corruption in government, for what better way is there to encourage corruption than to cause the elected representative to rely on bigger and bigger financial contributions.

In my opinion it is now up to President Nixon to submit an alternative to the television and radio campaign funding limitation bill passed by the Congress when Congress reconvenes in November. Unless he can suggest a workable and reasonable alternative, I plan to seek a vote in the U.S. House of Representatives to override his veto. I believe that all elected representatives owe this to our experiment in representative democracy and to our Nation.

RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. SENATOR

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, after 13 productive years as U.S. Senator from the State of Texas, the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH steps down this year. In the months since his defeat in the primary election, Senator YARBOROUGH has added a new dimension to his record of accomplishments. Senator YARBOROUGH may be a lameduck, but you could not tell it by his actions. Rather than take the easy road to retirement, he has attacked the legislative process with a gusto that has become the Yarborough style over the years.

Senator YARBOROUGH and I have not always agreed on philosophy and legislative approaches, but this does not diminish my respect for this man. He is controversial, but I do not think this is by design. Rather, this is a natural aura that surrounds any man who is deeply involved in his beliefs. I respect Senator YARBOROUGH for his significant contributions to his State and his Nation. I know of no man who works harder, is more dedicated, has higher ideals or higher goals.

We will miss Senator YARBOROUGH in the Congress.

A good friend of the Senator's offered a colorful description of this colorful leader—he once said:

> Yarborough is always dependable. Regardless of his position on any issue, you can expect half the people to admire him, and half the people to be angry with him. Senator Yarborough never disappoints either side.

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, the Dallas Morning News ran a profile of Senator YARBOROUGH which does a good job of capturing not only his style but also his accomplishments. Sam Kinch, Jr., has written a good analysis of the man, the Senator, and the ideas. I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

YARBOROUGH IS NOT THROUGH YET

(By Sam Kinch, Jr.)

U.S. Senator Ralph Webster Yarborough has been in public life for nearly 40 years. And, by State Department protocol at least, he is the highest ranking Texan in government.

Perhaps curiously, he identifies in Texas history with Sam Houston: He considers Houston to have been, as he considers himself, a misunderstood and under-appreciated public servant. Yarborough also thinks Houston was Texas' "premier and ideal senator." He ranks himself, modestly, not far below.

Houston, of course, was kicked out of office in 1861 when, as governor of Texas, he refused to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy. As a result of his defeat in the Democratic primary, Yarborough ends his current Senate career the day before the 1971 Congress convenes—ironically at the height of his power as a senator. His successor will be chosen in the November general election.

Historians might argue over the relative significance of the deposing of Houston and Yarborough, but the fact that Yarborough mentions the implied parallel is an insight into this man. For even if he is not misunderstood by Texas voters, at least he is rarely seen in his full dimensions.

When he was asked how he felt about his failure to win renomination for the Senate, he gave, by Yarborough-watchers' standards, an unusually concise answer, one both stoical and egotistical: "If you do things, you are apt to get voted out of office. Winston Churchill, at the end of World War II, is a classic example. I've done things, too, and taken chances. I'd rather be doing something than just coasting along, although coasting along makes you more likely to stay in office. I never have coasted, and neither have the other men who have accomplished things in this world."

Many Texas Democrats who voted in the May 2 primaries obviously did not like some of the things the senator had done. Or, in the senator's view, what they were told he had done. Yarborough readily admits that everything he has done in the Senate has not been popular.

"I've been in tune with progress," he asserts. "I realize I don't always have 100 per cent support (in Texas), but the people are for me. The Texas press and the establishment, for example, have been opposed to the education, antipoverty and health programs of the last six years that have moved the country and Texas forward dramatically. But the people of Texas are for those programs. So it's the establishment people who are out of tune with me and the people."

Possibly true, although the "establishment" certainly does not include all the 816,000 or so persons who voted against Yarborough in the primary.

When he "retires," the 67-year-old senator will receive a pension for the rest of his life. But, he points out ruefully, "it is only about one-third of what federal judges get." At one point, Yarborough's major goal was to be a federal judge.

He wants to practice law in Austin, on his own, and "be free to speak out on public issues about which I have some knowledge and on which I can make a contribution."

He plans to do more writing and speaking about public affairs and also has signed a contract to write a book about the Big Thicket area in East Texas which he wants to make into a national park. "That's my native habitat," he says, "and the thicket bill would be my choice if I could only pass one bill before Congress adjourns."

No one expects Yarborough to be retired completely from politics. Indeed, he delights in encouraging speculation about his personal political ambitions. He always has wanted to be governor of Texas and, under the right circumstances, he might make his **fourth try for the job.** He lost gubernatorial races in 1952, 1954 and 1956.

He prides himself on being something of a mystery. This quality extends beyond his political behavior to his personality. One would guess that his biggest disappointment in pubic life would have been his defeat this year. But, illustrating his history-mindedness and ability to bear a grudge, the senator says it reaches back 16 years to his loss of the governor's race to Allan Shivers in 1954. That was when Shivers accused Yarborough, who always had heavy support from labor groups, of being responsible for a strike in Port Arthur, as well as for other strikes in Texas.

Why does he choose that race, rather than his Senate defeat, as his biggest disappointment?

"Because I had that (1954) election won and had earned it," Yarborough says. "Shivers took it away from me. Beat me with the Port Arthur lie. And more importantly, at the time it looked like I would never have another opportunity to do anything in public life, there had been such a smear campaign."

Yarborough does not consider Texas voters "ungrateful" for what he has done in Washington. He simply thinks they are not informed about his worth to the state and the nation. Characteristically, he accuses the press of being responsible: "They have been screening me out of the news for 13 years—not the working press, but the management people."

The alleged prejudice of the press has been one of the most persistent Yarborough refrains of the last two decades. Whether the allegation is right or wrong, it is something the senator feels quite deeply. So deeply, in fact, that he has been accused of being almost paranoid in his dealing with some reporters and some newspapers, which has tended to make the issue circular.

There was a time during last spring's campaign when Ralph Webster Yarborough considered becoming a Texas version of Spiro Theodore Agnew.

"I've criticized the press in the past, of course," he admits, "and I could have done it again this year. But I didn't because I thought I would be wasting my time. You can't change the press, anyway. But I may have made a mistake. Agnew is popular as hell for doing it."

Yarborough spends a lot of time these days talking about what he might, or could or should have done to prevent his defeat. But his pondering and worrying goes beyond his own situation. He talks constantly about "the cause of progressive government," because his idea of what that means is what, fundamentally, moves him. He avoids the term "liberal" because it "means something different to everyone." But he constantly uses "conservative" and even "reactionary" to describe those with whom he disagrees.

No one, not even his most bitter political enemy, questions Yarborough's legal skills. He was a brilliant young lawyer, a teacher of law and a respected judge before World War II. Undoubtedly he could have made a lot of money and become a financial backer of "the cause of progressive government" instead of Texas' most prominent liberal politican, and probably the most controversial, of the 1950s and 1960s.

What moved him to get involved in elective politics rather than staying on the sidelines as perhaps a wealthy financier of liberal politicians?

"You have to have the feeling," he says, "that you can accomplish something for mankind that you could not have accomplished if you hadn't gotten involved. And I have that feeling, particularly about the legislation I have passed through Congress."

When he says his biggest contribution to Texas is "the whole body of legislation I've passed and the image I've given Texas because of it," Yarborough claims he is not being arrogant or egotistical. He simply states it as his version of the truth.

Whatever his reputation in Texas politics, Yarborough's standing (as opposed to popularity, which he disdains) with his fellow senators is high. He is chairman of the Senate's influential Labor and Public Welfare Committee and his name is probably attached to more legislation than that of any other senator in Texas history.

Yarborough is fond of pinning down the authorship of legislation by pointing out, "When (former) President Johnson, as Senate majority leader back in the 1950s, was passing all those bills, most of them had somebody else's name on them." By contrast, LBJ, when called on recently for praise of Yarborough, quoted the late J. Frank Dobie: "I salute him for his sense of civilized values, for his sense of justice, for his enlightened intellect, for his decency as a human being and for his integrity."

Asked to specify the significant legislation that he had a major role in passing, Yarborough began with education. He was author or principal cosponsor of a number of landmark laws including the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which laid the groundwork for federal aid to education, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which extended the federal aid concept to the public schools below the college level.

The senator also personally created and saw through to passage the Cold War GI Bill, the Bilingual Education Act, Professors Emeritus Act and measures to extend educational media aid to schools and assist education of the handicapped.

He has been the chief Senate sponsor of the Padre Island National Seashore and Guadalupe Mountains National Park. Yarborough rewrote and got passed over President Nixon's veto an expansion and total reform of the Hill-Burton hospital aid act. He authored a number of other major health programs, including those to establish regional mental health centers, provide migrant health care, aid medical libraries and expand schools of public health.

The Texas senator, while deemed contentious, argumentative and uncooperative by many of his fellow Texans, is regarded as a legend of sorts in Congress. For one thing, he is the only chairman of a Senate committee who represents a state with more than 10 million people. "In most of the big states you either get beat so often, or die trying to stay in, that you don't build up enough seniority to be a chairman," he says. For another thing, he spends almost all his time on committee work. He is a shrewd legislative architect, to start with, and a rugged compromiser, to end with. In between, as one of his colleagues said in private, "He's hell on wheels if you cross him and a friendly collie if you play ball with him."

That analogy may seem inconsistent with the way Yarborough has appeared to much of the Texas electorate. On the stump, he is a courthouse-lawn orator; the arch foe of the entrenched and the big and the rich; a master of political bombast. But it is not at all surprising that the senator's view of himself differs from his public image. He describes himself as a "calm, sedate, studious type of person—a careful man, a teacher, a lawyer, a judge." He prefers a few hours' reading (mostly about legislative matters and history, his favorite field) to attending a party. Perhaps this is because he does not drink and does not really approve of it.

The Yarboroughs live as simply and privately as a senator from a big state who chairs a major committee can. They do little partying other than official and quasi-official functions they have to attend. Their unpretentious 6-room Washington apartment in the Methodist Building is the one they have rented for 12 years. It is a 5-minute walk to the senator's office.

They are not wealthy, by any means. Other than a modest, older twice-decorated home in Austin, where they will live after he leaves office, they own only "a few shreds of land" in West Texas that he got as fees in lawsuits years ago.

"I haven't lined my pockets in public office," he asserts, "unlike many of those who have opposed me. I don't want to name any names—no."

Yarborough likes to recall his earlier campaigning days when the automobile caravan, rather than the corporate airplane, carried the candidate and his entourage, and the old-time "give-'em-hell" speech was the trade mark of a candidate, rather than a slick television commercial. That was when the primaries were held in late July, with the runoffs in August, and even in the Texas heat Yarborough was an indefatigable campaigner.

"These new fellows couldn't beat me in a summer campaign," he claims. The senator frankly misses the old style of campaigning, perhaps because, though he won't admit it, he isn't particularly effective in the new mass-media advertising style.

For Ralph Webster Yarborough, born just three years after the turn of the century, the politics and politicking of the plain people were simple. You came to a small town, shook all the available hands at the courthouse, dropped by to have coffee with the local folk, kissed a few babies, made an eloquent if perhaps slanderous attack on your opponent and moved on to repeat the performance elsewhere.

Yarborough knew the system well, virtually from birth. His family has been involved in politics for years in East Texas where he was born in Chandler, Henderson County, on June 8, 1903. Young Yarborough didn't take the direct path to politics. He did some rather strange things for an East Texas boy, like spending a year at West Point before dropping out; working for the American Chamber of Commerce in Berlin; entering The University of Texas law school at age 20 and later graduating with highest honors, though he was essentially a college dropout.

The young lawyer served as an assistant state attorney general and in 1936 as a state district judge, but even with that background he lost a 1938 race for attorney general to a former SMU all-American quarterback, Gerald Mann. He spent World War II as an army infantry and military government officer, then returned to a postwar law practice. After his 1952 and 1954 defeats by Shivers, he challenged U.S. Senator Price Daniel for governor in 1956, only to lose

again. But in the 1957 special election to finish Daniel's term in the Senate—which Daniel had resigned to become governor—Yarborough finally won, and against 18 opponents.

Yarborough won the Senate seat again in 1958 against William "Dollar Bill" Blakely, as he called his Democratic opponent, and Republican Roy Whittenburg. Again in 1964, with then-President Johnson's help, he beat Democrat Gordon McLendon and GOP challenger George Bush.

"A political career is terribly difficult on your family," the senator says. "You take a terrific loss financially if you play it straight, so your family suffers, of course. You have to regret all the hardships on your family. (He has a son, Richard, who is a member of the U.S. Indian Claims Commission.) But I don't regret at all having gotten into politics. I am always encouraging young people toward public service, although I warn them about the sacrifices and the pressures and the disappointments. But I certainly have no regrets about my own career."

His lack of regret shows in his work. He continues to act as if he were going to be a senator for another dozen years. All his new legislative proposals, obviously, are not earth-shaking, but some of the senator's work in his lameduck months probably will be vintage—controversial, fight-provoking and worth remembering. For example, he wants to build the legislative groundwork for a national system of health insurance.

There are moments when Yarborough slows down. He likes to recall that in his years in the Senate, he has accumulated 383 packing cases of mail. He's kept it all, this correspondence about subjects as far-reaching as legislation of national import or as personal as getting a son out of an Army stockade.

He also has 350 or so boxes of books, Congressional studies and other papers that he wants to keep. Cataloging his Senate papers and getting them ready for a voter-decreed trip to Texas tends to slow the senator's pace. "Next to losing the election and this office," he says, "the worst thing is having to move."

Talking at his usual fast clip, and at all angles, he mentions a "leisure" activity: "I have only hunted and fished nine days in more than 13 years. I used to do it four to six weeks a year. I want to get that going again."

But, characteristically, his conversation turns again to his Senate work—about how much time he has left, how Congress is likely to be late adjourning this session, and how, therefore, there is more time to be spent passing bills. But, mostly by implication, he is talking about how little time there is left for him—and how much there is for him to do for the nation.

Then, unable to resist one of his career-long favorite roles, he becomes the political enigma again: "If I live as long as my father did (to age 100, plus 11 days), I will be around for a long time." That works out to 33 more years, plenty of time to run for public office again.

Yarborough identifies with Sam Houston in history as an under-appreciated public servant. There have been many under-appreciated politicians in history. But when the senator claims he is a misunderstood man, the least one can say is that he has always seemed to enjoy that status.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my 23d Report From Washington to the residents of California's 30th District, "91st Congress—Re-Cap," highlighting some of the major accomplishments and significant legislative issues considered during the 91st Congress.

In addition to this series of regular reports, I have also sent out 20 special reports to cover topics and events in the Nation's Capital of particular interest to the citizens of our Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

The report follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

I am happy to send you this Report from Washington, highlighting some of the major accomplishments and significant legislative issues of particular interest to the citizens of Metropolitan Los Angeles, which were considered during the 91st Congress.

TAX CUT

I voted for the 91st Congress' landmark Tax Reform Act—the most far-reaching and comprehensive revision since the U.S. income tax law was enacted in 1913—providing substantial across-the-board rate reductions for all individual taxpayers, while making a start toward closing some of the major loopholes which allow special interests and the wealthy to avoid paying their fair share of the nation's tax burden.

Although it falls short of doing all that needs to be done, both in terms of easing the overall tax load, and in making the tax system more equitable, the Tax Reform Act is a good beginning, and for this reason I supported it—especially after the measure was amended to assure a tax cut for all taxpayers.

While reducing the financial burden for everyone, the legislation concentrates its relief provisions to benefit the average middle and lower income taxpayer, removes completely from the tax rolls millions of poverty-level wage earners, and greatly reduces tax liability for low-income families.

Other sections of the Act increase both the personal exemption and the standard deduction: attempt to plug loopholes and generally tighten-up provisions relating to oil and gas depletion allowance, capital gains, tax-exempt foundations, charitable contributions, the business investment tax credit; as well as adopt a new "minimum tax" to make sure that, regardless of any tax breaks still in the law, every citizen who is able bears at least some share of the country's tax load.

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE

The American people today face a health crisis of major proportions.

While spending more now for medical care than any other nation—over $60 billion a year—their health is worse than many other industrialized countries.

For example, America ranks 13th in infant mortality among industrialized nations, seventh in maternal mortality, 18th in life expectancy for men, and 11th in life expectancy for women. By every index, Americans are less healthy now than they were 20 years ago.

I agree with the former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, who declared, "This nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate concerted action is taken by government and the private sector."

Although good health care is recognized as an essential right of our citizens, for millions of people such care is virtually nonexistent.

Because of this situation, I have joined with a bi-partisan group of over 50 other members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives in introducing legislation, the Health Security Act of 1970, to establish a comprehensive national health care program for all residents of the United States.

My bill, H.R. 19158, would help enable our Nation to make the right to health care not merely a principle or a long-term social goal, but a living reality. The goal would be to insure that all persons residing in the country had the opportunity to receive good health care—without barriers to the care they need, and without the crushing financial burdens that too often accompany the delivery of health services today.

The program would not only create a system of national health insurance which would make adequate personal health services available to all residents, but, through the operation of the system, it would effect major improvements in the organization and methods of delivering health care, so as to increase their availability, control rising costs, and safeguard their quality.

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

One of the most significant measures passed by the House in recent years is the proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the present electoral college system and provide for direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

As a co-sponsor of this one-man-one-vote national election plan, I was delighted at the 339–70 House vote of approval, and am hopeful the Senate will be able to overcome the current opposition filibuster and take affirmative action before the end of the year.

With the latest nationwide polls showing more than 80% of the electorate favoring direct elections, it should then be possible to obtain ratification by the necessary three-fourths of the states to become the law of the land.

As adopted in the House, the proposal would provide that the candidate getting the most popular votes would be elected President, as long as he had at least 40% of the vote. If no candidate received 40%, a runoff election between the two leading candidates would be held.

By recognizing the basic justice of assuring that each citizen's choice is given equal weight, and the candidate with the most popular votes wins, I believe we will be implementing a long-overdue reform in America's electoral system—and at the same time, guaranteeing that every member of our society has a full opportunity to participate directly in the selection of our national leadership.

LOS ANGELES YOUTH CAMP

I was delighted to help secure full federal assistance for a unique federal/local government/private industry cooperative project to convert the former Angeles National Forest Job Corps Center at Fenner Canyon into a multi-purpose juvenile rehabilitation facility operated by the Los Angeles County Probation Department.

County and federal officials have now worked out final arrangements for use of this $2 million camp site to provide a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week residential training program for 17- to 18-year-old youths—in an effort to solve one of Los Angeles' most pressing problems: an acute shortage of adequate space and properly equipped facilities to handle the County's rapidly rising juvenile delinquency case load.

With the official opening ceremonies held on October 9th, the U.S. Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration awarded a special $200,000 grant for the Teledyne-Packard-Bell Corporation of Los Angeles to develop an experimental demonstration community-based correctional program, stressing job-related educational and vocational training experiences for youthful offenders.

Expected to be fully operational by early 1971, the 35-acre San Gabriel Mountain site will accommodate some 200 youths, on a year-round basis with the rehabilitation program emphasizing remedial and vocational education, job training, forest conservation work, camp maintenance, individual

and group counseling, and job placement after release.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

It was an honor to receive a second major legislative assignment in the the 91st Congress as a member of the important House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This appointment is in addition to my work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and has provided an opportunity to be of service to California's 3 million veterans—more than any other state in the Nation.

In fact, almost 50 percent of our citizens are affected, either directly or indirectly, by activities of the Veterans Committee in such fields as veterans housing, education and training programs; VA hospitals and medical care; GI insurance; compensation and vocational rehabilitation; and veterans pensions.

I was also pleased to have been able to obtain federal agency approval this year for the new Veterans Assistance Center in Los Angeles. When fully operating, the Center will be one of the first of its kind in the nation designed specifically to provide returning Vietnam servicemen with a new concept of personalized outreach services—to insure that all veterans, especially those recently separated, receive comprehensive educational, vocational counseling, social services, and job training and placement assistance, tailored to the individual needs of the veteran—to help him make a successful readjustment to civilian life, take full advantage of all government benefits available to him, and become a productive, self-supporting member of the community.

During this session, the Veterans Committee was responsible for legislation enacted to provide an 8% increase in disability compensation for two million disabled veterans, as well as a similar increase in nonservice-connected pensions to more than one and one-half million veterans and widows—assuring that none will have their pensions reduced because of the social security increase als OKd by Congress.

Moreover, nearly a million ex-servicemen are now receiving a 35% increase in education and training allowances, and all members of the Armed Forces are covered with an additional $5,000 in insurance.

Also as a direct result of the intensive efforts of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the VA's Hospital and Medical Program will have $155 million in appropriations above the original budget request—to assure the very best possible care is provided those who have served their country in uniform, especially those who have suffered wounds or service-connected disabilities.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Almost half a century of effort—by more than half the Nation's citizens—to gain full equality under the law is approaching final success.

Legislation similar to my resolution, H.J. Res. 477, proposing an amendment to the Constitution to guarantee equal rights for women, has been introduced in Congress since 1923 without receiving favorable action from the House Judiciary Committee (though the Senate had passed such an amendment in 1950 and again in 1953).

But, by using a "discharge petition" to bring the issue directly to the House Floor for a vote, we were able to overcome the Committee's continued opposition, and then score a resounding 352–15 victory—far more votes than the necessary two-thirds required on all constitutional amendments.

Though currently facing a parliamentary delay in the Senate with final approval of the equal rights resolution by Congress, it will be submitted for ratification by three-fourths of the states, as provided in Article V of the Constitution.

This legislative breakthrough is an important step toward full equality for women in America. There are many reasons for federal and state approval of the measure, but the strongest is that it is simply the right thing to do.

Discrimination in any form has no place in a modern society, and we cannot afford to waste the talents of any group of citizens in these demanding times. Complete equality before the law, as well as acceptance of women's equal rights, must be granted if we are to realize the full potential of all members of our society.

CABINET COMMITTEE

Congressional enactment of my bill to establish a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People is a good indication of the nationwide support we found for the goal of increased jobs, better housing, improved health care, and wider educational opportunities for America's 10 million Spanish-speaking citizens.

The proposal's resounding 314–81 vote of approval in the House was an encouraging demonstration of a desire for stronger federal leadership in identifying and meeting the unique needs of the country's second largest minority group.

Spanish-surnamed Americans, along with all other citizens, must be offered a real chance to enter into the mainstream of every phase of our nation's life—to obtain a full share of the great economic, social, and educational benefits of this land.

VOLUNTEER ARMY

I have been pleased by the growing evidence of widespread bi-partisan support for my bill, H.R. 18615 to end compulsory military service and establish an all-volunteer army.

The bill translates into Legislative Form the findings and recommendations of the President's blue-ribbon Gates Commission, which completed the most extensive and objective study of the voluntary military concept, and developed a comprehensive plan for eliminating the draft with all its inequities and moving toward an all-volunteer armed force—as one of the Nation's first priorities.

Headed by former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, the study Commission found that ending conscription and implementing the volunteer service concept (1) would cause only a small budget increase, and would actually be cheaper in real economic terms; (2) could be achieved without impairing the country's ability to meet existing and anticipated troop level requirements; (3) would be adequate to defend the nation, even against a surprise attack: (4) would not result in a more militarized society; and (5) would be similar in ethnic, racial, and economic make-up to the present system.

Although we have not been able to obtain Congressional approval of the volunteer army proposal so far, I am hopeful that the broad public support developing for this idea will help bring more favorable consideration in Congress next year.

LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Again this year I sent out a questionnaire asking the views of the residents of our 30th Congressional District on some of the key legislative issues of special interest to Los Angeles, the State of California, and the Nation.

As in my previous Congressional Polls, I was highly pleased at the overwhelming response—over 10,000 returns were received—and want to express my sincere thanks for the time and effort spent in answering this survey, and in helping determine the thinking of our constituents on the major questions of the day.

The tabulated results have been mailed to each person who responded to the questionnaire, and I would be happy to furnish a copy to anyone else who is interested, upon request.

MASS TRANSIT

I was glad to have the opportunity to discuss legislation in Congress of direct interest to Southern California at a recent business luncheon of the Westlake Lions Club, whose officers included (l to r) Don Le Clere, Treasurer, Russell Rowan, President, and Dr. Larry Kaplan, First Vice President.

Among the key measures approved this year was the first major federal program for comprehensive support of urban mass transit projects in the Nation's fast-growing metropolitan centers, like Los Angeles, where over 70% of our population is now concentrated.

Considered a real transportation breakthrough, the mass transit legislation is a significant first step toward relieving increasingly acute automobile congestion in urban areas, and reversing the steady decline of public transit facilities over the past 25 years.

BOLERO TIME

Some weeks ago I was honored to be invited by Los Angeles entertainment personality, Vance Graham, to appear on his popular radio show "Bolero Time". Currently, the show is broadcast every week by some 300 stations of the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service around the world.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

Joining Mr. & Mrs. Don Meyer of Los Angeles during their recent visit to the Nation's Capitol. As President of the All-City Employees Association, Don expressed an interest in the possibility of federal revenue sharing with the states, and city and county governments.

Because of greatly increased local tax burdens due to rising costs of police, fire, education, health and welfare programs, there have been various proposals advanced along this line, but though the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee has held hearings on the subject, the chances for substantial Congressional support for the idea would appear to be rather remote at the present time.

ECONOMIC EXPANSION IN CALIFORNIA

Touring Apollo space program production facilities with officials of Los Angeles' North American Rockwell Corporation, I had a chance to discuss the recent Defense Department contract award to North American for engineering development work on the B–1 advanced strategic aircraft—a $10 billion federal program that will eventually generate some 100,000 jobs in Southern California.

However, with unemployment in both Los Angeles and Orange Counties approaching 7 percent, and with overall defense and space cutbacks continuing to adversely affect business and employment opportunities, I have supported the immediate implementation of a National Economic Conversion Program to assist the transition to a peacetime economy, and to protect those workers who lose their jobs because of reduced levels of space and military expenditures.

By assuming some measure of federal responsibility to provide financial incentives to encourage government contractors in the military and aerospace fields to shift their capital and labor resources as smoothly and rapidly as possible to meet the needs of expanding civilian markets, we will be taking effective action to help prevent individual employees, business firms, and the communities in which they are located, from suffering extreme personal hardships and severe dislocations during this time of economic adjustment.

And, in addition to assisting in an orderly and gradual move away from an economically unhealthy dependence on government procurements, we will be helping re-orient our national priorities toward pressing domestic needs—as the technology, the resources, and the administrative management skills developed by so many of our defense

and space-related industries are increasingly channeled into broader and more diversified areas urgently demanding the Nation's attention, such as improving our transportation systems and facilities, finding ways to promote urban development and solve housing needs, expanding education and health care opportunities, providing more effective air and water pollution control and solid waste disposal, developing new sources of power, and protecting our environment, to name but a few.

U.S. STRATEGY IN ASIA

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on September 12 and 13, 1970, the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington conducted a seminar on "U.S. Strategy in Asia" under the chairmanship of Earl C. Ravenal, the former Director of the Asian Division of Systems Analysis in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

This was a timely seminar in that this is the time to start a responsible dialog on the future implications of the Nixon Doctrine and, generally, the U.S. role in Asia after Vietnam.

Mr. Ravenal's presentation to the conference, "The Nixon Doctrine, Defense Policy, and Our Commitments in Asia," raises some serious questions about our present and future course in Asia. The paper is well reasoned and documented and I recommend it to my colleagues for careful reading, as follows:

THE NIXON DOCTRINE, DEFENSE POLICY, AND OUR COMMITMENTS IN ASIA

(By Earl C. Ravenal, Institute for Policy Studies, Sept. 12, 1970)

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Earl C. Ravenal was Director of the Asian Division (Systems Analysis) in the Office of the Secretary of Defense from 1967 to 1969. He drafted the Memorandum to the President on U.S. Strategy and Force Structure for Asia and directed the Interagency Program Analysis of Korea for the National Security Council. He is now a member of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C.

SELECTED POINTS FROM THIS PAPER

Thus the Nixon Doctrine reveals its first contradiction: between objectives and strategy. Are we seeing the beginning of a return to the defense posture of the 1950's, with an unabated collection of commitments and a gaggle of front-line client states, but with limited options and a renewed flirtation with the fantasy of tactical nuclear warfare?

The system is now neutral to the proposal and creation of arbitrary forces. Thus the Administration's defense planning procedure causes a second contradiction: between strategy and forces. This country may well end the 1970's with the worst of both worlds: on the one hand a full panoply of commitments and a strategy that continues to serve an ambitious policy of containment; on the other, a world-wide sprinkling of token deployments and a force structure that is still expensive, but unbalanced, unready, and irrelevant to our security.

The only solution that transcends the triangle of unsatisfactory choice is to re-evaluate our interests in Asia; restate those objectives that implicate us in the possibility of war on the Asian mainland and diminish our control over our actions; resist the grand and vapid formulas of our role in Asia—such as the existential platitude that "we are a Pacific power"—that encourage a posture of paramountcy; retreat from the policy of military containment of China; and revise the alliances that have come to represent our commitment to containment.

SUMMARY AND SITUATION

More than a year after its enunciation at Guam, and after several elaborations and explications,[1] the Nixon Doctrine remains obscure and contradictory in its intent and application. It is not simply that the wider pattern of war in Indochina challenges the Doctrine's promise of a lower posture in Asia. More than that, close analysis and the unfolding of events expose some basic flaws in the logic of the Administration's evolving security policy for the 1970's.

The Nixon Doctrine may properly be considered to include not only (1) the declaratory policy orientation (the Doctrine itself), but also (2) the revised worldwide security strategy (the "1½ war strategy") and (3) the new defense decision-making processes (such as "fiscal guidance budgeting")—aspects that have received little comment, especially in their integral relation to the making and implementing on this country's foreign policy. I propose to discuss the interrelationship of these elements of the Nixon Doctrine and their bearing on United States commitments in Asia. The effects of this Administration's moves in these areas—by decision, indirection, or default—will shape and constrain the choices of the United States for a long time to come.

The President's foreign policy declaration of February 1970 promises an adjustment of our political-military purposes and our resources:

"Our interests, our foreign policy objectives, our strategies and our defense budgets are being brought into balance—with each other and with our overall national priorities." [2]

After a decade of burgeoning military spending and entanglement in foreign conflict, the nation has welcomed the vision of lower defense budgets balanced by a reduction in American involvement overseas, particularly in Asia.

Actually, however, the Administration's new policies and decision processes do not bring about the projected balance. In fact, they create some new strategic imbalances. Essentially, we are to support the same level of potential involvement with smaller conventional forces. The spectre of intervention will remain, but the risk of defeat or stalemate will be greater; and the nuclear threshhold will be lower. The fundamental issues of interests, commitments, and alliances are not resolved.*

The President's foreign policy statement pretends to expose a contradiction in the security planning process of the previous Administration—between its strategy of 2½ wars and the force structure it proposed to implement that strategy. But the President's program contains two contradictions: The first is a new gap, between strategy and objectives, since this country's exposure to local conflict, through its worldwide objectives and commitments, is to be undiminished. The second is the same old gap between strategy and force structure, which it has not eliminated but attempted to close only by arbitrarily rationalizing the strategy down to 1½ wars. Moreover, the new budgetary technique of fiscal guidance actually severs the conceptual link between strategy and force structure, and any momentary concurrence of the two will be accidental. It is difficult to see how such maneuvers can satisfy either those critics of intervention who call for guarantees of limited future exposure or those conservative analysts, and our allies, who demand assurance of our capability to fulfill existing commitments.

THE STRATEGY PROBLEM

In the late 1960's some Defense Department analysts identified a triangle of alternatives that proceed from the objective of close-in military containment of China and the forward defense of an Asian allies. More precisely, the alternatives can be defined in terms of three triangular sets:

(A) With regard to deterrence in peacetime: (1) a high level of active conventional forces, conspicuously deployed or deployable; or (2) obvious early and fundamental reliance on nuclear weapons; or (3) weakened deterrence and greater risk of an enemy initiative.

(B) With regard to initial defense in case of war: (1) large conventional forces in Asia are quickly deployed; or (2) early recourse to tactical nuclear weapons; or (3) greater risk of losing allied territory.

(C) With regard to terminating a war: (1) large troop commitments and heavy casualties; or (2) the use of nuclear weapons, either tactical battlefield or strategic coercive; or (3) an indefinite and wasting stalemate, tantamount to defeat.

Once the objective of containment is accepted, these sets of alternatives have the force and objectivity of a law of nature. One can choose among the alternatives or try to substitute an equivalent—as the program of Vietnamization attempts to do. But any policy that claims to evade the alternatives without revising the objective is mere pretense.

The only solution that transcends the triangle of unsatisfactory choice is to re-evaluate our interests in Asia; restate those objectives that implicate us in the possibility of war on the Asian mainland and diminish our control over our actions; resist the grand and vapid formulas of our role in Asia—such as the existential platitude that "we are a Pacific power." [3]—that encourage a posture of paramountcy; retreat from the policy of military containment of China; and revise the alliances that have come to represent our commitment to close-in containment.

But this course the President has consistently rejected: "We will maintain our interests in Asia and the commitments that flow from them. . ." [4]

"The United States will keep all its treaty commitments." [5]

Thus, the root problem of the Nixon Doctrine remains its abiding commitment to the containment of China. In the furtherance of this policy, our government hopes to maintain all our present Asian alliances and de facto commitments, profiting from their deterrent value but avoiding their implications. Yet it also intends to scale down our conventional military capability.

This paper contends that the Administration has neither diminished our potential involvement in Asian conflicts nor resolved the resulting dilemma by providing convincingly for a defense in Asia that will obviate reliance on the use of nuclear weapons.

* * * * *

Let us first examine the prospect of the Nixon Doctrine as a relief from involvement in Asian contingencies. The trauma that has resulted from our inability to win decisively in Vietnam has caused our policymakers to suggest a limitation of future involvement on the basis of a distinction between external or overt aggression on the one hand, and insurgency, political subversion, and civil war on the other. The President's policy document attempts in this way to avoid the strategy dilemma by altering the criteria for intervention and thus understating the probability of involvement: ". . . we cannot expect U.S. military forces to cope with the entire spectrum of threats facing allies or

Footnotes at end of article.

potential allies throughout the world. This is particularly true of subversion and guerrilla warfare, of "wars of national liberation." Experience has shown that the best means of dealing with insurgencies is to preempt them through economic development and social reform and to control them with police, paramilitary and military action by the threatened government." [6]

The hard question remains: what if these "best means" are not successful? Under *those* conditions, what kind of solutions does the Nixon Doctrine envisage? Might the United States be impelled to intervene with combat forces? The President's message states:

"A direct combat role for U.S. general purpose forces arises primarily when insurgency has shaded into external aggression or when there is an overt conventional attack. In such cases, we shall weigh our interests and our commitments, and we shall consider the efforts of our allies, in determining our response." [7]

But this formula for discrimination and discretion seems both unclear and unrealistic. At what precise point does an insurgency become "external aggression"? A definition sometimes proposed is the introduction of enemy main-force units, rather than mere individual fillers. But, even apart from the difficult question of verification, this event might be well beyond the point where our intervention became critical to the situation. In this resort, nice distinctions would not even be relevant. The paradox is that in the critical cases we might have no incentive to define the situation to preclude intervention; in the less than critical cases the occasion would not even arise. In any case, it is simply not credible that the world sacrifice our still-held objectives to the vagaries of circumstance.

As long as our policy remains the containment of China and the repression of Asian Communism, we are inclined to view even largely indigenous revolutions as objective instances of the purpose of Peking, or Hanoi or Pyongyang. Consequently, if an insurgency in an allied or even a neutral country began to succeed, we would probably fir ` increase logistical aid, then extend the role o. advisers, and provide air support. Since such moves might bring a countervailing response from the Asian Communist sponsors of the insurgency, we might have to choose between sending ground forces and allowing an ally to lose by our default. In certain extremities, we might be forced to the final choice among unlimited conventional escalation, defeat of our own forces, or "technological escalation" to the use of nuclear weapons.

Thus, with our formal or implied commitments and the President's open-ended prescription, the United States might yet be drawn into a land war on the Asian mainland, or have to confront equally dire alternatives. In this respect the Nixon Doctrine does not improve on the policy that led to Vietnam. And, of course, our exposure to involvement in case of more overt aggression. Such as a Chinese-supported invasion in Korea or Southeast Asia, remains undiminished.

* * * * *

The only proposition that has become clear about the Nixon Doctrine is that its most advertised hope of resolving the strategy problem—both reducing the forces we maintain for Asian defense and avoiding or postponing involvement in an Asia conflict—is Asianization: the substitution of indigenous forces, equipped through enlarged U.S. military assistance, for American troops. The President's foreign policy message, expanding on his Guam declaration, takes cognizance of political and economic changes in East Asia that "enable us to change the character of our involvement." [8] ". . . the planning of general purpose forces must take into account the fact that the manpower of our friends greatly exceeds our own." [9]

"The responsibilities once borne by the United States at such great cost can now be shared." [10]

"In cases involving other types of aggression [conventional attack or insurgency] we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested and as appropriate. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense." [11]

The essential dependence of Asianization on expanded military assistance is illustrated even more explicitly in Secretary Laird's discussion:

"An important element of national security policy—one that will be more important in the future under our new policy—is the Military Assistance Program (MAP) . . .

"I cannot stress too strongly the need for increased understanding of the importance of this program to the success of the Nixon Doctrine.

"The Military Assistance Program (MAP) is the key to this approach. It is the essential ingredient of our policy if we are to honor our obligations, support our allies, and yet reduce the likelihood of having to commit American ground combat units." [12]

The Secretary recognizes the declining level of popular support and Congressional appropriations for military assistance. His solution, considered perennially within the Defense and State Departments but proposed for the first time in a Secretarial posture statement to the Congress, is a legislative ploy:

"We believe that military assistance should be integrated into the Defense Budget so that we can plan more rationally and present to the Congress more fully an integrated program." [14]

Military aid for certain "forward defense countries," including South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos, and consisting of about 80% of the total category "Support of Other Nations," [15] is already meshed into the Defense Budget. This justification has not been made effective in the case of Korea or Taiwan. And yet a policy of attenuating the number of our troops in Korea—already decided by the President—or insuring Taiwan in the event of pressure or attack depends, in the judgment of this Administration, on our freedom to substitute U.S. materiel for manpower.

To merge military assistance into the regular functional appropriation categories of the Defense Budget would be to institutionalize a dual rationale for military assistance that has become traditional in debate within the Department of Defense. The first element in this rationale is the argument from "trade-off." This is a calculus that compares the costs of equal units of effectiveness of U.S. and foreign troops. It is essentially an assertion of "absolute advantage" and is the basic and obvious sense of Secretary Laird's statement: ". . . a MAP dollar is of far greater value than a dollar spent directly on U.S. forces." [16]

The second element is the argument from "comparative advantage," imported from the economic theory of international trade:

"Each nation must do its share and contribute what it can appropriately provide—manpower from many of our allies; technology, material, and specialized skills from the United States. In many cases our allies are able and willing to provide the forces if we can contribute some of the needed weapons, and, in some circumstances, specialized military support. Under this approach, each partner would be doing what it can best do and both would benefit." [17]

The proponents of military comparative advantage assert, by analogy, that the cooperating and specializing defense community can "consume" security at a higher level. It may be, however, that they can only consume more of the tangible intermediate trappings of security—the forces and arms; the attainment of real security, especially for the United States as senior partner, might depend more on certain qualitative factors. In fact, there are several difficulties in the Administration's ostensibly neutral and technical arguments for military assistance.

First, both trade-off and comparative advantage assume and confirm the inevitability and relevance of the shared mission—that is, the forward defense of the ally's territory. But only if the shared mission cannot be avoided entirely is it proper to confine the debate to the optimal distribution of roles and costs.

Second, the argument from comparative advantage, like the economic theory at its origin, stresses specialization. But the concomitant of specialization is interdependence. Thus a policy of selective reliance on allies, in order to be effective, implies automatic involvement from the earliest moments of a conflict. And the logic of specialization must be reinforced by even larger amounts of assistance, more conspicuous deployments, and more fervent and explicit confirmations of our commitment. [18]

Third, the existential language of diplomacy will not express the cost-effective neutrality of trading off U.S. troops with massive infusions of modern arms. To the North Koreans and their sponsors, for example, the one and one-half billion dollars of support and new equipment we now intend to give South Korea might look very provocative and destabilizing. A new phase of the peninsular arms race could be the result, with a net loss to regional and U.S. security.

Finally, the legislative tactic of integrating MAP into the Defense Budget would remove military assistance as an object of the broader concerns of foreign policy and assign it to the jurisdiction of more narrowly defense-oriented Congressional committees. The debate would be rendered more technical and less political. The focus would shift from the question of involvement to the question of relative costs.

Thus Asianization, which is the keystone of the Nixon Doctrine, might substitute some Asian forces and resources for U.S., but along the same perimeter of interest. It affords a pretext for reducing expense, but it does not enhance our security or relieve us from involvement.

* * * * *

Let us next examine the Nixon Doctrine to see how it proposes to maintain the defense of our allies in Asia. The most obvious change in our military posture is that the new formula provides conventional forces to counter a major Communist thrust in Asia or Europe, but not both simultaneously.

"The stated basis of our conventional posture in the 1960's was the so-called '2½ war' principle. According to it, U.S. forces would be maintained for a three month conventional forward defense of NATO, a defense of Korea or Southeast Asia against a full-scale Chinese attack, and a minor contingency—all simultaneously. These force levels were never reached.

"In the effort to harmonize doctrine and capability, we choose what is best described as the '1½ war' strategy. Under it we will maintain in peacetime general purpose forces adequate for simultaneusly meeting a major Communist attack in either Europe or Asia, assisting allies against non-Chinese threats in Asia, and contending with a contingency elsewhere." [19]

The fundamental question is whether this is an honest policy that will fully fund our worldwide and Asian commitments, or whether it conceals a drift toward nuclear defense or an acceptance of greater risk of local defeat.

The ultimate force levels associated with the new 1½ war strategy were not revealed in Secretary Laird's Budget for Fiscal Year 1971, which he described as "transitional." The force structure implications of the Nixon Doctrine will only begin to be re-

Footnotes at end of article.

flected in the Budget for FY 1972. There are, however, several indications of the probable limits of the future force level.

Our peacetime forces and their costs are entailed by the level of our commitments, but in no precisely determinate way.[20] The controlling intermediate variable—which could account for wide differences in our strategy and forces—is the probable simultaneity of the major and minor contingencies as assessed by our defense planners. The Nixon strategy of 1½ wars is explicitly founded on the improbability of two simultaneous major contingencies:

"the prospects for a coordinated two-front attack on our allies by Russia and China are low, both because of the risks of nuclear war and the improbability of Sino-Soviet cooperation.[21]

Thus the planned general purpose force is allowed to be two-directional, and demands on the adequacy of this force are to be considered alternative rather than additive.

One might be tempted to take the Administration in the literal sense and expect a reduction equivalent to the requirement for defending against the lesser of the major contingencies. For example, during the 1960's, to support the strategy of 2½ wars, the Baseline Force Structure was thought to provide seven active divisions for Southeast Asia, two for Korea, eight for NATO, and two and one-third for a minor contingency and a strategic reserve—a total of nineteen and one-third. Therefore, with the present 1½ war doctrine that includes only one major contingency, in NATO or Asia, one might expect the larger of the two requirements simply to dominate the other. This reasoning would yield an active ground force as low as ten and one-third divisions.

Such a literal expectation, however, is immediately discouraged by the President's invocation of "the desirability of insuring against greater than expected threats by maintaining more than the forces required to meet conventional threats in one theater—such as NATO Europe." [22]

The calculation is further upset by the President's assertion that the force levels necessary to implement the previous 2½ war policy "were never reached."

This judgment is amplified by Secretary Laird:

"Although the Joint Chiefs of Staff did develop their force recommendations on this basis (2½ wars), the budgets proposed by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President fell considerably short of what would be required to support such forces. Thus there remained a substantial gap between the stated policy objective and the means provided to fulfill it." [23]

These statements are carefully phrased to pacify the Joint Chiefs of Staff by deferring to their judgment while preserving the latitude to cut their force recommendations. They are principally designed, however, to warn against any simplistic calculation of force and budget cuts that might follow from the reduction in strategy. A possible implication is even that the previous Baseline Force Structure, designed for 2½ wars, might be barely adequate for the new doctrine of 1½ wars. Thus the lower strategy in itself does not necessarily imply any force cuts at all, though it can be used to justify them if they are required for fiscal or political reasons.

Obviously Laird's judgment of the sufficiency of the force structure and budgets proposed by his predecessors differs from theirs. Both McNamara and Clifford were persuaded that the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were excessive and that the lower force structure of land divisions and tactical air wings developed by their own staff—the one that was embodied in their formal budget proposals—was at least adequate to carry out the stated policy. On the other hand, the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense, toward the end of 1969, articulated their recognition that the ultimate force requirements of a war with China would vastly exceed the conventional resources this country could commit without drastic mobilization; such a war might not even be terminable by conventional means. And Chinese intervention could be provoked by our attempt to impose a definitive military solution on a lesser Asian war. In this sense, our planned defense resources were overcommitted.

No contradiction exists here, if we keep in mind the distinction between (a) the requirements of initial defense, and (b) the ultimate demands of a war. Initial defense involves the Baseline Force Structure, which is the level of military readiness to be maintained in peacetime. This force does not cover the requirements of sustained defense, the recovery of lost territory, or the termination of a war by conventional military means. For these requirements it is expected that, through varying degrees of mobilization, reserve units would be activated and additional units temporarily created. The Baseline Force Structure, in short, is merely the entry fee to foreign conflict. The full price of our foreign commitments is the contingent cost of a war, measured not only in units deployed and their budget dollars, but also in attrition of equipment, expenditure of supplies, loss of lives, and indeed the destruction that we and our allies might inflict as well as suffer.

The reasoning of the previous administration of the Pentagon, if pursued to its logical conclusion, might have led to two independent propositions: (1) that we *could* drastically reduce our peacetime general purpose forces for Asia, but *only if* we correspondingly reduce the possibility of involvement; and (2) that we *should* move to revise our commitments and eliminate the causes of conflict with China, *because* the risks and costs of such a conflict are insupportable. The reasoning would not, however, have led to the proposal of the present Administration to reduce our conventional strategy for Asia without reducing our exposure to conflict.

There is another reason why the force structure for the 1½ war strategy will not simply shrink to the level required by the larger major contingency plus the minor contingency. Ground forces are heterogeneous, consisting of infantry, mechanized, armored, airmobile, airborne, and amphibious units. Certain types of divisions are inherently specialized for certain geographical contingencies. Thus the planned general purpose force can be only partially two-directional.

Therefore, if in the future force structure associated with the Nixon Doctrine the number of divisions of a type normally oriented to a particular theater falls below its pre-Vietnam requirement, it will be proper to inquire whether the concept for the defense of that theater has changed.

Secretary Laird's statement recognizes that all of our four armored and four mechanized divisions "are oriented principally to our NATO requirements." [24] These divisions are likely to remain in the active force structure and remain oriented to NATO even if, beyond 1971, they are physically withdrawn from forward deployment in Europe. Since our entire active divisional force for NATO consists of these units, future inactivations will arise rather from Asian withdrawals; and there will be further cuts. These predictions find support in the statements of Secretary Laird:

"The President has reaffirmed United States support for the agreed NATO strategy and maintenance of substantial forces in Europe. The primary U.S. objective in Asia will be to help our allies develop the capability to defend themselves, while continuing to honor our obligations.[25]

"We expect that future redeployment [from Vietnam] will further reduce the Army's active division/brigade force structure in FY 1971." [26] [27]

It is most likely, therefore, (1) that the future Baseline Force Structure will contain several more active ground divisions—Army and Marine—than the requirements for the larger of the two major contingencies plus the minor contingency (ten and one-third divisions), but several fewer than the force structure of the pre-Vietnam period (nineteen and one-third divisions); (2) that these permanent cuts will be largely at the expense of divisions of types that are normally oriented toward Asia; and (3) that the reduced posture will be plausibly rationalized by the Nixon Doctrine and the strategy of 1½ wars.[28]

* * * * *

The ultimate Baseline Force Structure under the Nixon Doctrine will probably contain even fewer divisions toward the Asian requirement than the most ardent force-trimmers among the Defense Department analysts of the 1960's considered minimal for the early stages of a conventional defense of Southeast Asia.[28] The consequences of this thinning of conventional forces alone for future decisions regarding the use of nuclear weapons would be ominous, in terms of the model of choice we have presented above.

But the number of available divisions is not in itself the whole story. More important is the reduced conventional force as a reflection of the altered view of Asian defense embodied in the Nixon Doctrine. The elements of this view are: (1) that the most likely threats to our Asian allies will not involve Chinese invasion, and (2) that, with greatly expanded military assistance, these allies can largely provide the ground forces to counter such threats.

There is a third premise, hardly expressed but strongly implied: that in a future Asian conflict, particularly one involving China, United States intervention would be more likely to carry with it the use of tactical nuclear weapons. It is difficult to express an increased contingent likelihood, but both the logic of the problem and certain signals in this Administration's policy statements indicate a pronounced drift toward reliance on theater nuclear weapons.

Prominent among these signals is the President's statement in direct justification of the shift down to a 1½ war strategy:

"The choice of this (1½ war) strategy was based on the following consideration:

"The nuclear capability of our strategic and theater nuclear forces serves as a deterrent to full-scale Soviet attack on NATO Europe or Chinese attack on our Asian allies;

"The prospects for a coordinated two-front attack on our allies by Russia and China are low both because of the risks of nuclear war and the improbability of Sino-Soviet cooperation. In any event, we do not believe that such a coordinated attack should be met primarily by U.S. conventional forces." [29]

The President stacks the argument for the adequacy of a 1½ war strategy by defining the unlikely simultaneous contingencies—that might require a nuclear response—in terms of "a coordinated, two-front attack." We must grant the improbability of simultaneous contingencies of the kind explicitly described by the President. Thus we might feel that the nuclear choice is one that would never be invoked. It should be noted, however, that the President mentions "theater nuclear forces" as deterrents against the single—not simultaneous—contingency of a "Chinese attack on our Asian allies." Deterrents are designed to be used if their use has been threatened by us and their deterrent intent disregarded by our allies.

Also, there are lesser, more plausible scenarios that would, in terms of their requirement for a build-up of forces or their potential to immobilize U.S. forces, be the functional equivalent of a major attack: a Soviet military build-up and political pressure in central or southern Europe; or

Footnotes at end of article.

China's rendering or promising massive logistical support to one of her Asian allies to the point where that ally could release overwhelming forces against a neighboring country; or the threatened imminent entry of China into a war where we or one of our allies might have provided the provocation. It is conceivable that two such partial contingencies could arise, in Europe and Asia, and that one of them could develop to the point of a conflict. In that event we would be reluctant to consider our conventional forces for either theater available for the other. And there are reasons—such as the illusions of decisive action and immunity from retaliation—why we might be tempted to dispose of an Asian conflict, especially, by "technological escalation."

Therefore, if we remain committed to the defense of interests in both theaters, and if we maintain conventional forces for only one large contingency, our strategy is biased toward the earlier use of nuclear weapons. Of course, there is no necessary continuum of escalation from conventional war to tactical nuclear war. The invocation of nuclear weapons would at any point be a sharp choice. But it would be a purely executive decision of the President. And the 1½ war strategy would have provided him with fewer alternatives and rendered the resort to nuclear weapons a more compelling choice, as well as making nuclear threat a more obvious residual feature of our diplomacy.

Thus the "balance" promised in the new security policy is achieved—but not by adjusting our commitments or restricting our objectives abroad, or by working through to a new philosophy about the essentiality of certain world interests of the United States. Rather, budgetary stringencies have inspired a reduction in force levels; a "1½ war strategy" has been tailored to fit the new and intractable realities; and a series of rationalizations has been constructed to validate the new strategy—rationalizations that simply stipulate a reduced threat, count heavily on bribed and coerced allied efforts at self-defense, and suggest an early nuclear reaction if our calculations prove insufficiently conservative.

Thus the Nixon Doctrine reveals its first contradiction: betwen objectives and strategy. Are we seeing the beginning of a return to the defense posture of the 1950's, with an unabated collection of commitments and a gaggle of front-line client states, but with limited options and a renewed flirtation with the fantasy of tactical nuclear warfare?

* * * * *

THE PLANNING PROCESS

A significant feature of the new security policy is that it not only shifts substantively down to a 1½ war strategy, but also changes the model for formulating defense requirements and strategy.

Instead of the classic progression from the definition of foreign policy interests to the formulation of objectives, to the prescription of strategies, to the calculation of forces and their costs, we now see a constrained calculus that proceeds in reverse from budgetary limitations to a mix of forces (now largely Service-determined), to a tailoring of strategies. This is not simply "feedback," a process by which a system adjusts its ends and means in order to come into balance. Rather, all indications are that the new strategy selection procedure originates in budgetary considerations; certainly it stops short of transmitting the implications clear through the system to include a revision of objectives and interests. Thus the system is at best only balanced back from resources through strategies; the imbalance is shifted to a point between strategies and objectives.

Moreover, even the strategies and the resources may be out of balance. For the budget-constrained strategy revision is complemented by a fundamental change in the process by which planning is conducted within the Department of Defense. The previous system, practiced under Secretaries McNamara and Clifford, was requirements-oriented. There was no explicit initial budgetary restriction. Rather, the planning process began with the stated world-wide defense objective and resulted in a schedule of prescribed forces and a budget. The appropriate documents were the Joint Strategic Objectives Plan (JSOP), devised each year by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, several months later, a series of Draft Presidential Memorandums (DPM's), prepared by the staff of the Secretary of Defense, largely in the Office of Systems Analysis.

Concurrently, concrete Program Change Requests (PCR's) were submitted by the Services and analyzed by the Secretary's staff. In pure theory, the forces proposed in the DPM's—those eventually recommended to the President and to the Congress—were the forces systematically entailed by our defense objectives, providing the necessary security with economy of means. Sufficiency—"how much is enough?"[30]—was the philosophy more of the previous administration than the present one. Both the JCS and the Services inevitably had objections to the dispositions by the Secretary's staff of forces and weapons systems, and to the implied strategic concepts. These objections were institutionalized in a series of comments on the DPM's and in a final process of "reclamas," which were adjudicated at the Secretarial level.

The resulting defense program for the next fiscal year and the four succeeding outyears was fashioned into a budget and Five Year Defense Program in the Office of the Defense Comptroller. After inspecting the budget aggregates, the Secretary might order overall monetary cuts, which were fed back through the system for apportionment. Resistance from the Bureau of the Budget, the President, or the Congress, or the experience of actual cost overruns during the course of the fiscal year, might result in further feedbacks that would occasion the adjustment of certain programs. Such corrections in the defense program did not extend to a corresponding revision of our national strategies or foreign policy objectives. To that extent, budgetary procedure caused a misfit of our strategic purposes and the force structure and economic resources we planned to put toward implementing those purposes. But these distortions were the product of the feed-back process, not the mechanism itself. The direction of defense policy-making was still the logical one.

By contrast, the defense planning process instituted in the present Administration begins simultaneously with "strategic guidance" and "fiscal guidance," to be established by the President and the National Security Council. Secretary Laird describes the procedure:

"After strategic objectives have been set by the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff prepare a detailed strategy statement oriented to force planning which is reviewed in my office. I then issue specific strategy guidance, with full participation by and input from the JCS.

"The President also issues overall fiscal guidance. I break the overall fiscal guidance down by Services and by major mission and support categories. Then, I issue fiscal guidance.

"The detailed strategy guidance and the more detailed fiscal guidance are the bases for the JCS and Service force planning. The Services meanwhile prepare a five-year program and budget plan. These are coordinated and integrated through formal procedures specified in the PPB (Planning- Programming-Budgeting) System."

The new procedure is intended to eliminate inflated program submissions and to encourage trade-offs of alternative means within the phase of Service and JCS action. Many mid-range decisions are within the initiative and discretion of the military Services. But from the policy standpoint, the process is completely existential: within the fiscal ceilings we will get the forces and weapons systems that the organization, of its nature, tends to produce—not the ones we might need. Of the two kinds of guidance, the fiscal is quantitative and unambiguous; the strategic is verbal and can be fudged. If there is a coincidence of those forces and systems tailored to the fiscal guidance and those derived from the strategic guidance, it will be either accidental or artificially contrived.

More likely, the Services will interpret the new procedure as set of outside parameters within which they can promote self-serving programs. Specifically, one could predict a tendency, under conditions of budgetary stringency, to skimp on manpower, supplies, war reserve stocks, maintenance, and transport, while preserving headquarters, cadre of units, research and development of large new systems, and sophisticated technological overhead. In short, the Services would tend, as in the 1950's, to sacrifice those items that maintain balance, readiness, and sustainability of effort, and to insist on those items that insure morale, careers, and the competitive position of each Service among the others.

Of course, nothing has occurred to have changed the institutional and psychological dynamics of weapons system and force creation since the regime of McNamara and Clifford; the motives and incentives of the Services, the JCS, and certain civilian components were no different in that era. In fact the previous philosophy of theoretically unconstrained implementation of security requirements led naturally to excessively ample interpretation of those requirements within the framework of 2½ wars. And the attempts of civilian analysts in the Office of the Secretary to prescribe and limit forces only led the military to attempts to gold-plate those prescribed forces, while keeping a ledger on the "shortfall" between the imposed strategy and the imposed force structure. But the direction of the planning process at least compelled attention to the relevance and adequacy of the force structure and weapons systems, and the continuity of the planning process at least perpetuated the possibility of reasoning back from the rejection of excessive requirements to the questioning of overambitious strategies, and—beyond that—excessive commitments and inflated and artificial interests.

The system is now neutral to the proposal and creation of arbitrary forces. Thus the Administration's defense planning procedure causes a second contradiction: between strategy and forces. This country may well end the 1970's with the worst of both worlds: on the one hand a full panoply of commitments and a strategy that continues to serve an ambitious policy of containment; on the other, a world-wide sprinkling of token deployments and a force structure that is still expensive, but unbalanced, unready, and irrelevant to our security.

ALLIANCES AND CONTAINMENT

The logical difficulties of the Nixon Doctrine are the result of its attempt to evade the choices that follow from its insistence on close-in military containment of China. Contradictions arise where one would expect: strategies are artificial and out of alignment with the continuing commitment to extensive foreign policy objectives in Asia; force structures are constrained and distorted out of alignment with the strategies themselves by budgetary pressures that arise not out of absolute scarcity of resources, but

---

Footnotes at end of article.

out of the nation's unwillingness to make large sacrifices for objectives that cannot be credibly invoked by its leadership.

If the Administration is to be consistent in revising our defense posture and in limiting defense budgets, it must consider a commensurate curtailment of our foreign policy objectives in Asia. Adjusting the intermediate term—strategies—will not effect the reconciliation and permit an honest implementation of the force and budget cuts.

But the Nixon Doctrine does not resolve the Asian defense problem in this fundamental way: it is simply another formula for permanent confrontation with China. What are the issues that elude the perennial expressions of interest, by several administrations, in accommodating China? During the Johnson Administration the policy of containment ceded to a variant characterized as "containment without isolation." The shift, however, gave rise to no tangible initiatives and induced no reciprocity from China.

President Nixon entered office with a mandate—which he had created largely himself through his campaign emphasis—to bring about a reconciliation with China. The present Administration has relaxed certain restrictions on trade and travel and revived the Warsaw ambassadorial talks. But such moves, though impressive as indications of enlightenment, do not touch on the essential concerns of China. However we ultimately conceive our interests, we might as well be realistic about the eventual price of a real accommodation with China.

This price would include three kinds of considerations: (1) diplomatic recognition and admission without qualification to the United Nations and the permanent Security Council seat; (2) affirmation of a one-China policy, conceding in principle that Taiwan belongs to mainland China—not the reverse—and allowing eventual incorporation; (3) removal of the U.S. military presence on the mainland of Asia, without substituting a naval cordon, a ring of nearby island bases, a host of Asian mercenary armies, or a nuclear tripwire. The components of such a withdrawal would include (a) liquidation of the Vietnam war and removal of all U.S. forces there; (b) retraction of U.S. troops from other mainland Asian countries and closure of all bases; (c) termination of military assistance to mainland states and cessation of efforts to create proxy military forces to continue our mission; and (d) dissolution of our security alliances with the "forward defense" countries, Thailand, Taiwan, and Korea.

Such a program would amount to a major diplomatic revolution. It might take a quarter of a century to implement, even with the most sophisticated public and political support within the United States. It would alienate present client regimes, unsettle for long intervals our relations with the Soviets, and tax the understanding of major allies such as Japan and Australia. It would signify the renunciation of our efforts to control events in Asia; henceforth we would control only our own responses to events.

But it is fair to ask whether we will not arrive at this disposition of affairs in Asia at some point, whether we will it or not. Should this be after a quarter of a century of tension and devastation, or of political maneuver and diplomatic search? Is it also fair to speculate that a more neutral, or even positive, relationship with China might give us a new scope of advantages. We might benefit eventually from a commercial relationship with China, rather than having to concede the economic penetration of the mainland by Japan and Western Europe while we remain frozen in our historic impasse. We might also, simply through the dissolution of automatic enmity with China, make it more difficult for the Soviets to challenge us in other areas of the world. And we might find it useful to have a counterpoise to Japan, which is still our principal Pacific competitor, economic and potentially military, and a possible future partner of the U.S.S.R. in such common interests as counterbalancing China and developing Eastern Siberia.

If challenged by the proponents of the status quo, one could find positive, though speculative, reasons for undoing containment and normalizing our relationship with China. This paper, however, has stressed the narrower and more immediate argument for relaxing the posture of containment of China and the other Asian Communist countries that proceeds from the costs and risks of maintaining this posture.

The tangible expression of containment is our security alliances and the other strong, though less formal, military commitments around the periphery of China. These commitments, it can be argued, (1) create the threat to us, by transforming otherwise neutral events into situations of relevance to our interests; (2) perpetuate the confrontation with China that gives substance to the threat, by frustrating the essential motives of China; (3) lock us into a posture of forward defense on the mainland of Asia; and (4) originate the requirement for large general purpose forces or equivalent means of deterrence and defense.

Our alliances in Asia do not form a coherent and comprehensive system such as NATO. Rather they are a collection of bilateral agreements, plus the multilateral SEATO pact, contracted separately from 1951 through 1962. Even the purposes served by these alliances, as seen at the time of their negotiation, were diverse. Containment of China, at the time, might have been a concurrent motive, but it did not uniformly inspire the attainment of the pacts. Quite apart from containing our enemies, several of the treaties exhibit motives of containing our allies as well.

The ANZUS and Philippine treaties of 1951, though signed against the backdrop of the Korean War, related more to the fear of Japan which these allies derived from World War II. The 1953 agreement with the Republic of Korea was, among other things, a price for Syngman Rhee's restraint from attempting to reunify the peninsula by force. Similarly the treaty with the Republic of China in 1955 was in part of a quid pro quo for Chiang's acceptance of "re-leashing" during the Straits crisis of that year. The SEATO alliance of 1954, which extended protection to South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, was inspired less by the vision of true collective defense than by the desire of the United States to have a legal basis for discretionary intervention under the nominal coloration of "united action." The bilateral U.S.-Thai adjunct to SEATO, negotiated by Rusk and Thanat in 1962, reassured the Thais, during the events that led to the Laos neutralization accords, that the U.S. would respond to a threat to Thai security, regardless of the reaction of other SEATO signatories; this agreement, too, was a price to secure the acquiescence of an ally in an arrangement that suited the interest of the United States. The 1960 Security Treaty with Japan, revising the original treaty of 1951, reaffirmed U.S. administration of Okinawa and perpetuated our use of bases in the Japanese home islands, subject to prior consultation for nuclear or direct combat deployments. (The Nixon-Sato communique of October 1969 pledged reversion of Okinawa to Japan by 1972, a status that implies removal of nuclear weapons and submission to the "homeland formula" for consultation on the use of bases.)

The military content of our alliance commitments is not fixed, and the fundamental deterrent and defensive concept itself has changed profoundly from the time the commitments were contracted. The Dulles policy, in the pacts of 1953–1955, did not emphasize the actual defense of allied territory or contemplate the dispatch of U.S. ground forces to any point where the Communist powers chose to apply military force. Rather, it was aimed at nuclear deterrence of overt aggression. In this concept the alliances served to establish a territorial definition. The implied counter-measure was the discretionary application of American nuclear force against Communist airfields, supply centers, ports, and perhaps industry and cities. The concept was not clearly resolved: it was semi-strategic and semi-tactical, partially coercive and partially for direct military effect. Also, certain cases short of obvious aggression, such as subversion and support for internal revolutionary struggles, were acknowledged to be imprecise and difficult. In Indochina in 1954 the Eisenhower Administration could not identify an appropriate enemy or target to fit the massive nuclear response and narrowly declined to intervene. The Administration also sensed the lack of formal alliance protection over Southeast Asia as an impediment to intervention and moved to create SEATO within two months of the partition of Vietnam.

The refinement of tactical battlefield nuclear weapons in the mid- and later 1950's elaborated the options that were available to our planners and made conceivable the notion of actual nuclear defense confined to the theater of conflict. The Kennedy-McNamara policy of flexible response, including larger and more balanced conventional forces and counter-insurgency techniques, provided the practical means of containing a wider spectrum of Chinese or Chinese-supported initiatives. Thus the close-in containment of China—involving the actual forward defense of allied territory—progressively acquired content with the attainment and exercise of the means to implement it. The concept of defense became a complement to the original concept of deterrence, which remains, however, the principal function of our alliances and other commitments.

There is a paradox that attaches to military deterrence: the more explicit and obvious the deterrent, the more effective in preventing war, but the less effective in preventing our involvement in the war. Conversely, the effort to reduce the chance of involvement by attenuating our commitment makes involvement less certain but a hostile initiative more probable. Any shift in posture or redrawing of lines might give "wrong signals" to the enemy, as did Acheson's "perimeter" speech in January 1950, that excluded Korea and Taiwan from our frontier of interests.

Therefore, this Administration will not overtly diminish any commitment; on the contrary, it is likely to reaffirm and reinforce psychologically any commitment that is beset by doubt. Budgetary pressure, however, is causing a reduction in the number of land divisions in our Baseline Force Structure and in their overseas deployment, to levels lower than 1965. To maintain the deterrent effect of our commitments in the face of these reductions in deployed conventional capability, the United States must demonstrate increased rapid deployment ability or it must move back toward the concept of nuclear defense or deterrence. The mobility of our forces can be evidenced only by massive exercises and adequate lift resources, which are far from certain to be provided. Nuclear deterrence need only be hinted. The few indications in the President's foreign policy statement of February 1970 and the renewed ruminations among high-level bureaus in the Department of Defense might be enough to make the point.

Will our Asian allies be satisfied by the existence of mobile U.S. strategic reserve forces,

Footnotes at end of article.

or the prospect of our reliance on nuclear weapons, or the uncertain flow of military assistance, nicely calculated to replace the deleted U.S. capabilities but grudgingly appropriated by the U.S. Congress? Or might they conclude rather that our commitment no longer includes our interest in the full forward defense of their territory?

After all, none of our Asian defense arrangements is specific about the tangible support that might be evoked by an act of aggression. No joint defense force exists, with agreed war plans and command arrangements. U.S. contingency plans are essentially unilateral and are certainly subject to uncommunicated change. And implementation of the treaty commitments in all cases specifies reference to our constitutional procedures, which are themselves in a phase of more stringent interpretation.

Therefore, no particular response is entailed by the fact of the alliances themselves, and the requisite actions on our part could be subject to wide interpretation. Defense could mean, rather than the forward defense of all territory, a mobile defense, an enclave strategy, or even a nuclear tripwire concept. In another dimension, our treaty commitment might be satisfied by various types of support, such as logistical, tactical air, or nuclear units. Thus, our mode of deterrence and our provisions for defense might indicate a progressive divergence from the objectives of our treaty partners. Our proposed substitution of technology for our manpower and presence might furnish the equivalent capabilities from our point of view, but not from that of our allies.

Because of the scope for maneuver afforded by our treaty commitments, our Asian allies will be correspondingly more sensitive to interpretive commentary by U.S. officials and by shifts in our military posture—our force structure, deployments, mobility dispositions, and base arrangements. Already they sense that the substantive content of our alliances is placed in doubt by the choices among alternative world-wide military postures that are reflected in the President's foreign policy statement. Although the selected strategy is designed to defend both Europe and Asia, though not simultaneously, Europe holds priority and claims virtually as many resources as previously. The major war case associated with the reduction in active forces is clearly Asia. Although no alliances are formally disturbed, our Asian allies, as they count our divisions and analyze our posture statements and policy declarations, have cause for concern that, behind the facade of ritualistic reiteration, we have in fact altered our capability to fulfill our treaty commitments.

Thus we can devalue the diplomatic and deterrent effect of our alliances, without even gaining immunity from involvement, simply by shifting strategies, debating criteria for intervention, and making arbitrary adjustments in force levels. In view of the liabilities of this course—which is the course of the present Administration—we might as well face the problem more directly and begin to consider the broader alternatives to containment, with their full implications for our alliances in Asia.

CONCLUSION

As long as we assert interests in Asia that (1) entail defending territory, (2) could plausibly be threatened by hostile actions, and (3) are evidenced by alliances that dispose us to a military response, we are exposed to the contingency of involvement, largely involuntary. If we maintain this exposure to threats through insistence on our present Asian commitments, and yet adopt budget-constrained strategies, we risk a future defeat or stalemate, or we allow ourselves to be moved toward reliance on nuclear weapons.

If we wish to avoid these alternatives, several policies are available. One course is heavy dependence on allied forces to fulfill defense requirements. This is the hope of Asianization, offered prominently by the Nixon Doctrine. But this policy binds us closely to the fate of our Asian clients and in some ways even diminishes our control over our involvement; and the potential liability still exists that U.S. forces might be required to rescue the efforts of our allies.

The other course is a process of military readjustment and political accommodation that would make it far less likely that we would become involved every time there is some slippage in the extensive diplomatic "fault" that runs along the rim of Asia. This course is arduous and complex, and as little under our unilateral and absolute control as a course of military deterrence. But the consequences of not budging from our present set of ambitions and illusions—or of trifling with the unalterable purposes of China by limiting ourselves to insubstantial diplomatic initiatives—are far bleaker.

The situation calls not for a symbolic shift in strategy—such as the 1½ war doctrine—which is founded on the hope that the contingencies that would test it, to which we are still liable, might not occur. The situation is not amenable to purely instrumental solutions—such as the calculated equippage of allied armies or the reliance on technological escalation. The situation requires a fundamental questioning and revision of the containment of China.

The confusion that surrounds the Nixon Doctrine is appropriate to its garbled message and incomplete intent. While pledging to honor all of our existing commitments, the President has placed them all in considerable doubt. While offering promise of avoiding involvement in future Asian conflicts, he has simply biased the nature of our participation.

In the attempt to perpetuate our control of the destiny of Asia, the Nixon Doctrine forfeits control of our own destiny in Asia.

FOOTNOTES

*The President's decision to extend the war to Cambodia was an early demonstration of the essential and abiding dilemma of any policy that leaves our objectives in Asia intact, but hopes to attenuate our means of implementing those objectives; cheap victories will be sought, even though they may turn out to be installment payments on a larger contract.

The general drift of criticism of the Cambodian adventure included the notions that (1) it would fail, in that a disproportionate military force would achieve extremely meager military objectives, and (2) its effects would be short lived, in that the Vietnamese Communists would return in force within several months to the areas we had overrun. These technical judgments might be accurate or wide of the mark: the immediate military outcome of the Cambodian offensive is almost beside the point. The universally expected effects did occur—the destruction of bunkers and tunnel complexes, the capture of food, weapons, and ammunition, and the dislocation of enemy forces. And our newly demonstrated readiness to strike at such complexes and buildups might have discouraged Hanoi from making another heavy investment in the same place under conditions of diminished security. The war did not escalate beyond control on this occasion. U.S. forces were extricated, and Vietnamization and troop withdrawals resumed.

The point is that one could have accepted, at the time, the short-run reasoning of the White House and still condemned the futility of this operation with regard to its effects on the direction of our Asian policy. It is enough to realize that the interests of China and her allies in their own quarter of the globe are likely to be less alienable and more enduring than ours, and to realize that their options in pursuing these interests are varied and extensive, in means, location, and timing.

[1] The President's television address of November 3, 1969; his report to the Congress of February 18, 1970 ("U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's").

[2] Richard Nixon, *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's, a New Strategy for Peace* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, February 18, 1970), p. 112.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 54

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] Melvin R. Laird, *Fiscal Year 1971 Defense Program and Budget* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, March 2, 1970), pp. 56–57.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[15] $2.443 billion out of $3.127 billion in the President's budget for FY 1971.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] After President Nixon's decision to reduce the ceiling on U.S. servicemen stationed in Korea from 63,000 to 43,000, our government took the decision to base permanently there a wing of F–4 fighter-bombers. An American official explained: "Our aim is to reassure the Koreans during this difficult period. Despite budgetary cuts, it shows we intend to maintain our relative air strength here. They know that the minute an air attack starts, we're involved." (New York Times, August 17, 1970). In addition, Vice President Agnew was dispatched to provide renewed and explicit assurances of American implication in the defense of Korea. And the Administration planned to introduce a special supplementary budget request for $200 million for Korean force modernization. This was in addition to about $140 million that has been provided in the regular military assistance budget request, and was to be only the first installment of a five-year supplemental appropriation of $1 billion. Even then, the government of the Republic of Korea was demanding $2–3 million, plus public assurances of no further troop withdrawals until after five years and the actual completion of the promised modernization program.

[19] Nixon, *op. cit.*, pp. 128–129.

[20] And the relation of general purpose forces to national security is one stage more remote—the intervening term being the foreign policy objectives of which our commitments and our security alliances are only the expression. In order to determine the extent to which national security itself entails a certain level of general purpose forces, it is necessary ultimately to assert the significance of any foreign policy objective for national security.

A general judgment of this kind was made by Secretary of Defense Clifford in his final Posture Statement (prepared January 15, 1969): ". . . the security of our Nation is inextricably bound up with a forward defense and thus with the security of our allies . . . [This] judgment has given rise since the end of the Second World War to a series of collective defense agreements with almost half the nations of the Free World . . . [These] represent, to a greater or lesser degree, contingencies for which we must provide, and these contingencies, in the aggregate, constitute the principal sources of requirements for General Purpose Forces." (p. 68)

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] Laird, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

[27] At its peak, at the end of FY 1969, the Vietnam deployment totalled ten and two-thirds divisions, and the active force structure was twenty-three and two-thirds, or four and one-third above the pre-Vietnam Baseline. By the end of FY 1970 three and two-thirds divisions had been withdrawn from Vietnam, of which three and one-third had been inactivated. Seven divisions remained in Vietnam, and the total number in the force structure was twenty and one-third, or one above 1965.

[28] There are several other sources of imprecision in determining the adequacy of our planned conventional forces. One is the practicality and timing of the mobilization of reserve divisions and the creation of new units. Another is the amount of long-range mobility that will be provided.

As our land divisions are withdrawn from forward deployment—with the policy of forward defense, however, still intact—a commensurate burden is placed on strategic mobility forces and a large and alert strategic reserve based in the continental United States. But sufficient funding for the implied mobility forces, both airlift and sealift, has not been forthcoming; and the enlarged reinforcement mission of the Strike Command, under discussion in the Pentagon and suggested in the "Blue Ribbon Panel" report, is far from realization. The net effect of these changes on the conventional defense of Asian theaters is correspondingly obscure. A third area of indefinition is the contribution of allied forces. The Asianization of future limited wars on the Asian mainland is the cardinal point of the Nixon Doctrine. But, as we have seen, the successful substitution of Asian forces depends on large increases in military assistance. Such increases are far less than certain to be appropriated. And, even if accomplished, the creation of Asian proxy armies does not relieve the United States of involvement in local contingencies. In some ways we become more involved, with ultimately unlimited consequences.

[29] About five to seven divisions were considered necessary to blunt and delay an attack along the main access routes in Southeast Asia, then to fall back to a defensible perimeter. Against a Communist invasion of Korea it was thought that the South Korean army alone could hold initially north of Seoul until reinforced by ROK reserves, other Asian forces, or U.S. units to be diverted from other requirements.

[30] Nixon, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

[31] The title of a forthcoming book (Harper and Row) by former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Analysis Alain Enthoven and his Assistant for DPM's K. Wayne Smith.

CONGRESSMAN SCOTT REPORTS

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it has been our practice during the past 4 years to keep constituents informed of congressional activities with monthly newsletters. Our October report is included in the RECORD at this point for the information of the membership.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN BILL SCOTT REPORTS

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

The Congress adjourned on October 14 after a series of quorum calls to prevent the consideration of serious and controversial legislation during the closing hours of the session. A Lame Duck session is scheduled after the election and we will resume our session on November 16. The most essential measures to be considered are appropriation bills for the various government departments. Many departments and agencies are operating under a continuing resolution permitting expenditures to be made at the same rate as last year until their appropriation bills are passed. I would expect that we will remain in session for approximately three weeks but this decision rests with the leadership of the majority party.

CRIME CONTROL

The Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 was passed by the House earlier this month and the House version has now been adopted by the Senate and sent to the President. The bill is aimed primarily at the professional criminal. It provides for special Grand Juries to sit for up to 36 months to investigate criminal activities; makes it a federal crime to conspire to obstruct the enforcement of state laws relating to gambling; prohibits the use of income from racketeering activities to acquire an interest in a business enterprise engaged in interstate commerce; authorizes up to the death penalty for transporting explosives in interstate commerce with the intention that they be used to kill or injure another individual. This harsh penalty is in part based upon statistics indicating that there were 4,330 bombings, 1,475 additional attempts and 35,129 threatened bombings in this country within a period of 15½ months. Another provision of the bill permits the taking of depositions rather than personal testimony in organized crime cases. This would permit the trial of criminal cases even though a witness later disappeared or was fearful to appear in court at the time of the trial. The measure also grants authority to hold a person unwilling to testify guilty of civil contempt; in some instances grants immunity from prosecution when a person claims his constitutional rights would be violated by testifying; provides additional penalty for the habitual criminal and establishes federal controls over the movement of explosives within interstate commerce. While the passage of this bill is long overdue, in my opinion we must insist on the enforcement of existing laws and a repudiation of the existing permissiveness.

COMMITTEE ACTION REGARDING P.O.W. DEPENDENTS

The House Veterans Affairs Committee, recognizing the plight of the 1,472 servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia, has favorably reported a bill authorizing educational benefits to their wives and children and home loan benefits to their wives. The benefits of this bill are identical to those presently provided for wives and children of service connected totally disabled veterans and widows and children of men killed in action. House action is expected after Congress reconvenes in November.

SECOND SPOUSE ANNUITY

At the present time a retired government worker whose spouse dies loses the opportunity to designate a second spouse to receive his annuity. Our Post Office and Civil Service Committee recommended a change in this law. Under the Committee measure, a retiree whose first mate dies and who later remarries may designate the second spouse to receive his annuity. The Civil Service Commission advises that the cost of this measure would be low because of the limited number of retirees it would affect and that a 2-year marriage requirement would prevent a young person from marrying an elderly retiree merely to obtain his retirement check.

FREDERICKSBURG OFFICE VISIT

While our principal office is in Washington, I do plan to be in the Fredericksburg Congressional office all day on Friday, October 30 to meet with constituents. This office, located in the Post Office building, is used to accomodate those of you who live in the Fredericksburg area or more distant points from Washington. Please call Mrs. Hancock at 373–0536 if you would like to stop by during that day to discuss any problem or concern.

PERSONAL AWARD

I was pleased a few days ago to receive an award from the National Commanders of the American Legion, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S. and the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. The award was given for "Invaluable service in passage of veterans legislation in the House of Representatives during the 91st Congress."

POLLUTION

Earlier this year I co-sponsored the President's 7-bill package of anti-pollution proposals to clean-up our environment.

H.R. 16049, known as the Clean Water Financing Act, authorizes the government to pay 40% of the construction costs of sewage treatment works. The bill is pending before the Committee on Public Works with no action scheduled.

H.R. 16048 is known as the Environmental Financing Act and would assist localities in obtaining funds to match those paid by the federal government for waste treatment plants. Hearings have been held on this measure and the Committee on Public Works plans to consider it further after the Congressional recess.

H.R. 16050 authorizes the federal government to cooperate with other agencies, institutions and individuals in determining ways to control and prevent water pollution and to protect water quality. The bill is under consideration in Committee.

H.R. 16047, known as the Clean Air Act Amendments, includes specific authorizations for research relating to fuels and vehicles. The Committee combined this bill with others which passed both the House and the Senate and is being considered in Conference.

H.R. 16046 would coordinate federal activities with regard to development of programs and encouraging greater reclamation and recycling of materials from solid waste. A measure similar to it was passed by both the House and the Senate and was considered in Conference but the differences between the House and the Senate versions have not been finally eliminated.

H.R. 16051 would permit the federal government to develop comprehensive water quality programs and contains strong penalty provisions for water pollution. It is pending in the House committee.

H.R. 16045 would authorize the federal government to utilize a portion of surplus real property for public park and recreational purposes. A similar bill has been passed by the Congress and sent to the President for approval.

PENDING LEGISLATION

The Congress does not enact all measures introduced and the following are examples of two bills I sponsored upon which action has not yet been taken.

H.R. 7023 would permit a federal employee to retire after 30 years of service, regardless of age without a reduction in the amount of their annuities. The Chairman of the Subcommittee is not unfriendly to this bill although he has his own measure to accomplish a similar purpose.

H.J. Res. 471 is pending in the Judiciary Committee with no action scheduled. This proposal would amend the Constitution to provide for a 10 year term for all federal judges and require that they be renominated and reconfirmed at the end of each term in order to remain in office.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

A $66.7 billion Defense Appropriation Bill was recently approved by the House. This is

a $6 billion reduction over the appropriations for last year and $2 billion less than the President's budget. The Appropriations Committee pointed out that, "Competition with the Soviet Union is becoming keener every day and there is no room for American bungling in the field of defense." According to the Committee report, military personnel strength as of June 30, 1971 will be 2.9 million, a reduction of 500 thousand in two years. The Navy will have 757 ships in the active fleet, including 41 Polaris and Poseidon submarines, carrying 656 ballistic missiles. The Air Force will have 1054 Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles on launchers and an active inventory of 13,352 aircraft. A breakdown in this year's bill indicates that each of the three Services gets about one-third of the total. Of the total amount appropriated in the bill, military personnel expenditures account for $20.6 billion, operation and maintenance $19.2 billion and procurement $16.2 billion.

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

The office has the following items which will be forwarded to constituents upon request in the order received until our supply is exhausted. In view of the limited supply, we cannot send both a calendar and yearbook to the same home.

The 1970 Agricultural Yearbook "Contours of Change" is about rural America and the forces that are reshaping it. Our allotment is 400 copies.

Capitol Calendars for 1971 will be available on December 1. Please specify whether you prefer the stiff back with a picture of the Capitol or the smaller flexible one with a different national shrine pictured for each month. Our allotment is 500 of each.

We also have 1000 copies of "Family Fare", an agricultural bulletin containing food recipes.

SOMETHING TO PONDER

"Every violation of truth is not only a sort of suicide in the liar, but a stab at the health of human society"—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD my final report to the residents of Indiana before this 91st Congress goes into recess:

THE PRESIDENT DESERVES A CHANCE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—President Nixon is nearing the half-way point in his term of office and this offers an excellent time to stop, pause and reflect on his accomplishments in the face of an overwhelming opposition congress.

In my opinion, we can assign the President high marks on all counts considering the deplorable mess he inherited.

When President Nixon went to work, he devised a plan where none before had existed, and today he has succeeded to a large extent in his Vietnamization plan, returned thousands upon thousands of American troops home and reduced casualty figures greatly.

Considering the President's plan thus far, we can foresee further progress and an eventual end to the conflict. Even the President's harshest critics will have to concede that he has done remarkably well in the less than two year period he has had to reverse the trend of the war.

The war was not the only major problem President Nixon inherited.

In 1960, when the late President Eisenhower left office, it was still safe to go out on the streets at night; high schools and colleges were not targets for drug distribution; riots and bombing were not commonplace; and America was at peace.

But, in 1969, when President Nixon was sworn in, the intervening years had brought all of the above troubles, and many more. President Nixon knew these crises existed when he took oath of office to preserve and protect the Constitution. He went right to work and despite the carping, partisan, backbiting of a vociferous and obstructional opposition Congress, the President has moved ahead in his plan to restore orderly progress.

Far-ranging crime control bills, drug abuse legislation, anti-pollution measures, and anti-inflationary action have all been battled through the hostile 91st Congress. The terrible tragedy, however, is the deliberate delays and outright scuttling in some instances, by the opposition Congress which would rather hurt the President than help the nation as a whole.

If President Nixon is given the support he needs and deserves next January when the new Congress is convened, I feel certain he can wind the war down further and end our troop involvement, restore law and order on the streets, rebuild our shattered world prestige and insure a strong, prosperous economy based on peacetime production instead of a wartime inflation paid for by the blood of American fighting men.

The present Congress has perpetuated the mistakes of the past by subverting President Nixon at every turn. These problems can only be solved by a dedicated President working *with* the support of Congress.

Autumn's thoughts. "He who governed the world before I was born shall take care of it likewise when I am dead. My part is to improve the present moment."—*John Wesley.*

Who said what. "There is no solid basis for civilization but in the Word of God."—*Daniel Webster.*

America's youth. "Somewhere among the youth of today are minds capable of discovering ways to world peace, ways to deeper and more fulfilling lives, ways to new appreciations of beauty in art or literature or music, just as there have been minds capable of splitting the atom and conquering space travel. Ours is the task of encouraging and inspiring these gifts of creative potentiality."—*Samuel B. Gould.*

Words of wisdom. "A good newspaper and Bible in every house, a good school house in every district, and a church in every neighborhood, all appreciated as they deserve, are the chief support of virtue, morality, civil liberty and religion."—*Benjamin Franklin.*

America's senior citizens caught in cruel financial squeeze. Let us reflect on the difficult money problem confronting many of our older Americans.

Living on a fixed income, the senior citizen sees his dollar diminishing in value while costs of food, clothing and housing steadily increase.

A retirement income that seemed adequate several years ago has been eaten away by inflation generated in the most part by ruinous federal deficit spending during the 1960's.

President Nixon has fought valiantly to stoke the fires of inflation by reduced expenditures, but his efforts have been repeatedly blunted by an opposition-controlled Congress more interested in embarrassing the President than helping reduce the budget.

We should attack this problem on several more fronts, in my opinion, and one big help would be Congressional approval of my bill permitting Social Security recipients to earn $3,000 per year and still draw maximum benefits.

Another approach we have sought is to put an automatic cost-of-living boost in the Social Security law. Practically all wage earners now receive this benefit, and these automatic raises would help our senior citizens to keep pace with other Americans. We have strongly urged this action and have discussed it personally with Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.), of the House Ways and Means Committee. When Congress reconvenes this must be a top priority item.

I am pleased to report that the 91st Congress did pass, with my strongest possible support, a 15% increase in Social Security benefits. But, this should be followed by the additional actions I have outlined.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS JERSEY CITY COUNCIL NO. 137 CELEBRATES ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus, Jersey City Council No. 137, of which I am proud to be a member, will soon observe and celebrate its 75th anniversary in the city of Jersey City, N.J.

On October 6, 1970, the following proclamation, declaring the week of November 1 through November 7, 1970, to be Jersey City Council No. 137 Knights of Columbus Week was unanimously approved by the Jersey City Council and signed by Mayor Thomas J. Whelan.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Knights of Columbus, Jersey City Council No. 137 will observe and celebrate their 75th Anniversary in the city of Jersey City, New Jersey and

Whereas, the members of Jersey City Council No. 137 of the Knights of Columbus have engaged in a program of activities and projects which has made important and permanent contributions to the improvement and development of the religious, educational, charitable, civic, and patriotic aspects of our community's welfare and integrity, and

Whereas, the members of this distinguished fraternal benefit society have exemplified for all to see what may be accomplished through the harmony and cooperation of a group devoted to the achievement of common and worthy goals,

The Mayor and Council of the City of Jersey City hereby proclaim the week beginning November 1st through November 7th, 1970 as "Jersey City Council No. 137 Knights of Columbus Week" in the city of Jersey City, New Jersey,

Now, therefore, I, Thomas J. Whalen, Mayor of the city of Jersey City, New Jersey, do hereby proclaim November 1st through November 7th, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy in the year of our Lord, as "Jersey City Council No. 137 Knights of Columbus Week."

And do extend to our fellow citizens in our community who are duly enrolled as members of Jersey City Council No. 137 of the Knights of Columbus congratulations for their magnificent demonstration of leadership and dedication, and hereby tender this public expression of gratitude.

Given under the hand and seal this 6th day of October, 1970.

THOMAS J. WHELAN,
Mayor.

THE 91ST CONGRESS—A RECORD OF INITIATIVE AND INNOVATION

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last December in my statement in appraising the work of the first session of the 91st Congress, I stated:

> The House of Representatives during the first session of the 91st Congress has seized the initiative and been innovative in every significant area of legislation. Its record in this respect stands out in sharp contrast to that of the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, the 10 months which have passed since then have witnessed the compilation of a unique record of legislative accomplishments which clearly demonstrates that not only was the congressional initiative and innovation of 1969 sustained during the second session of the 91st Congress, but that 1970 witnessed an even greater congressional dominance in the development and enactment into law of legislation designed to solve the major problems facing this Nation as we enter the decade of the seventies.

The paramount domestic problem facing this country during the past year has undoubtedly been the deteriorating state of our national economy. When President Nixon assumed office, unemployment stood at 3.3 percent. Latest Government figures indicate that unemployment is now officially recorded at 5.5 percent. Actually of course these figures do not fully reveal the seriousness of our situation. For in addition to those officially classified as unemployed, we must, to appreciate the full magnitude of our problem, add those workers—the elderly, the teenagers, the housewives, and others—who, having become discouraged by months of unsuccessful efforts to find a job, have withdrawn from the labor force. If one, in addition, takes into account the virtual elimination of overtime together with the drastic reduction in the length of the work week, it becomes even clearer that the American working man has suffered greatly because of the reestablishment of the same type of Republican economic policies which caused three recessions during the 1950's.

Unemployment and reduced paychecks prove but even more onerous when accompanied by sharply escalating prices for food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life. In addition to rising unemployment, this country has during the past year experienced the worst inflationary binge in two decades. The cost of living increased by more than 7.6 points during the first year of Republican rule. Eggs, fruit and vegetables, meat, poultry and fish—the "market basket" foods that make up the meals of Americans averaged a 5-percent increase in 1969. Medical care was 7 percent higher and the cost of credit and insurance rose by 11.5 percent. The price of all of these items has continued to escalate in 1970. The cost of living is now 10 percent higher than when President Nixon took office.

Traditional Republican laissez-faire economic philosophy has prevented the Nixon administration from moving effectively to deal either with inflation or unemployment. The record of the Democratic 91st Congress in the economic sphere justly enables it to claim a monopoly in efforts to grant the American people some relief from the twin burdens of higher prices and fewer jobs. Last December, in Public Law 91–151 we granted the President authority to impose selective and/or voluntary credit controls. If the President would but abandon his refusal to utilize this grant of authority, it would be possible to channel available credit into areas of high social priority such as housing and much needed community facilities. At the same time, the utilization of selective controls would make easier the abandonment of the present blunderbuss approach embodied in the current tight money policy, a policy which discriminates against consumers, small business, homebuilders, and the public sector of the economy.

This year, the Congress in enacting the Defense Production and Economic Stabilization Act, Public Law 91–379, granted the President discretionary authority to freeze prices, rents, and wages. This is a measure of unique importance. It is tailored to meet our present inflationary situation.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is now in the grips of what economists term "cost-push" inflation. Most price rises today emanate from the monopolistic or semi-monopolistic giants which dominate a significant portion of the American economy. So strong are these monopolies, so great are their internal financial resources, that they are all but immune from the effects of a restrictive monetary policy. The prices they choose to charge are not set by the traditional supply and demand forces of the marketplace, but rather theirs is an administered price structure set on the basis of what the traffic will bear. As they raise their prices ever upward, labor is then compelled to ask for higher wages and an escalating spiral of inflation ensues. The effort by the Republican administration to counter this type of inflation by tight money and high interest rates has been a total failure.

The combination of standby wage and price controls given the President this session together with the credit controls authorized in 1969 does, however, give the President all the tools necessary to control this type of inflation, while at the same time providing for healthy economic growth. In this way, we will not need to rely exclusively on fiscal and monetary actions which place an inordinate burden on those segments of our society least able to bear them.

Mr. Speaker, in a further effort to return this Nation's economy to a sound basis and eliminate inflation, the 91st Congress acted in a careful and prudent manner in exercising its constitutional prerogatives as the guardian of the public purse. While administration spokesmen indulged in a great deal of talk about Government economy and the reduction of expenditures, it was the Congress which in reality acted to effect substantial reductions in Government outlays.

The House of Representatives, with the passage of the major defense appropriation measure last week, has now assured a substantial reduction of around $7 billion in the President's budget requests to this 91st Congress.

It is now indicated that around $1 billion will be trimmed this 1971 fiscal year from the budget requests sent to Congress by President Nixon. Congress last year—fiscal 1970—cut $6.4 billion from the President's appropriations budget requests. In all, the 91st Congress is expected to cut approximately $7¼ billion from the President's appropriations request for the 2 years. The President's budget requests for fiscal 1970 and 1971 were the two largest in history.

According to current estimates, the first 2 years of the Nixon administration are expected to produce the largest two successive real budget deficits in history, based on the administrative budget concept. The administrative budget is considered by many experts to be the "real" measure of comparison of Federal spending with revenue, since the unified budget concept now used in computing deficits includes the surplus in the social security and other trust funds. These funds are supposed to be held in trust by the Federal Government for their recipients. The big 1970 and expected 1971 deficits are attributable mostly to loss in revenues due to the recession and unemployment, plus excessive interest rates. Unprofitable businesses and unemployed workers pay no taxes.

The 91st Congress did move decisively during the past year in an endeavor to put the millions who have experienced joblessness as the result of Republican economic policies back to work. We passed the Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970. This measure was based on a congressional finding that it was needed "to provide an effective and practical method of combating unemployment." It authorizes a billion dollars in Federal grants to local communities for needed water and sewer facilities. This measure was reflective of the traditional Democratic humanitarian philosophy exemplified in the statement of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt upon assuming office during the great depression that—

> The greatest tragedy about unemployment is that it should exist at a time when there are so many things which need to be done. Surely in a country as great as ours the means can be found to put the unemployed to work doing those things.

President Nixon, taking issue with the late President Roosevelt's humanitarian philosophy, sharply attacked the proposal and criticized Congress for having passed it, but having been advised that Congress would undoubtedly override any veto, permitted it to become law without his signature.

As an additional antirecession measure, the 91st Congress this year acted to reform and upgrade the unemployment compensation system. Public Law 91–373 extends program coverage to employers

who employ one or more workers in each of 20 weeks or who have quarterly payrolls of $1,500, to certain agricultural processing workers and to certain employees of nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education. These extensions will bring an estimated 4.7 million additional workers under the program. Most important, there is also established a new Federal-State program for extending unemployment compensation benefits during periods of above average National or State unemployment.

Crime, which has increased 29 percent during the past 2 years, is another major domestic problem facing this Nation. The concern of the people has been translated into legislation by this Congress. The passage last week of the organized crime bill, which also includes provisions against illegal gambling and the control of exposives, is the 14th anticrime bill passed by the House in this Congress. This is evidence of congressional concern, and further reflects the response of the Congress to the wishes of the citizenry who are demanding action to halt the rising crime rate.

Probably the most comprehensive anticrime measure approved in recent history was the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Amendments which strengthened the Safe Streets Act of 1968. This measure provides Federal funding for the frontline fighters of crime, the local and State police, and the courts.

Since crime control remains a local responsibility—and must remain basically a local responsibility—strengthening the forces most responsible for its control is the most effective way that the Federal Government can act against the rising rate of crime.

The House therefore approved $650 million for the Omnibus Crime Control Act, over the objections of the Nixon administration. It further approved an increase in the amount of Federal help over the next 2 years in the belief that strong local and State law enforcement is the place to start combating crime.

The House has now passed a comprehensive package of 14 anticrime bills, most initiated by Congress and supported by the administration. The measures approved include the omnibus crime control and organized crime bills mentioned earlier, plus drug control measures, court reorganization, the District of Columbia crime bill, bail reform, control of sex advertising, juvenile bill amendments, control of explosives, and control of gambling.

Mr. Speaker, congressional leadership was likewise dominant in the civil rights field during the past 2 years. A review of the legislative history of the Voting Rights Act—Public Law 91–285—clearly demonstrates the positive and progressive role played by the Democratic 91st Congress, and the lack of leadership evident on the part of the Nixon administration in this vital area.

Chairman CELLER introduced H.R. 4249 providing for a 5-year extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 on January 23, 1969. The views of the Department of Justice were requested shortly thereafter. They were not forthcoming for several months. On April 30, Attorney General Mitchell was invited to testify on May 14. On May 14 at the Attorney General's request, his appearance was canceled and rescheduled for May 21. This appearance in turn was canceled at his request and so were appearances scheduled for May 28, June 5, and June 18. He finally appeared on June 26. The administration's voting rights proposal, H.R. 12695, which would have crippled the 1965 legislation and which no senior Republican member on the House Judiciary Committee was willing to sponsor, was finally introduced by the minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, on July 9 of last year. It was opposed by every pro-civil-rights group. Because the Republican Party chose to turn its back on Abraham Lincoln, the Ford bill was substituted on the House floor for the 5-year extension which had been reported by the House Judiciary Committee. On the key vote, Republicans voted 129 to 49 against a continuation of the Voting Rights Act, and thus against civil rights, while Democrats voted 154 to 79 in favor of a continuation of the Voting Rights Act and thus for civil rights.

Fortunately, however, the Senate subsequently amended H.R. 4249 to provide for a straight 5-year extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act without crippling amendments. The Senate also added a provision lowering the voting age to 18 by simple statute effective January 1, 1971.

I had long favored giving the 18-year-olds the vote by simple statute feeling that this was well within Congress powers under the equal protection of the laws clause of the 14th amendment. I therefore strongly supported House passage of the Senate-approved bill. Regrettably, the President and the House Republican leadership exerted their influence and efforts against House approval of the 18-year-old vote and extension of the Voting Rights Act. Despite this, on June 17, 1970 the House voted to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 4249. On the key vote, ordering the previous question, Democrats voted 165 to 66 in favor of a continuation of the Voting Rights Act and granting 18-year-olds the vote. Republicans voted 117 to 59 against this progressive legislation. A majority of House Democrats thus supported a democratic extension of the franchise while a majority of House Republicans opposed such an extension.

The negativism of the Republican administration as contrasted with the positivism of this Democratic Congress is reemphasized when we examine the contrasting records in the environmental field. In 1969, we raised President Nixon's budget request for waste treatment plants from $214 million to $800 million. This year, President Nixon in his state of the Union message made a strong and fervent statement calling upon the Nation to act against water pollution. His budget message, however, failed to recommend the appropriation of a single dollar for waste treatment plants. In the Public Works Appropriation Act, Congress acted to match the President's rhetoric with action by providing a $1 billion appropriation for treatment plants, the largest sum ever appropriated for this program. The President only reluctantly signed this measure into law.

President Nixon recommended an appropriation of but $150 million for water and sewer lines. The Congress this year in the housing and independent offices appropriation bill—H.R. 17548—once again demonstrating its acute awareness of the needs in the water pollution area, raised this appropriation to $500 million, again the largest amount ever voted for this item. President Nixon, unfortunately, saw fit to veto this vitally needed appropriation. In the vote in the House to override the President's veto of H.R. 17548 on August 13, 1970, Democrats voted 181 to 40 in favor of overriding and against pollution while Republicans voted 155 to 23 to sustain and thus for pollution. As previously stated, the Congress also acted over administration opposition to increase the authorization for water and sewer lines in H.R. 17795, the Emergency Community Facilities Act, by an additional $1 billion.

The passage of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970 represented yet another example of congressional leadership in the antipollution field. Acting on their own initiative, Chairman FALLON of the House Public Works Committee, and Representative BLATNIK, the father of water pollution control legislation, introduced the Water Quality Improvement bill on January 23, 1969. The Nixon administration was not prepared to present its views on this much needed legislation until Secretary Hickel appeared before the House Public Works Committee on March 5. The subsequent legislative history of this subject makes it obvious that the executive branch was but an observer on the side lines in developing what ultimately became the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970. The measure was hammered out in the give and take of the House Public Works Committee as reported on March 21 and as passed the House on April 16 of last year. It passed the other body in October and was signed into law as Public Law 91–224 on April 3, 1970. In its basic thrust it follows that of the original Democratic measure as introduced last year. It amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the means available to control the pollution of the offshore water and the rivers of the United States. It provides for control of oil and other sea-carried pollutants, sewage from vessels; acids and other pollutants from mines; and pollution from any federally operated sources. It also provides for research grants and a scholarship program for students for programs instituted by the Secretary of the Interior. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to make a study of any and all methods of financing the cost of preventing, controlling, and abating water pollution. Finally, it authorizes an appropriation of a total of $348 million for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 for these purposes.

The House of Representatives likewise gave clear evidence as to its concern with the many interrelated environmental problems which face this Nation and that Congress is increasingly called upon to deal with in passing H.J. Res. 1117 to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment. It would be composed of 11

Members of the Senate and 11 Members of the House. This body would be a nonlegislative committee charged with the following functions: First, to make a continuing study of the character and extent of environmental change; second, to study methods, including financial and technical assistance, to foster harmonious relations between man and nature; third, to develop policies that would encourage maximum private investment in environmental improvement; and, fourth, to review any recommendation made by the President relating to environmental policy—including the environmental report required to be submitted pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 91–190.

The 91st Congress has likewise acted to curtail air pollution. The House on June 10, 1970, passed H.R. 17255, the Clean Air Act. This measure would establish national air quality standards due to pollution by automobiles, plants, fuels, and planes. It would authorize $220 million of Federal spending for fiscal year 1971 and further increase the funds to $250 million for fiscal year 1972 and to $325 million for the following 12-month period. It would also authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set air quality standards on a nationwide basis for the five pollutants on which criteria has been published—sulfur oxides, particulate matter such as dust, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and photochemical oxidants. Similar legislation passed the Senate on September 22, 1970, and is now pending in conference.

In the area of the environment, the 91st Congress has acted because we feel this country has to move more vigorously and rapidly in pollution control. Congress, here once again over the reluctance of the administration to recognize the necessity, demonstrated concern with a national problem of high priority. The administration abdicated leadership, but Congress acted.

The clear line of demarcation between the progressive philosophy of the Democratic 91st Congress and the unenlightened views of the present Republican administration has also been sharply drawn in the field of health. A Democratic measure to extend and liberalize the Hill-Burton Act was introduced early in February 1969. Proposed hearings were delayed several times on request of the administration. When the administration finally did appear to present its views late in March, it was able to offer only a few exceedingly broad and general suggestions as to proposed changes in the existing law. No draft bill or specific amendments were ever given the committee. In executive session, the administration's proposals were rejected in toto and H.R. 11102, a clean bill, was reported on May 20 embodying modifications in the hospital construction legislation developed by members of the committee and perfected in the give and take of the committee's deliberations with almost no guidance or assistance from the administration.

The House on June 4, 1969, by rollcall vote of 351 to 0, passed H.R. 11102 extending the Hill-Burton Act for Hospital Construction and Modernization. It passed the Senate April 7, 1970, by a rollcall vote of 79 to 0. The conference report was approved by the Senate by a voice vote on June 8 of this year while the House gave its final approval 2 days later by a rollcall vote of 370 to 0.

Despite the unanimity of support in both Houses for this measure; despite the fact that the Hill-Burton program from its very inception a quarter of a century ago has enjoyed widespread support from the medical profession and the public at large; despite the fact that in the Congress there has been no program that has been less partisan in character; despite a need by the States for an additional 85,000 acute care hospital beds, 165,000 additional long-term beds, 893 public health centers, 872 diagnostic and treatment centers, and 388 rehabilitation facilities, together with a need to modernize some 450,000 acute and long-term care beds; and despite the fact that President Nixon had stated in July 1969 that the Nation faced a health crisis and said the problem was one of not enough doctors and hospital beds—the President saw fit to veto this measure.

I am happy to record that both Houses of the Congress, being more fully cognizant of the Nation's health needs than the Nixon administration, voted to override the President's veto and this measure became Public Law 91–296. In the House on June 25, 1970, the vote was 279 to 98. Only three of the negative votes were cast by Democrats.

In line with its vote to override the Presidential veto of the Hill-Burton bill, the House in passing the Labor–HEW appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 this year, more than doubled President Nixon's budget request for hospital construction raising it from $89 million to $182 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1969—Public Law 91–173—stands as another example of the quality of leadership in the field of health demonstrated by the 91st Congress. This measure will protect the health and safety of coal miners and combat the steady toll of life, limb, and lung which terrorizes so many unfortunate families. Here again, it was Congress that moved first and moved further than the recommendations of the President. The initial bills in this area were introduced early in January by Chairman PERKINS of the Education and Labor Committee and Chairman DENT of the General Subcommittee on Labor. The administration's proposals were not transmitted until March. The measure which evolved through subcommittee and full committee stages, on the floor of the House and ultimately in conference, represented at every stage imaginative and dynamic legislative workmanship on the part of Democratic Members of the Congress. The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act can quite properly be deemed a milestone piece of health legislation. It is also, I might add, a milestone piece of labor legislation. It is the strongest Federal law ever enacted to protect miners at work. It will protect their health by setting limits on the amount of coal dust permitted in a mine. This dust is the cause of black lung disease which can prove fatal. The previous distinction between gaseous and nongaseous mines is ended and all mines will be required, according to an orderly schedule, to install nonspark electrical equipment to prevent explosions. In the future, it will be possible to further raise health and safety standards by administrative action without coming back to the Congress for additional legislation. A dust ceiling of 4.5 milligrams per cubic meter of air is imposed by the measure immediately and further reductions will be required within a year. Disability compensation is provided for miners suffering from black lung disease. Fines and jail sentences are provided for violations of the legislation.

Alarmed by the spread in recent years of many communicable diseases, the Congress in 1970 passed S. 2264, the Communicable Disease Control Act. The legislation authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make grants to the States to prevent or control the introduction, transmission, or spread of diseases susceptible to vaccination or communicable disease control in the United States from foreign countries and from interstate and intrastate sources.

Once again, it proved to be necessary to overcome the vigorous opposition of the Republican administration. In the face of irrefutable evidence that present programs fall far short of effectively coping with such communicable diseases as measles, German measles, tuberculosis, whooping cough, and venereal diseases, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a letter to the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee dated October 23, 1969 stated:

> In our opinion, legislation in this field is neither necessary nor desirable.

Despite the administration's negativism, the House of Representatives gave approval to the conference report on S. 2264 by a vote of 292 to 2, on September 28, 1970. The conference report cleared the Senate on October 1 and now awaits President Nixon's signature. I would hope, in light of the proven need and widespread support for this most meritorious proposal, that the President will see fit to approve it.

Mr. Speaker, the congressional leadership described earlier in regard to the national economy, environment, and health, has been equally evident in the vitally important area of education throughout the 91st Congress. H.R. 514 to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was introduced by Chairman PERKINS on January 3, 1969, and hearings commenced on January 15. Secretary Finch however was not prepared to testify until March 10, the last day of the committee hearings. H.R. 514 cleared the committee on March 18 and passed the House on April 23, 1969, by a rollcall vote of 400 to 17. This measure was approved by the Senate on February 19, 1970, and became Public Law 91–239 when signed by the President on April 13, 1970. It is a tribute to the diligence, energy, and imagination of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS). This legislation extends and authorizes appropriations for the following pro-

grams of assistance for elementary and secondary education for 3 years through 1973: First, major programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; second, the impacted areas program, including refugees and children in public housing; and third, adult basic education, including high school equivalency. It also extends for 2 years through 1972 provisions of the Vocational Education Act. In addition, it authorizes a study of the effectiveness of the allocation of ESEA title I funds, bonus pay for teachers in disadvantaged areas; special grants for districts with high concentrations of disadvantaged children; aid for gifted and talented children; programs for children with learning disabilities; a Student Teacher Corps; and a National Commission on School Finance.

In the actual appropriation of funds for education, it was the Democratic Congress once again rather than the Republican administration which proved to be progressive. President Nixon's budget for fiscal year 1970 had provided for a request of $370 million below that of the Johnson administration. Congress by way of contrast acted to increase the Nixon request by a billion dollars for education. Regrettably, President Nixon failed to share the concern of the Democratic 91st Congress as to the crying educational needs of this Nation because on January 26, 1970, he chose to place dollar values above human values and vetoed H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970. Because Republicans, who had previously voted to approve this needed appropriation for education, under political pressure reversed themselves, the House on January 28 voted to sustain the President's veto. Democrats voted 199 to 35 to override and thus in favor of education, while Republicans voted 156 to 27 to sustain and thus placed their partisan political loyalties above the educational needs of this country's schoolchildren.

This year saw a replay of the 1969 conflict between the pro-education 91st Congress and the anti-education Republican administration. The Congress in passing the appropriation bill for the Office of Education for fiscal year 1971—H.R. 16916—increased the President's budget request by some $425 million. Congress felt that this represented the absolute minimum needed by this country's schools to perform their mission. Despite the fact that in its passage through every step of the legislative process, the Office of Education appropriation bill received widespread support in the Congress, and had the strong endorsement of the education community, President Nixon chose once again on August 11, 1970, to turn his back on America's schoolchildren and their obvious educational needs by vetoing H.R. 16916. This time the pro-education forces of the Nation were able to muster sufficient strength and both Houses of the Congress voted to override the President's veto. The House vote was 289 to 114 in favor of overriding. Democrats voted 212 to 13 in favor of overriding and thus for education, while their Republican colleagues voted 101 to 77 to sustain and thus against education.

Mr. Speaker, when we turn to the subject of housing and urban development we find the same repetitive pattern. On the one hand we find a responsive and responsible Congress endeavoring to formulate and adopt programs tailored to the increasingly complex problems of our urban areas. On the other we find a Republican administration unimaginative and unresponsive characterized by a failure to provide leadership or demonstrate initiative, in this, as in areas previously discussed.

The record compiled by the incumbent Republican administration in the housing field has in effect been little short of a disaster. In January 1969, housing starts stood at 1.9 million. By August of this year they had declined to 1.4 million, a decline of over 25 percent. The whole thrust of the economic and housing policies pursued by the Nixon administration has been to frustrate the intent of the Congress in establishing as a national goal a decent, safe, and sanitary home for every American family.

The chaotic situation to which the housing industry has been reduced becomes obvious when we realize that we are now producing substantially fewer homes than the 2 million units built in 1950. This in the face of the fact that this Nation's population in 1950 was approximately 150 million while our current population is well over 200 million. The manmade depression foisted upon this Nation's housing industry has without doubt been a major contributing factor to the general recession from which this Nation now suffers. The half million fewer homes being produced now than when President Nixon took office have cost us about a million jobs, half of them on site and half of them on materials production. In an endeavor to reverse this downward trend in housing, Congress made available last year in the Housing and Redevelopment Act of 1969, over vigorous administration opposition, some $2 billion to the Government National Mortgage Association to purchase mortgages on low-cost FHA and VA housing. The President however has refused to utilize this authority.

This year, the House on July 20 passed H.R. 18253, likewise over vigorous administration opposition, authorizing the investment of some $3.5 billion of funds in the National Service Life Insurance Fund in VA mortgages. This most sensible proposal would make moneys, which our veterans have paid into their insurance fund, available for them—the veterans—to purchase homes. In addition, because of the higher yield on VA mortgages than that on the Government bonds in which these funds are now invested, the proposal would greatly increase the income of the trust fund. This measure is now pending in the Senate and is expected to be acted on shortly after we return from the current recess.

In addition, this year in the independent offices-HUD appropriation bill—H.R. 17548—the Congress voted to increase the President's request for urban renewal by $350 million, from $1 billion to $1,350,000,000. The Congress also raised the President's request for water and sewer facilities grants from $150 million to $500 million. Because of reductions in other programs the total increase in the bill over the President's budget request amounted to some $540 million. On the specious grounds that this exceedingly modest increase would greatly accelerate inflation, President Nixon vetoed H.R. 17548. This ill-advised veto by the President in the face of the well-established need to clean up the filth and stench of the ever-encroaching slums in our cities is reflective of the traditional Republican policy of disregard for the urban centers of this Nation. His opposition to the congressional desire to provide adequate funds for water and sewer facilities demonstrates that the Republican Party is as antagonistic toward the growing suburbs of the Nation, which are literally about to be engulfed in sewer pollution, as it is toward the inner cities. On August 13, 1970, the House voted to sustain the President's veto. Democrats voted 181 to 40 to override and thus for housing and urban development, while Republicans voted 155 to 23 to sustain and thus against housing and urban development.

Mr. Speaker, last year the 91st Congress, in Public Law 91–177, acted to extend for 2 additional years the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It authorized $2,195,500,000 for fiscal year 1970 and $2,295,500,000 for fiscal year 1971. This legislation also contained provisions strengthening Headstart, Follow Through, the manpower training program, Mainstream, and New Careers, and the emergency food and health service program. The successful 2-year extension of the war on poverty without crippling amendments was due exclusively to congressional efforts. Chairman PERKINS introduced legislation extending the antipoverty program for 5 years on January 3, 1969. He initiated 29 days of hearings before his full committee on March 24 taking testimony from witnesses representing all areas of the country. The administration's proposed 2-year extension was not transmitted and introduced in the House until June 3. Subsequently, however, Chairman PERKINS received no assurances that the Republican votes would be forthcoming to support the administration's own requested legislation against crippling floor amendments. He was forced to report out a 2-year bill without those assurances on November 6. When the bill was brought up on the House floor on December 12, a substitute proposal, giving the States complete control over the program and containing other emasculating amendments, received the all-out support of the House Republican leadership and the senior Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee. The crippling substitute was defeated by a vote of 231 to 163, Republicans voted 103 to 63 to emasculate the antipoverty program while Democrats voted 168 to 60 to sustain a continuation of the war on poverty.

The final version of this legislation worked out in conference followed the House measure in all major respects and was signed into law December 30, 1969.

Regional development legislation was yet another area where congressional initiative was demonstrated. The initial bill providing for an extension of the Appalachian Regional Commission was introduced by the chairman of the House Public Works Committee, Mr. FALLON, on January 17, 1969. Because the Nixon ad-

ministration was not prepared to present its views, it was not possible to start hearings until March 25. The Assistant Secretary for Economic Development in the Commerce Department, Mr. Robert Podesta, did not appear until near the conclusion of the hearings on April 17. The House Public Works Committee in executive sessions then fashioned a measure which extended the Appalachian Regional Commission as well as the other regional commissions established pursuant to title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

The bill drafted by the Public Works Committee was a well-thought-out, balanced measure and passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 273 to 103 on July 15, 1969. Public Law 91–123 authorizes an additional $1,219,000,000 for regional economic development programs in fiscal years 1970–71. It extends the programs under the Appalachia Regional Development Act together with those five other multistate regional commissions provided for in title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The Appalachia highway program is extended through fiscal year 1973 and an additional $150 million was authorized for this program. Nonhighway Appalachia programs were authorized additional moneys amounting to $268.5 million: the five other regional commissions were given an authorization of $275 million.

The history of the Appalachian regional development bills in this body since 1965 is, I feel, an excellent case study of what happens to progressive legislative proposals. In 1965 when Appalachian legislation was first considered by the House, the record shows that a motion to recommit the bill on March 3 witnessed the Republican membership voting 92 to 44 in favor of recommital and then 109 to 25 against final passage. In 1967 when the question of extension was before the House on September 14, Republicans voted 143 to 17 in favor of recommittal and 123 to 35 against passage. In the 91st Congress I am gratified to report that when the House acted on this matter on July 15, 1969, Republicans voted 90 to 77 in favor—this time they did not even choose to offer a recommittal motion. While the Republican record of support did not approach that of the Democrats who voted 183 to 26 in favor, it shows reluctant Republican acceptance that these regional programs must be succeeding and must be popular.

The same story is likewise true of the public works and economic development program which provides assistance for depressed areas. When the initial legislation was considered in the House on August 12, 1965, Republicans voted 115 to 0 in favor of recommitting the proposal. On final passage Republicans were recorded 93 to 31 in opposition. When H.R. 15712 providing for a 1-year extension of this program was considered in the House on June 8, 1970, it had become so noncontroversial that the bill passed on a voice vote and has become Public Law 91–304. Area and regional development thus follows in the path of so many other Democratic pieces of progressive legislation, social security, unemployment compensation, minimum wage, and so forth. At first they are violently and vociferously opposed by our Republican friends, then reluctantly tolerated and finally embraced.

The 91st Congress in 1969 enacted an across-the-board increase in social security benefits of 15 percent effective January 1, 1970, for the 25 million elderly people, disabled people and their dependents, and widows and orphans who now get monthly social security benefits. In addition, the increase would apply to those people who will come on the benefit rolls in the future. Minimum benefits for retired workers were increased from $55 to $64 while the maximum worker's benefits were increased from $218 to $250.

This legislation once again reflected a congressional rather than an Executive imprint. The President did not see fit to send a social security message to the Congress until September 25, 1969, and a draft bill did not arrive until September 30. Hearings were announced immediately by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to begin on October 15. The President earlier in the year had publicly suggested a 7-percent increase, then in his message recommended a 10-percent social security increase. The House Ways and Means Committee moved to raise this to 15 percent. Because of Democratic action, Republicans in the Congress joined in. Once again the administration followed congressional leadership.

In addition to last year's legislation, the House during the past session passed H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments of 1970. This measure would increase social security benefits by an additional 5 percent effective January 1, 1971, and further increase benefits thereafter as the cost of living rises. In addition, the tax base would be raised to $9,000 next January and further increased thereafter as earnings levels rise. It would also increase widows' benefits. This measure is expected to be acted on by the Senate in November.

Mr. Speaker, the single innovative proposal recommended by President Nixon's administration during the past 2 years has been the Family Assistance Act. Even in the case of this legislation, however, had it not been for substantial Democratic support, this reform would have not cleared the House of Representatives. When the proposal was brought up in the House on April 15, 1970, on the key vote on House Resolution 916 providing for the consideration of H.R. 16311, the family assistance bill, the vote was 205 in the affirmative as against 183 in the negative. Republicans deserted the President and voted 91 to 79 against welfare reform. Democrats, on the other hand, voted 126 to 92 for reforming welfare assistance. In addition, more Democrats than Republicans voted for the bill on final passage.

The Family Assistance Act would establish a new family assistance plan under which each family with children would be eligible for Federal assistance benefits equal to $500 a year for each of the first two members of a family, plus $300 for each additional member. The States would be required to supplement Federal benefits to insure that families would not receive less than they would have received under the State plan for aid to families with dependent children in effect in January 1970 or the poverty level, if lower. Adults in eligible families would be required to register for employment at the local employment office. Training programs under the Labor Department would be established for recipients. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would provide day care for children of mothers employed or in training under the program.

It would also combine the adult programs of aid to the aged, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled into one program of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled with a $110 minimum payment to all recipients.

The 91st Congress placed on the statute books the most comprehensive tax reform measure in history. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 will provide tax relief by increasing the personal exemption and the standard deduction by providing a special tax-free allowance for low-income individuals, and by taxing single persons at lower rates than previously. It raised the personal exemption from $600 to $650 as of July 1, 1970. It will be increased to $700 for 1972 and to $750 for 1973. The present $1,000 standard deduction would be increased in stages to $2,000 by 1973. It includes a whole new concept in the tax law, a "minimum tax" aimed at preventing wealthy individuals or corporations from completely escaping the Federal income tax. The oil depletion allowance is reduced from 27½ percent to 22 percent.

The tax reform measure is another conspicuous example of congressional enterprise. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means announced on January 29, 1969, that he would hold extensive hearings on tax reform. Those hearings began on February 18. It was over 2 months later, on April 21, before President Nixon sent a message on the subject to the Congress. At that time, President Nixon said that "comprehensive" tax reform legislation would be submitted no later than November 20, very evidently indicating that even the President did not consider the April 21 message "comprehensive." An administration draft bill never was submitted.

Nevertheless, on April 22, hearings were held on the Nixon proposal. But the administration sent Under Secretary of the Treasury Charls Walker and Assistant Secretary Edwin Cohen to testify for Treasury—not Treasury Secretary Kennedy—thus indicating that the matter was not one of top priority. Hearings on the administration proposal were completed April 24. Subsequently, the Ways and Means Committee went into executive session and drafted its own tax reform proposal. It passed the House 394 to 30 on August 6, 1969. Even the House Republican leader hailed the bill as "the most sweeping tax revision and tax relief bill in the 56 years since the Federal income tax was first adopted." The administration, however, double-talked, seeking credit for originating tax reform, but telling special interest groups what they wanted to hear. Treasury Secretary Kennedy recommended amendments to the Senate Finance Committee which would have transferred much of the tax relief from the low- and moderate-income groups to the wealthy and the

large corporations. These regressive proposals were rejected by the Senate and the progressive character of the House bill preserved through every legislative step to final disposition as Public Law 91–172, the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Absence of firm and consistent Presidential leadership and support has likewise been evident from the very outset in our efforts to provide for the direct election of President and Vice President.

Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee on January 6, 1969, introduced a proposed constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of the President and Vice President. This was in response to the near constitutional crisis resulting from the previous year's presidential election. He commenced public hearings on February 5. President Nixon did not transmit his message on electoral college reform until February 24. I am informed that Attorney General Mitchell on at least three occasions requested a delay in appearing before the Judiciary Committee on the grounds that he was as yet not prepared to set forth the administration's proposals. He finally appeared before the Judiciary Committee on March 13 over 5 weeks after the commencement of hearings and almost 3 weeks after the submission of President Nixon's message. Only after the House had passed the direct election amendment, House Joint Resolution 681, on September 10, 1969, did President Nixon see fit to give it his endorsement.

That even this belated endorsement appears to have been more pro forma than real is clear from what happened in the Senate this year. Although a majority of the Senate favored the direct election of the President, their efforts to secure passage of this constitutional amendment were frustrated by a filibuster on the part of the minority opposed. Had the President provided leadership and support for this long overdue reform, I feel certain the two-thirds vote required to cut off the filibuster and secure its passage could and would have been obtained.

The House also on August 10 of this year by a rollcall vote of 352 to 15 passed another constitutional amendment, House Joint Resolution 264. It would guarantee equal rights for women. The amendment specifies that—

> Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This Congress has passed a series of very important bills aimed directly at improving benefits for veterans of the Vietnam war and veterans of other wars. The administration has opposed practically all of this legislation. Early in the Congress work was begun on a series of improvements in the education and training program. Most important among these was a proposal to raise education allowances by about 35 percent. The administration first attempted to have consideration of this legislation deferred, and later, upon seeing that Congress would not accept such a recommendation, tried to limit the increase to 10 percent. Even though President Nixon had been complaining that Vietnam veterans were not utilizing the education and training program, he called the rate increase proposed by Congress excessive and inflationary and threatened a veto. Despite these attempts by the President to prevent improvement and expansion of the GI bill and its education program, Congress passed this legislation virtually without dissent and placed the President in such a position that he could do nothing but sign it.

Vietnam veterans who are injured in service receive service-connected compensation. Congress enacted legislation this year over the protests of the Nixon administration to grant an 8-percent cost-of-living increase to disabled veterans. The Nixon administration attempted to obstruct this legislation and urged that it be deferred.

Earlier in the session, the Nixon administration attempted to prevent cost-of-living increases for widows and children of Vietnam servicemen who died from service-connected causes and other veterans whose deaths were service connected. Congress took up consideration of this legislation early in the 91st Congress and passed it over the recommendation of the Nixon administration that consideration of the legislation should be postponed pending a study being conducted by the administration. Congress made adjustments in the compensation of surviving widows and children of veterans in line with cost-of-living changes and sent it to the White House despite the administration's objections.

In an effort to realine the life insurance program covering veterans and other servicemen, Congress passed legislation to raise the amount of coverage from $10,000 to $15,000. It should be borne in mind that this is a group life insurance policy and the veterans pay the premium. Despite this, the Veterans' Administration recommended against increasing insurance coverage for Vietnam servicemen exposed to combat hazards.

Before veterans conventions this year the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs commended President Nixon for signing two veteran bills, when actually they were not favored by the administration. The bill which raised grants to paraplegics for specially adapted housing from $10,000 to $12,500 was opposed on the basis that any increase in the amount was not warranted, even though the amount was set many years ago.

The increase in the VA direct loan amount from $17,500 to $21,000 was not favored by the administration and this opposition has continued. In its latest form, the administration has recommended against extending the direct loan program to veterans for the purchase of mobile homes.

Congress has been greatly concerned with problems relating to the veterans hospital program, and has voted $105 million in additional funds to solve some of the serious problems confronting the medical and hospital program. The bill bearing this appropriation was vetoed by the President. Seventy-five percent of House Democrats voted to override, while 87 percent of House Republicans voted to sustain the veto of this appropriation so necessary for our sick and disabled veterans.

The administration opposition to veteran legislation has not been restricted to legislation involving Vietnam veterans. The administration has also opposed legislation designed to benefit elderly veterans. The administration has opposed a bill designed to prevent elderly veterans receiving a pension from experiencing a loss in their pension as a result of the 15-percent social security rate increase voted by the Congress effective in April of this year. Despite the opposition of the administration, the House passed this legislation and it is now in the Senate. Another bill aimed at solving problems of the elderly was the bill to permit any war veteran age 65 or over to enter a VA hospital without signing the oath of inability to pay, or the so-called paupers oath. The administration opposed this legislation but it has passed the Congress and is now awaiting the President's signature. I hope he will approve this meritorious bill.

President Nixon's veto on October 12, 1970, of the political broadcasting bill, S. 3637, was a serious mistake. This veto should it sustained by the Congress will, I feel certain, have far-reaching antidemocratic implications. It has become clear in recent years that the television media is by far the most effective political campaign device. There have been obvious examples where candidates were able to secure victory because they possessed the financial resources to blanket the airways. Our democratic system simply cannot tolerate candidates of either party buying an election through excessive expenditures on election advertising. We simply cannot permit packaging and selling of candidates like so much laundry soap if we are to retain a valid election process. I consider the passage of the political broadcasting bill one of the most important measures to receive the approval of the 91st Congress. It is the most significant legislation ever passed on election spending. It was approved by overwhelming majorities in both Houses of the Congress.

S. 3637 had a threefold purpose:

First, it repealed the equal opportunities provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to candidates for President and Vice President. This would permit the broadcast networks to donate free time for debates between major candidates for President as occurred in the Kennedy-Nixon campaign in 1960.

Second, it reduced the rate which broadcast stations may charge legally qualified candidates for public office for the use of broadcast time.

Third, it established reasonable limits on the amounts which may be spent for broadcast time by candidates for President and Vice President for general elections and by other candidates for major elective office—U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, Governor, and Lieutenant Governor—for primary and general elections. The States could elect by law, to place candidates for State and local of-

fice under the provisions of the legislation.

In 1970 with little or no opposition the Congress passed S. 3154 to continue and expand the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964. This year's legislation will provide $3.1 billion in Federal grants over the next 5 years to local communities for their mass transit systems. It has been hailed by the Secretary of Transportation and other Republican spokesmen as a major achievement of the Nixon administration. I welcome, even at this late date, the support of the Republican Party for mass transit. Candor, however, requires me to recall that in 1964 when we Democrats were, against great odds, laboring to pass the original mass transit bill, Republican support was exceedingly limited. On June 25, 1964, Republicans voted 135 to 33 to recommit—kill—the mass transit measure, and on final passage, they were recorded 128 to 39 in the negative. Democrats, by way of contrast, voted 181 to 55 against recommittal and 173 to 61 for passage. Mass transit thus joins that vast array of legislation on the statute books which was pushed through the Congress by the Democratic Party over the vigorous opposition of the Republicans, yet has now not only become accepted but actually enthusiastically embraced by the Republicans.

In the field of banking, the major legislation considered by the 91st Congress was undoubtedly H.R. 6778 amending the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. As passed by the House, H.R. 6778 would place single-bank holding companies under the regulating authority of the Federal Reserve Board, by extending the Bank Holding Act of 1956 to apply to such institutions. They had been specifically exempted in the 1956 law. The bill also authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to rule on the types of nonbanking business interests that bank holding companies may acquire. It prohibits bank holding companies from engaging in certain businesses, such as insurance, travel agencies, accounting, data processing and equipment leasing. It requires the single-bank holding company formed after the enactment of the 1956 law to divest itself of all nonbanking interests. Finally, the legislation changes the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 by defining a bank holding company as one which actually controls a bank rather than one which owns 25 percent of the voting stock.

House passage of H.R. 6778 in 1969, probably the most important banking legislation we have approved in a generation, was clearly the product of congressional rather than administration leadership. Chairman PATMAN, of the Banking and Currency Committee, introduced H.R. 6778 on February 17, 1969. Reports were immediately requested of all the relevant executive agencies. They were extremely tardy in responding, the report from the Treasury Department not arriving until April 16, the day after public hearings had commenced. The administration submitted a draft bill only after Chairman PATMAN announced that public hearings would commence on April 1 with or without administration recommendations. At administration request, they were further delayed until April 15. When Secretary Kennedy testified on the bill on April 17, he refused to endorse many of the key features of the Patman bill. The strong measure which ultimately passed the House was due to the Democratic Party under the able leadership of Chairman PATMAN, the administration throughout playing a negative and indecisive role. In pushing through H.R. 6778, the House Democratic majority took a decisive step to preserve the free enterprise system by protecting consumers and small businessmen from the monopolistic encroachment of bank holding companies.

H.R. 6778 passed the Senate on September 11, 1970, and is now pending in conference.

Mr. Speaker, the 91st Congress in 1970 passed the first congressional reform bill in 24 years. H.R. 17654 passed the House on September 17 by a vote of 326 to 19 and the Senate on October 6 by a vote of 59 to 5. This measure, now awaiting President Nixon's signature, would afford the public a greater opportunity to observe the operations of Congress by encouraging more open committee meetings and requiring that all committee votes be made public, allowing television coverage of committee hearings, and providing that teller votes in the Committee of the Whole be recorded, thus ending the secrecy surrounding Members' positions on important amendments. It would also expedite House proceedings by allowing all House committees to sit without special permission when the House is engaged in general debate, dispensing with the reading of the journal and allowing quorum calls to be ended after a quorum is established. H.R. 17654 would protect the minority by writing into the rules a specific time period for minority views to be added to a committee report, permitting the minority members of a committee to select two of the committee's six professional staff members, authorizing minority members to call witnesses of their choosing during at least 1 day of hearing on a measure, and requiring that debate on a conference report be equally divided between the majority and the minority sides. The bill would also provide that a committee report on a bill and committee hearings on appropriations bills must be available at least 3 days before the House votes on the bill. It would require that there be 10 minutes debate on any amendment offered on the floor which had not been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at least 1 day prior to consideration. A conference report would have to be available 3 days before the House votes on its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the 91st Congress, in enacting the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, has taken a major step in updating the congressional process and making it more responsive to the public will. It has also effectively answered those of its critics who had charged that it was an outmoded institution incapable of adjusting its rules and procedures so as to cope successfully with this Nation's problems of the 1970's. For in passing H.R. 17654, that is exactly what it has accomplished.

This, then, has been the record of the 91st Congress. Its hallmark, I believe, has obviously been innovation and initiative. To an extent unprecedented for at least a generation, the past 2 years have witnessed the legislative branch of our Federal Government replacing the executive in moving forward decisively in all major areas of legislative activity. Such has been the case in anti-inflation and anti-recession legislation, the areas of electoral college reform and tax reform, in civil rights and education, the providing of benefits for our veterans, and many others, including proposals in the fields of health and housing and the environment. It was in hearings before the legislative committees of the Congress that new ideas were developed and then, in the give-and-take of executive drafting sessions, hammered out into specific legislative proposals.

The leadership supplied by the administration in practically every major domestic area bordered on the nonexistent. The transmission of Presidential messages to the Congress on most subjects was exceedingly tardy. While these official communications were often preceded by a barrage of statements and press releases from the White House, the reduction of Madison Avenue-ese to the more traditional language of Presidential messages apparently often perplexed and defied the ability of presidential writers for weeks and even months on end. In addition, when the Congress was ultimately the recipient of some form of official communication from the Executive on a given subject, an additional lengthy period of time would almost invariably elapse before a draft bill embodying the President's proposals made its way to Capitol Hill. In a number of important areas, moreover, such draft bills apparently were lost somewhere in the bureaucratic maze of the executive branch and never successfully navigated the mile and a half trip from the White House to the Capitol. Under these circumstances, unaccustomed as they were to writing legislation on the basis of press releases, congressional committees found their tasks exceedingly difficult. When the drafting stage was reached in the case of many bills, the contribution of the department supposedly charged with its sponsorship, was generally limited to informing the committee on technical matters. Bureau chiefs, general counsels, Assistant Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and even Secretaries, were of markedly little assistance to the members of our legislative committees in the policy area, in defining the limits to which administration proposals might be modified or compromised, yet still meet the general objectives sought after by the administration. The story was much the same at each stage of the legislative process. When the end of the road was finally reached, after the legislative wheels had turned and the final product was presented to the President for his approval, in all too many cases, particularly if the measure dealt with some humanitarian subject such as health or

housing, or education, our efforts were doomed by a Presidential veto.

My congratulations, therefore, to the chairmen of the legislative committees of the House, as well as to the Democratic members of those committees who, under the most trying and frustrating circumstances, have labored so long and so effectively in producing a body of legislation which is extremely noteworthy both as to the amount of its quantity and as to the level of its quality.

The 91st Congress to date under the leadership of the Democratic Party has made an outstanding record in the service of our country and of our people, and warrants the strong appreciation and support of the electorate.

INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the past summer, I had the privilege of participating in a congressional internship program arranged for honor students of the summer session of the Lawrenceville School, located in Lawrenceville, N.J., in the Fourth Congressional District.

The Lawrenceville-Washington internship program is a concentrated experience and includes regular congressional staff duties as well as outside seminars. During the 2-week period they were here, Miss Carla Robbins, Miss Mary Waller of my district, and Mr. Mitchel Garrett of Rosslyn, N.Y., participated in the following programs:

SCHEDULE FOR INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

August 8—Reception for members of Congress and Staff.

August 11—Briefing, Department of Defense.

August 12—Lecture, Georgetown University, member, Center for Responsive Law.

August 13—Briefing, Federal Trade Commission.

August 13—Seminar, Franklin Nofziger, Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs.

August 18—Seminar, Marvin Zim, reporter, Time, Inc., Washington Bureau; Hugh Sidey, Bureau Chief, Washington Bureau, Time-Life, Inc.

August 19—Seminar, Clark Clifford, former Special Assistant to President Truman, former Secretary of Defense.

August 20—Tour and Briefing, Department of State.

August 20—Critique of Washington Intern Program and Dinner.

The Lawrenceville School program and others like it are valuable ways to introduce young men and women to Washington, and to develop an appreciation of legislative action. I compliment these young people on their interest in national political affairs, and I express my gratitude to the institutions which have made these programs possible.

FARM PROGRAMS—A LOOK AT THE 1970'S

HON. HENRY BELLMON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, very recently, the junior Senator from the State of Kansas (Mr. DOLE) addressed the International Commodities Conference at their meeting held in New York City. His remarks reflect an indepth understanding of the agricultural policies of our Nation and the food and fiber needs of our citizens and other people of the world. Mr. President, I would encourage all Members of Congress to share the insights provided by Senator DOLE, and ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

FARM PROGRAMS—A LOOK AT THE 1970'S

(Remarks of Hon. BOB DOLE)

I am deeply indebted to Jerry Taylor for his foresight and energy in bringing together this array of talent. I will not spend any of your time in pointing out the importance of the trading in commodities.

Rather, I would like to make what contribution I can to this conference under the general heading of the future direction of farm policy and the framework in which it will exist. We are dealing with an extremely complex, dynamic industry, and there are a multiplicity of forces that will shape the future of agriculture. Some of these factors are: reduced farm numbers in America's growing total population, technological changes both inside and outside agriculture, foreign market developments, special government food programs, and shifting consumer preferences.

While no one can exactly foresee changes in demand, technology, production and prices of farm products, those of us who are concerned with agriculture in America must continually look ahead and try to analyze present trends and future prospects.

POLICIES OF THE FUTURE

The agricultural policies of the future strike me as one of gradually increasing orientation toward a free market economy—as opposed to past and current government-controlled market economy. Within this framework, the objectives should be:

(1) Satisfactory levels of price and income;

(2) Growth in domestic and export markets;

(3) Removal of obstacles to more efficient farm operation;

(4) Portrayal of rural America as a much more attractive place to work and live;

(5) Development of domestic food program designed to reach and nourish the needy.

Against this background of objectives, I visualize that in the 1970's loan rates will be established at levels that will move commodities into expanded use. These will be supplemented by payments, where needed.

Implicit in this concept is the need for agriculture to hold and expand its markets—against industrial and synthetic competitors, as well as against foreign competition.

It is most important that we expand our agricultural exports. In considering farm policy, one must be sensitive to the fact that export outlets for feed grains, wheat, cotton and soybeans, including the products, provide an important share of the market. And we have to be most concerned with the need to maintain and expand these outlets. In the last fiscal year, farm exports exceeded $6.6 billion. Commercial dollar sales hit a new high—over $5.6 billion.

Our programs must look to overseas markets, and we must be prepared to compete for maximum utilization of our products throughout the world.

If U.S. farm exports are to reach $10 billion by 1980—a necessary objective—they must move freely in the markets of the world.

A basic purpose of future farm programs will be to help increase farm income—accomplishing this without interrupting normal market operations.

I visualize that the programs ahead will give farmers greater freedom in planning and producing on their lands.

Farm program participation will be voluntary; the farmer who wishes to stay out of the program will be free to do so. He will be subject to no restrictions, will receive no payments, and will not be eligible for loans.

FUTURE PROGRAMS

The chief characteristics of the farm program will be these:

(1) Farmers will have much greater freedom to shift acres from one crop to another—to make the best use of their opportunities and their equipment.

(2) Farmers will have the opportunity to produce at less than full capacity, without loss of income.

(3) The program will help us compete in world markets, in terms of both price and availability.

(4) Contrary to the massive dumping of grains we saw in the 1961–68 period, sales of CCC-owned grains will be at not less than 115 percent of the loan rate, plus carrying and other charges, or the market—whichever is higher.

The framework of the farm program I have just discussed, however, can only survive if it is implemented by realistic, constructive efforts on the part of the federal government. In other words, the future of free markets can be greatly improved, if and only if the Executive and Legislative branches give greater priority to an expansionist trade policy and the Food for Peace Program.

TRADE

Fundamentally, I endorse the concept of a liberal approach to trade. I am deeply concerned by the implications of the developments affecting trade around the nucleus of the European Economic Community.

Agriculture has received entirely too little attention in negotiations for trade liberalization. Some of the attention it did receive was counterproductive—especially the international grains arrangement. An objective analysis of the results of the Kennedy Round Trade Negotiations would have to show the following:

(1) There was no amelioration in the variable levy system of the EEC. Actually, we saw it extended and given greater emphasis.

(2) No production-stimulating support price was reduced or even modified.

(3) Subsidization of exports was increased.

(4) For the modest reductions in duties negotiated, the United States "bound against increase" its duty on "canned pork"—a rapidly expanding import. It was a poor bargain.

Our experience with a Feed Grain Agreement and its complete unilateral disregard by the United Kingdom is no better than the IGA.

An objective analyst of the world agricultural commodity trading scene must conclude that:

(1) The loopholes in the GATT have been exploited by the EEC with no challenges, even from the United States.

(2) Export subsidies have been used to expand markets in violation of GATT regulations.

(3) The whole variable levy system—so damaging to our feed grain and wheat exports—is a violation of GATT principles. The United States has never challenged the legality of this technique for controlling imports.

(4) The EEC has been developing preferential "arrangements" with GATT members—in violation of the most-favored-nation principle.

As the countries involved in the special arrangements have proliferated—with no action or reaction from the United States—the number of GATT nations involved in the EEC orbit has increased. The one-country-one-vote system of the GATT makes it unlikely that the United States can win enough votes to effectively challenge these activities.

The current negotiations for expansion of the ECC, plus the special preferential arrangements already in evidence, will mean the deathknell of the most-favored-nation concept—one of the corner stones of the GATT.

The United States should immediately request a meeting with United Kingdom and EEC representatives to discuss post-IGA grain pricing—after June 30, 1971—and guaranteed market access provisions. U.S. objectives must be to reduce the grain price structures in these large importing nations and to reestablish third country access potentials based on comparative advantage.

COST MARKETS

Past mistakes have cost the United States dearly in lost markets and in payments to farmers for reduced production. The net cost to the U.S. Treasury is in the hundreds of millions of dollars. For example, since 1966–67, the United States has lost markets for over 10 million tons of coarse grains. This trend must be arrested and reversed.

The U.S. Government should announce the course it intends to pursue if policies inimical to our interests and in violation of the GATT are implemented.

This system of "early warning" has already proved successful in the case of soybeans and its products. A system of energetic defense will deter those who will try to expand the current system of gradual exclusion from overseas markets.

The U.S. Government has formally told the officials of the EEC that their proposed taxation would reduce sharply the Community's imports of oilseeds and oilseed products and would result in a massive impairment of the present market agreement under GATT. It was made clear that implementation of this policy would leave us no choice but to retaliate on a large scale against the products their countries sell us. Our retaliation might include such important European exports as automobiles, typewriters office equipment, wines and other items Americans buy from them in large amounts.

The U.S. Government is saying to the Community that what it does about its agriculture is more than an agricultural matter—it concerns the whole economy of Western Europe and the Free World. If the cost to help European agriculture is high, then let their industry pay the expense—but not ask the United States to pay it.

The U.S. Government should continue to hold the prospect of immediate U.S. retaliation against a tax on oilseed products, for this proposal is by no means dead. But I am confident that if we act forthrightly, we can continue to maintain a zero duty on soybeans and soybean meal.

PUBLIC LAW 480

Those who have studied and admired the Food for Peace Program, initiated by President Eisenhower in 1954, quickly recognized that the program had much broader significance than as a mere means of surplus disposal. It was recognized that the program could be used to advance the foreign economic policy of the United States.

On June 18, 1970 President Nixon said:

"The Food for Peace Program enables the enormous technological capability and productive capacity of American agriculture to be utilized to assist low income countries in developing their agricultural sectors, and in feeding their citizens while they still require outside help in doing so. The Administration pledges to continue its efforts toward achieving the goals of this program."

American agricultural capability is a tremendous asset to the whole Free World. In any examination we must consider how to use this to the advantage of the food-deficient developing countries. The fundamental fact is that the quantities of agricultural commodities made available on concessional terms, make capital resources available to increase not only agricultural production, but industrial production as well.

The potential advantages are great—and at little net cost to the U.S. Treasury.

There has been insufficient emphasis on the fact that the P.L. 480 Program enabled several countries importing under the concessional provisions of P.L. 480 to strengthen their economies and become some of the current major commercial importers of agricultural commodities. Also, as a part of P.L. 480 agreements, sales must be preceded by, or accompanied by, dollar imports to reflect normal purchases—the concept of "additionality."

Let's look at the record on one of two of these nations:

Japan has long been a good customer for our agricultural products. In 1957, Japan's imports of U.S. agricultural products were $135 million under P.L. 480 agreements and $322 million through commercial sales. Now, 13 years later, Japan's volume of U.S. agricultural imports has grown to $1.1 billion, all commercial sales.

Venezuela, in 1964, had P.L. 480 agricultural imports of $5.2 million with $77.6 million of commercial agricultural sales, and in 1970, their business was 100 percent commercial sales which had increased to $96.8 million.

In 1957, Spain had $141 million in P.L. 480 sales and only $12 million in commercial sales. In 1970, Spains sales were all commercial—$169 million.

Comparable success stories are in store for other nations such as Taiwan, the Philippines, Korea, and Yugoslavia.

The total story of P.L. 480 has never been told. Because of Budget Bureau limitations, the Administration is not utilizing a great basic tool of foreign aid to its full potential.

To date, the program has been considered all too narrowly by the Bureau of the Budget. The focus has been on initial outlays, and there has been no study of the long-term returns to the Treasury.

Let us examine some of the major benefits:

(1) It generates higher farm income—with increased tax receipts.

(2) It increases employment—both rural and non-farm—thus reducing welfare and unemployment insurance costs.

(3) It reduces CCC inventories and, along with that, storage and interest costs.

(4) It increases the volume of agricultural commodity processing—especially wheat to flour and soybeans to meal and oil—and increases shipments of these processed products with resultant employment increases and profits—both of which increase tax revenues.

(5) It improves the health of those who receive the foods and fosters better international relations.

I would urge President Nixon to use his authority to move larger quantities of agricultural commodities into export under the Food for Peace Program. I believe that the 1970's will see a much greater appreciation of the cost-benefit ratios of this great program.

SOVIET BLOC TRADE

Present regulations affecting sales to the Soviet bloc nations are adversely affecting export sales and our efforts to solve the balance of payments problem. Moreover, there is no indication that these regulations are preventing the Soviet bloc from obtaining needed supplies.

The present program of licensing exports of generally available agricultural commodities to the Soviet bloc is of doubtful validity.

Exports to the Soviet bloc of any agricultural commodity, except those in short supply, should be handled under general license. A "general license" is a license established by the Office of Export Control of the Department of Commerce for which no application is required, and for which no export document is granted or issued. Naturally, any exportation under this general license would be in accordance with the export regulations.

We should offer the same competitive conditions and terms as other nations in sales to the Soviet bloc. Such a policy would enable our export firms to be in the position to offer all but short-supply agricultural commodities every hour of every day.

I believe that during the 1970's the removal of this roadblock to market expansion will be accomplished.

As a member of the Senate Nutrition Committee, I have seen what malnutrition does to people. Under this Administration, government-feeding programs have been improved, and many needy people heretofore outside these programs will be reached.

The nation is now committed to a drive to eliminate hunger and malnutrition. We now have programs to do the job of providing an adequate diet for every American. We also have the will to achieve this goal within the vitality of the system that makes abundance possible.

The revised Food Stamp Program provides the means by which even the poorest of the poor can gain the buying power to obtain an adequate diet; we have a Food Donation program; we have an amended School Lunch Act to improve the nutrition of needy school children; we have a Food Certificate Program for infants and expectant mothers; and we have a Nutrition Education Program to help low income families get the most from their food dollars. We are on the right road.

I do feel confident that in the 1970's we will conquer hunger and malnutrition in this nation. While we are improving the health and well being of our neediest, we are increasing the demand for food, especially animal proteins.

CONCLUSION

Expansion of world trade, increased domestic markets, and improved nutrition at home and throughout the world will all contribute to increasing demand and production of agricultural commodities. This will be the orientation of future farm legislation.

The blueprints for this future legislation are on the drawing boards of the Joint Conference Committee of Congress, which continues its deliberation of the Agricultural Act of 1970 tomorrow morning. Through the '70's, these plans will be revised and improved.

The United States will continue to improve the well-being of its citizens, and the thrust of its international agricultural policy will be to impress on other nations the importance of stimulating markets to improve worldwide trade.

JEWS UNDER GUN IN PRAGUE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable observers of the European scene is the sage international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol. In one of his recent articles carried in the September 29 Sacramento, Calif., Union, Mr. Danielopol analyzes the recent developments in Czechoslovakia. I commend this article to the Members for its objectivity:

JEWS UNDER GUN IN PRAGUE

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—There are disturbing echoes in Czechoslovakia of Adolf Hitler's brand of anti-Semitism. Soviet-inspired propagandists now say Jews fomented the liberalization in Czechoslovakia that led to the 1968 Russian invasion.

This "revelation" came in the Soviet magazine "Tydenik Aktualit" which is published in Prague. It accuses Jews of conspiring and planning the overthrow of socialism in Czechoslovakia.

The Jews were in cahoots with espionage agencies of the United States, Britain, West Germany and Israel, according to the magazine. They plotted with "anti-Communist Czechoslovak groups," established counter-revolutionary organizations, and set up more than 30 foreign sabotage centers to support "anti-Socialist forces."

"The Israelis had the 'lion's share' of these activities," it adds.

Obviously, the Reds in Prague and Moscow still are at a loss to find a plausible excuse for the military intervention of the Warsaw Pact forces in Czechoslovakia. They have apparently fallen back on the oldest tactic of a dictator: Invent a plot, find a scapegoat and shift the blame away from the real culprit—in this case, Moscow.

The Jews are the most convenient scapegoat at hand, just as in the Hitler years.

In the meantime, the process of "normalization"—that is the eradication of every vestige of the reforms carried out in 1968—goes on relentlessly.

"Re-indoctrination" and "re-education" of students and teachers is being carried out at all levels, under the directives of hardliner Jaromir Hrbek, the Czech minister of education.

The teachers' principal task, Hrbek says, is political education and ideological work. Children literally were flooded in 1968 and 1969, Hrbek says, "with streams of lies, demagogic deception and hysterical slanders.

"The teachers should tell the children that they lied to them."

When school opened Sept. 1, some 80 per cent of the teachers had been bounced out or moved to different schools. Indoctrination is more easily done by strangers, Hrbek believes.

On Sept. 15, Junak (the Czechoslovak Scouts and Girl Guides Organization) which was revived during the Dubcek era, was disbanded. It was accused of engaging in political activities under the influence of "anti-Socialist elements."

Youths must now enroll in the Communist Party pioneer organization.

As the French say, "Plus ca change plus c'est la meme chose'—the more things change the more they remain the same.

What happens in Prague today is old hat. It happened in Hitler's Germany, in Russia, China, Cuba and other Communist countries—and it continues.

What is baffling, however, is that so many in the West, including Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany, believes communism is "maturing"—that it is changing and getting close to our free-enterprise system.

Nonsense! Communists can't afford a free-enterprise system.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, was the recipient of the 1970 National Congressional Award from the National Recreation & Park Association at its annual convention in Philadelphia, Pa. The award was personally presented to Congressman MCCLOSKEY at the convention on September 30, 1970.

The Congressional Award of the National Recreation & Park Association is in recognition of the Members of Congress who, through their responsible legislative action, have enhanced the park, recreation and conservation efforts. The selection and award to Congressman MCCLOSKEY was based upon his active support and participation in the nationwide observance of Earth Day, as well as his past record and achievements in support of conservation and improving our environment.

The award presented to our distinguished colleague reads as follows:

Despite his short time in Congress, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., of California, is considered to be one of the most qualified conservation and environmental experts in the House of Representatives. In addition to leadership roles in several crucial House floor fights, he has sponsored a number of far-reaching pollution control and conservation bills.

The Congressman's conservation record includes his sponsorship of House bills to increase the amount of funds in the land and water conservation fund; to establish a joint congressional committee on environmental quality; to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data; to create a wildlife refuge in South San Francisco Bay.

He was a leader in the fight to defeat the Timber Supply Act of 1969, and in the fight for full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act in the public works appropriation bill. In addition, he sponsored the Federal Low-Emission Vehicle Procurement Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the National Park & Recreation Association for acknowledging the work and efforts of our distinguished colleague, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, because it is this kind of national recognition which, more times than not, makes the long hours and drudgery of our legislative responsibilities well worth the effort. It is this type of recognition which gives we legislators, regardless of what field of experience, a feeling of satisfaction and accomplishment. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I personally want to pay tribute to my colleague, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, on being the recipient of this national award as one Member of the Congress of the United States who is well deserving of this recognition.

And, I want to thank you, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, for the assistance and support you have given me in our mutual efforts to bring about a greater understanding of the importance of conservation and the need to enhance and improve our environment.

DRUG PROBLEM

HON. HENRY BELLMON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, very recently. I received in the mail a questionnaire which asked the open-ended question:

Were I to be confronted by the knowledge that my child or someone else close to me was using or planned to use drugs and/or alcohol for other than medicinal or conventionally accepted reasons, I would say and/or do the following: . . .

Such a statement points only too vividly to a question which parents hope never to have to answer, and to the lack of information which I and probably most other citizens have to draw upon in the area of drug use.

As with most areas where there is lack of information, there has developed a great deal of myth and misinformation and it is due time that accurate information be made available.

Governor McCall of Oregon summed it up very well when he stated:

We are late in recognizing the seriousness of the drug problem in this country. We don't know its extent. We don't know whether drug abuse among the young will peak out next month or next decade. We know only that we must act now to prevent further abuse and to help those already affected. We know that public officials and particularly the schools must assume a great responsibility for action, even though the family, the community and the society are probably at fault.

The generation most involved have been bright, sincere, creative and sensitive people. They are the sons and daughters of every segment of American life. We have much to learn from them about ourselves.

The Governor went on to point out:

We have to clarify our intentions and our alternatives in dealing with drug abuse among the young. There is little agreement on the nature of narcotics addiction—whether it is an emotional illness or a physical disease—or on the long range effects of marijuana or hallucinating drugs. More research is needed. But we cannot wait. We must explore ways to recoup the kids who have experimented and gotten hooked. We must consider carefully and develop ways to prevent more from being affected.

It is only too clear that there is lacking, the adequate information to answer all of the questions concerning the use and misuse of drugs. Among the medical and human behavioral experts there seems to be general consensus concerning the effects of such depressants as heroin, morphine, and barbiturates. There is also a degree of consensus concerning the effects of stimulants such as cocaine. These drugs, however, are not the usual entry into the make-believe world of drugs by the novice drug user.

There is a marked lack of agreement among the experts as well as among the potential users, concerning the short- and long-range effects of hallucinogens which are frequently the entry vehicle to more extensive drug use. These relatively "mild" drugs are identified often as marihuana, hashish, LSD, or mescaline. The distortion of facts concerning these specific drugs has a twofold negative effect. First, underestimates of the deleterious effect invites use by the "thrill seeker" or the "frustration escaper." Second, it has a very damaging influence on legitimate research efforts which are directed toward the acquisition of new knowledge concerning specific drugs.

Mr. President, it is to the decreased attention to research that I would like to make special emphasis today. The National Institute of Mental Health reports expenditures of $13.9 million on research efforts for fiscal 1970. For the current fiscal year, expenditures for all Federal drug abuse programs range from $65.5 million in fiscal 1960 to $104 million in fiscal 1970 to an estimated $128 million in fiscal 1971. Of the estimated 1971 ex-expenditures, the amount going into research is $23.2 million for all Federal agencies, an expenditure level which comprises only 18 percent of the total drug abuse program. It is apparent that there is not adequate knowledge concerning drugs and that research can provide much of the needed knowledge. There is quite obviously a need for more information and better distribution of information concerning the real effects, both long and short range, of drugs which find their way to popular misuse.

Mr. President, I would encourage this body to address itself to the responsibilities of Congress in meeting this need. Further, as an emphasis as to what may be achieved in the area of drug research, Mr. President, I would direct the attention of the Senate to research conducted on the hallucinogen, hashish, by Dr. Forest Tennant, Jr. I ask unanimous consent that the report of that study as it appeared in the Stars and Stripes Saturday, October 10, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTS FIND HASHISH FAR FROM HARMLESS

(By Kay Scanlan)

BERCHTESGADEN, GERMANY.—Caution! Hashish IS dangerous to your health.

Hashish, when smoked in large quantities over an extended period of time, will produce significant and in some cases disabling physical consequences.

It can cause severe bronchitis, allergic reactions, skin problems such as acne and dandruff, and abdominal cramps and diarrhea ranging from slight to severe.

These are the findings of an 18-month-long study made by Maj. Forest Tennant Jr., surgeon, 4th Bn, 64th Armor, Aschaffenburg, and Maj. Paul Ventry, former USAREUR allergy consultant now reassigned to the States. Results of the study were presented Thursday by Dr. Tennant at the second session of the 14th annual preventive medicine conference being held at the Berchtesgadener Hof.

Out of 150 hashish users surveyed, 31 were selected to take part in the study, one of the few scientific surveys that has been made on the physical effects of smoking hashish. To be accepted in the studies, each soldier had to be smoking a minimum of four grams of hashish (about two pipe bowls full) a day for six months or longer. The average GI in the study, however, used 10 to 12 grams of hashish a day and some used up to 25 grams a day. The GIs were from 19 to 23 years of age.

TYPICAL SYMPTOMS

"We found the 'typcial guy,' the typical hashish user, had what we call the chronic hashish syndrome," Tennant said. "He had a runny nose, acne and dandruff. He was short of breath and had a chronic cough. He occasionally had hives or diarrhea.

Tennant also found that 20 out of the 31 studied had swollen uvulas (soft palate), probabaly from the many irritants contained in the hashish smoke. Many also had greenish-colored stains on thumbs and index fingers of both hands from rolling the hashish and stuffing it into the pipe. Both swollen uvulas and the stained fingers can be used by doctors trying to determine whether a person is on hashish, Tennant believes.

"Such diagnostic aids are important," he feels, "because there is no known way—such as a blood test—now available to determine whether a person is on hashish or not."

Of all the physical results of prolonged, heavy hashish smoking, Tennant believes the lung and bronchial complications are the worst.

"We found the fellows would usually have a bad cough, would be wheezing and would be short of breath about three to four months after starting heavy usage," he said.

The study showed hashish is probably far more damaging to a person's lungs than cigarettes are. According to the data, to smoke one bowl of hashish a day would damage the lungs more quickly than one pack of cigarettes a day smoked over the same number of months or years.

SEVERE BRONCHITIS

Many of the GIs were disabled from lung problems to the point where they missed work regularly and some had such severe bronchitis they had to be hospitalized. In cases when hashish consumption was decreased or stopped, the lung problems lessened or disappeared.

Tennant said hashish hasn't been used over a long enough period of time for doctors to tell what, if any, permanent lung damage takes place with prolonged use. But it would appear to be extensive.

Abdominal complications can also be severe in hashish users, the doctors discovered. Three soldiers out of the 31 in the study had to be hospitalized for abdominal cramps and diarrhea; one of the three had lost 20 pounds prior to hospitalization due to debilitating diarrhea.

AILMENTS CAUSED

"We haven't found how the hashish causes cramps and diarrhea, but our study shows it does indeed cause them," Tennant said.

While the study found that the GIs with allergic reaction were not allergic to the hashish itself, it found consumption of hashish would bring other allergies out—such as allergy to house dust or ragweed—and that hashish would make existing allergies worse.

Twenty-one of the 31 heavy users were found to have acne or dandruff problems. Although Tennant and Ventry's studies were the first to find acne and dandruff problems in hashish users, another study published in New York early this year found the same complications in marijuana users, Tennant said.

BIG PROBLEM

Tennant called the pot problem (meaning both hashish and marijuana) "one of the greatest problems facing medicine today."

The big question about the study, he added, is: "If hashish does these things, can marijuana do the same?" His answer: "Yes. We think marijuana would do the same thing over a long period of time. You just have to smoke more of it."

Hashish, he said, is prepared by scraping active resin from the tops of the female hemp plant, cannabis salvia, while marijuana is a crude preparation of the entire plant including leaves, flowers and stems.

"Since marijuana contains much lower resin content, it is five to 10 times less potent per weight than hashish. So, to have the same physical effects, you probably have to smoke more."

MARIJUANA RARE

Hashish is used in West Germany, he said, while marijuana is fairly rare. The opposite situation exists in the States, where the cost of hashish—$5 to $30 a gram, depending on the location—keeps it out of general use. A gram of hashish in Germany costs only 75 cents to $1.25 depending on location.

"The hashish we have in West Germany, usually imported from the Middle East and Mediterranean areas, is one of the heaviest in the world," Tennant said. "It gives those of us in West Germany an excellent opportunity to study the drug and its effects."

Tennant will present the study Oct. 16 at the International Congress of Allergy and Immunology to be held in Florence, Italy.

PROGRESS AGAINST THERMAL POLLUTION

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, environmental pollution, especially thermal pollution, has taken a high priority in the list of problems facing our times. It becomes significant, then, when a private firm moves to abate pollution.

A breakthrough in the abatement of thermal pollution in the Saginaw Valley has been announced at a Dow Chemical Co. plant at Midland, Mich. To encourage other efforts to reduce environmental pollution, I ask unanimous consent that the Detroit News article from Midland be printed in the RECORD.

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

DOW PLANS $7 MILLION WATER COOLING PROJECT

MIDLAND—Dow Chemical Co. says it will spend $7.2 million to build 28 cooling towers in the Saginaw Valley to cool the heated water it releases into the Tittabawassee River.

With construction of the towers over the next 30 months, Dow said it will reduce the amount of hot water it discharges into the river daily by 45 percent, or 100 million gallons.

"We are moving up on the problem that has come to be known as thermal pollution," said Harold Bosscher, Midland Division general manager.

"The towers will permit recycling of the cooling water used by 55 of our Midland production buildings."

Added to the 11 cooling towers already operated by Dow, and the 880-acre cooling pond planned for the Midland nuclear energy plant, the new towers will increase to $25 million the investment by Dow and Consumers Power Co. for keeping heat out of the Tittabawassee.

COMMERCIAL FARM POLICY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Willard Cochrane, a distinguished professor from the University of Minnesota has recently delivered an exceptional, comprehensive statement on U.S. farm policy to the American Agricultural Economics Association.

In this speech, Dr. Cochrane relates the position of American agriculture to agricultural developments in the less developed world and to various domestic problems facing the American farmer.

I commend this thoughtful speech to all Members:

[From Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station Misc. J. Series No. 7325]

AMERICAN FARM POLICY IN A TUMULTUOUS WORLD

(By Willard W. Cochrane, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota)

(NOTE.—The author wishes to thank Keith Bryant, Dale Hathaway, James Houck, Nathan Koffsky, Vernon Ruttan, John Schnittker and Louis Upchurch for helpful comments and suggestions. Errors of fact, judgment, or logic are, of course, the responsibility of the author alone.)

I

More than five years have elapsed since I last discussed farm policy with members of this Association. At the winter meetings in Chicago in 1964 I argued as follows ". . . barring a major catastrophe such as a hot shooting war or an intensification and enlargement of the present spotty drought conditions, increased agricultural productivity is going to drive farm program costs, under voluntary control programs, into direct collision with the budget limitation objectives of the urban voter within the next three to ten years. A crisis in commercial farm policy is in the making."[1]

Much has happened since the winter of 1964. India suffered through the worst drought in this century, the United States military advisory role in Vietnam escalated into a full scale war, and we now recognize that our cities are confronted with a tidal wave of problems that may engulf and destroy them. The first of these developments had the effect of greatly increasing the demand for American grain products and thus lessening the farm surplus condition in the United States for the period 1965–67; the second two developments have had the effect of greatly increasing the demands on the financial resources of the United States government, thus increasing the pressure on the farm program budget. Consequently, the collision mentioned above was first delayed a few years and now would seem to be approaching the crunch stage. But other forces, too, have been at work during the past five years, some old, some new, which have a bearing on American farm policy. And much of this paper will be concerned wtih a review and analysis of those forces.

Before we turn to a review and analysis of those forces, however, it should be pointed out that this paper is not concerned with rural affairs, rural poverty, or domestic food and nutrition policy. This paper concentrates on commercial farm policy, and assumes that these other important issues will be dealt with by other people in other settings. Commercial farm policy may, at this point in history, represent the tail of the agricultural dog. But I believe that some exciting things are happening in the world that have an important bearing on commercial agriculture and farm policy in the United States, and that these developments should be analyzed and appraised even though the importance of commercial agriculture in the general scheme of things is obviously reduced. Hence, it is appropriate, in my opinion, for some of us to spend some time tonight with an old enchantress, American commercial farm policy.

II

Dwindling Farm Population.—As is well known, the farm population of the United States has declined steadily for two decades, reaching a low of ten million lonely, frustrated souls in 1965. In percentage terms the farm population now constitutes slightly less than five percent of the total population. Using a different measure, the total number of farms in the United States had declined to just over three million in 1968, and the commercial farms (i.e., those grossing over $10,000 per year, which produce 85 percent of the product sold) had declined to approximately one million. And there is no indication that this dwindling process is coming to an end; the annual rate of outmigration from farming stood at 6.3 percent during the period 1965–68—the highest rate in history.

With these dwindling numbers, of course, has come diminished political power. The term "farm block" has been forgotten, and neither candidate in the 1968 presidential election gave a major farm speech. Farm people and rural areas still maintain a respectable degree of power in the Senate, but the political strength of farm people in the House of Representatives has declined to an extremely low level; in 1969, for example, the congressional districts which contained 25 percent or more farm population stood at only 31: the East contained none, the West 1, the South 14 and the Midwest 16.[2] And this handful of farm Congressmen (by this generous definition) are concentrated in two tiny, embattled enclaves: the Committee on Agriculture and the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

The 1970 Census is going to have two further adverse effects on the political power of farm people in the Congress. First, it is going to cause a good number of Senators, who have thought of themselves as coming from a farm state, to reassess their political stance and recognize that they really represent an urban state with an economy that is predominantly concerned with the production and distribution of industrial goods and services. Second, it is going to reduce further, through the process of redistricting, the handful of House members whose interest it is to represent the farmer. The House of Representatives, which is now overwhelmingly urban in its outlook, will be even more so by 1972. In this kind of a situation, farm people are going to find it exceedingly difficult to pass legislation that is designed to protect their economic interests, or needs, at an important cost to the nonfarm sector.

Increased Agricultural Productivity.—The overall productivity of the American farm plant has not lagged during the past decade. Total farm output increased percentage-wise by almost as much in the 1960's as it did in the 1950's: slightly over two percent per year, noncompounded, in the 1950's, and slightly less than two percent per year in the 1960's. But something new and different has occurred in the 1960's. The USDA index of production efficiency—output per unit of input—stopped rising along about 1962 and has held essentially constant since that year. Total farm output continued to increase through the 1960's by the increased application of nonfarm inputs, *not by farm technological advance.* In economic parlance, the aggregate supply curve for agriculture stopped shifting to the right in 1962, and it has become more price elastic.

One would be foolish to predict the end of the technological revolution on American farms, especially when so great a potential for increasing the efficiency of production would seem to exist in the livestock area. But if the situation of the past seven years should continue (i.e., a situation in which total output increases only as the application of production inputs increases), then some important new implications follow for farm policy. With a decline in the level of farm product prices, we would now expect the total input of productive resources in farming to decline, hence for total output to be reduced. In this situation farmers and their policy leaders are freed of the curse of a perfectly inelastic aggregate response curve, and might logically expect some corrective action to a general surplus condition from falling farm prices; namely, a contraction in aggregate output. It is just possible that *price level* changes in the future might begin to affect *aggregate output* in agriculture.

World Grain Developments.—Some exciting developments have been taking place in recent years with respect to grain production. In the hot regions of the world stretching from Morocco to the Philippines a revolution in the production of grains is taking place. To date the most spectacular developments have occurred in wheat, but there have been noteworthy gains in rice production and progress is being made in the production of other grains and legumes.[3] This revolution—the Green Revolution—has lifted the spectre of starvation from these countries and replaced it with the expectation, and a not unreasonable expectation, of improved levels of food consumption.

But like all revolutions this one too has left trouble and dislocations in its wake—political trouble and economic dislocations. The political trouble to date has been mostly internal resulting from an unequal distribution of the benefits of the production revolution, wherein the large farmers are the great income gainers and the small farmers and landless laborers are largely bypassed. The economic dislocations are beginning to occur as pockets of low-quality grains build up to surplus levels in localized producing areas, which, because of inadequate storage and marketing facilities, cannot be held, and must be squandered at home or come pouring onto the world market as distressed grain. In this context, the production gains of the developing countries will be lost in the form of low domestic and export prices, and the world market will be damaged for the other export nations.

But before we develop further what is occurring or could occur in the developing world, let's look at what has happened in the developed world. While the eyes of the world have been on the Green Revolution in the developing countries, grain production during the period 1964–68 in the developed countries—principally, Australia, Canada, the European Community and the United States—quietly, almost secretly, increased by 123 million tons, or by 25 percent. In the words of Lyle Schertz ". . . while the developed countries increased cereal output by 123 million tons, the developing countries, with twice as many inhabitants, increased cereal production only 52 million tons."[4] Increases in the developed countries included such spectacular changes as a 75 percent increase in Australian wheat production from the 1960–64 average to 1968, and a nearly 70 percent increase in United States rice production during the same period.

What we have had in the second half of the 1960's is then a great increase in world grain production, of which more than two-

Footnotes at end of article.

thirds of the increase was provided by the developed world. The result has been rising wheat stocks and declining wheat and rice prices. For example, the carryover of wheat in Canada approximated 950 million bushels in July of this year, equivalent to nearly two years disappearance.

World grain production will certainly continue to increase importantly in the decade of the 1970's, in which that increase is shared in some unknown proportions between the developed and developing worlds, but in which the sharing roles may well be reversed from that of the decade of the 1960's. Given this situation, we can expect (1) average diets in the developing countries to improve slowly, (2) for the United States to lose much of its P.L. 480 market and for that part of the P.L. 480 market which remains to become increasingly unstable, (3) for pockets of surpluses to accumulate intermittently in the developing countries and to come gushing onto the world market as distressed grain, (4) for wheat, rice and possibly other grain stocks to increase further, (5) for world grain prices to continue to sag, and (6) for world grain prices to behave chaotically as distressed grain supplies from the developing countries gushes onto the world market, and as the developed countries succumb to the temptation to employ export subsidies and dump surplus stocks on a thin international market. For Westerners it is not a pretty picture to contemplate. But in large measure they created it, hence they cannot complain too bitterly when the developing countries add the finishing touches in the 1970's.

Urban Demands on the Federal Budget.— As everyone sitting in this room knows, our cities are falling apart: We can't dispose of human wastes in a satisfactory manner; we can't dispose of our garbage; we can't eliminate the smoke and the smog; and we can't control crime and violence. We need new and improved educational services, airport services, police services, rapid transit services, park and recreation services and all kinds of housing; and most of all we need to discipline ourselves. As urban dwellers we have squandered our rising incomes on automobiles, durables, roads and single unit houses, and let the service systems that hold cities together go begging. We have not been willing to pay the price to build and maintain the service systems—police, welfare, educational, sewage, public transportation—required by a complex, opulent modern urban society; we have in effect, been living beyond our means. Hence, our cities are in disarray and disrepair.

Now we must dig down in our collective pockets and find the money to repair and build the urban service systems so long neglected. And only the federal government has the power and the prestige to raise the funds required to do this job of rebuilding and repairing our cities. This in turn means to me higher taxes for everyone (a reduced level of gadget living), and a new set of priorities in the use of existing federal revenues. In this connection I do not suggest that the President and the Congress look first at the USDA; my first candidate for budget scrutiny is the Defense Department. But I am also certain that any serious effort to re-establish national priorities and to redirect patterns of federal spending in line with those priorities by an urban society, through the instrument of an urban Congress, will have some negative effects on farm policy goals and federal spending in agriculture. The pressure to find funds to cope with the problems of the cities in the 1970's is going to be terrific.

Pollution and Environmental Control.— Many of the issues that might be discussed in this section are closely related to, or are indeed a part of, the plight of the cities (e.g., smog and its control). But I will not be concerned with those aspects of pollution and environmental control in this section; I will be concerned with the polluting effects of some of the inputs now regularly employed in agricultural production. What, for example, are the polluting effects of the hard chemicals now commonly used in fertilizers and pesticides. As I understand it, some experts are of the view that the chemical nutrients from commercial fertilizers found in the water run-off from farm lands are seriously polluting our ponds, lakes and rivers. It is further held, that many pesticides are injurious to various species of wildlife, and that some pesticides are harmful to man himself.[5]

I am not sure how far this line of argument will carry us in the next decade, but I do know that it has now passed out of the exclusive hands of the naturalists and bird-watchers and into first the researches and debates of recognized scientists and second into the difficult realm of public control and political action. The uncertain state of affairs with respect to that "uninvited additive" DDT is, for example, summarized in a November 1969 issue of *Science*. I quote briefly from the *Science* article:

"What appears to be shaping up is a battle over the issue of 'zero tolerance' for DDT—in effect, a ban on the pesticide.

Aligned against (the current official government view) are conservationists and scientists active in the cause of environmental protection. They regard DDT as a primary enemy because of its persistence in the food chain. To justify their apocalyptic vision they cite the damage to some species of animals, birds, and fish that has already been traced to DDT and the ominous reports of tests on lab animals. . . .

Still unsettled, of course, are the arguments as to whether carcinogenesis is 'dose related' and whether causing cancer in small animals with a chemical substance proves there is real danger for humans. . .

Other practical questions seem to defy categorical answers. Farmers, particularly in the cotton belt, are reportedly worried about finding a replacement pesticide that matches DDT's long-lasting, broad-spectrum action and its low cost. Partisans of DDT argue that studies by the World Health Organization show there is no practical substitute for DDT in malaria control in underdeveloped countries. The question of whether DDT might be replaced by biological controls or other pesticides or by a combination of these elicits conflicting answers from responsible scientists. And these conflicts help to explain the difficulty of carrying out a satisfactory risk-benefit analysis of DDT use."[6]

Now if it turns out during the next decade that we learn that some of the chemicals regularly used in fertilizers and pesticides constitute a serious threat to man and his environment, and society takes action to restrict or eliminate their use, such action would have important implications for agriculture and the production of food. Restricting or banning the use of low priced fertilizers and pesticides now regularly used in farm production would act to dampen down food production and hence raise food prices as either (1) those output increasing inputs were banned from use on the part of farm producers, or (2) more expensive, but environmentally safe, substitutes were developed for use in food production. Either way, the goal of a safe, clean environment would have the effect of increasing the cost of producing food, reducing food supplies and increasing food prices.

Again I am too much of a layman in this area of pollution and environmental control to have strong opinions regarding desirable courses of action, but I do know that the environmentalists have won an increasing number of battles, and my intuition tells me they are going to win a lot more during the next decade. If this is the case, we may be entering a new era in agriculture: one which continues to rely heavily on science and technology, but one in which the adverse consequences of new technologies to man and his environment are largely neutralized. In this kind of situation I would expect technological advances in agriculture to come more slowly, at greater cost to society, and hence result in a slower rate of agricultural output expansion and possibly a slowly rising level of food prices.

It is just possible that the period of easy output expansion based on rapid technological advance in which man took no account of the consequences of technological developments to his environment is coming to an end. This is so, because man is now beginning to take account of those consequences and counteract them *even though it costs him to do so.*

III

From our discussion of the important forces at work in American society and farm economy, what can we say about the economic and social milieu of the 1970's in which American farm policy will be reassessed and possibly reformulated. It seems clear to me that world grain prices will exert a strong downward pressure on grain prices in the United States, and, through the process of substitution, falling grain prices will result in a general lowering of farm prices in the United States in the early 1970's an increased accumulation of commodity stocks and increased program costs. Confronted with these developments farmers will lack the political power to strengthen their programs, increase program costs and maintain farm incomes. In fact, mounting pressures in urban areas to cope with the formidable problems of those areas could contribute to a weakening of commodity programs in agriculture at the very time that farm prices and incomes are falling.

I am not predicting the complete dismantling of farm programs of price and income support in the early 1970's, but it does seem realistic to me to expect the financial support of commodity programs in agriculture to be reduced, perhaps only a little, perhaps a great deal, in the first half of the 1970's. And this could have disastrous price and income consequences for commercial farmers in the United States, as they and other farmers around the world struggle against growing grain surplus.

Now, of course, another great drought in India, a war between India and Red China or a big war in the Middle East could change drastically the potential developments sketched above. But barring such contingencies, the middle 1970's could well look like the farm price trough of the mid 1890's and for somewhat the same reasons—a world surplus of grain created by the farmers of the new world, plus those in the now developing world. But those American farmers who ride out this crisis-still-to-be may discover that a new set of forces is emerging to control their destiny. This new set of forces would operate to protect and improve man's environment, to render technological developments more sophisticated and more costly, to increase the cost of producing food, to slow the rate of output expansion and to drive farm prices upward. This, indeed, would be a new era for farmers of the developed world.

IV

For the remainder of this paper I will be discussing *what ought to be* the programmatic features of American Farm Policy in the 1970's. But I shall break this discussion into two parts: *What ought to be* in terms of the immediate future of 1970–71, *and what ought to be* in terms of the middle run of 1971–80. And for purposes of this paper I assume that once again I am playing the role of an economic advisor to

Footnotes at end of article.

the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, I assume (1) that I have someone to whom to give advice, and (2) that I am a part of the established political process. Hence, I am concerned here with the "art of the possible"—not with some concept of perfection.

I use the Agricultural Act of 1965 as a point of departure in the current setting, because on balance it has more good features than bad. It has provided price and income stability and support for all of commercial agriculture without forcing any farmer to accept compulsory supply management; it has provided supplementary income to a large number of small to medium-sized farmers who have participated in the voluntary programs; it has moved commodity price support levels close to world market price levels and thus facilitated the export of American farm products without the use of subsidy; and it has assured American consumers an adequate supply of food, including food reserves, at reasonable prices. In the main, it has been a good program.

The principal inadequacies of the program are two in number: (1) its high costs (gross federal expenditures for commodity programs together with related price, income and disposal programs approximated $6.2 billion in fiscal 1969), and (2) its inequitous treatment of many persons involved in farm production. For example, large producers of cotton and wheat receive large income supplements under the program, while hired farm workers in all commodity lines are forgotten. If the above two inadequacies could be eliminated, or minimized, then a good piece of farm legislation could be converted into an excellent one.

I also suggest beginning with the Agricultural Act of 1965 for two practical reasons. First, although I am convinced that a farm program budget crunch is coming, it still has not arrived. Thus, there is time in 1970–71, to work with the Act of 1965 and try to moderate its more objectionable features, namely, high cost and the inequitous treatment of farm people. Second, the downward slide of world grain prices has already started, and there is need (a) to provide price and income support for American grain producers and (b) to continue to hold idle the approximate 60 million acres now under government programs.

In my view, the place to begin with the inequity problem, as well as the cost problem, under the Act of 1965, is with the size of payments made to producers of cotton, wheat and feed grains. But before we recommend a ceiling payment limit for commodity payments, it is important to recognize two important characteristics of those payments. First, in 1968 less than five percent of all payments received by farmer participants were $5,000 or more, and less than two percent were $10,000 or more. Second, payments were made for essentially two purposes: (a) to control production and (b) to supplement incomes, although these different purposes are not overtly recognized in the legislation. Secretary Hardin has estimated that in the case of feed grains almost 90 percent of the payments were made to control production, whereas in wheat only 50 percent were made for this purpose and in cotton only 35 percent were made for this purpose.[7] Thus, it should be possible to remove the inequitous situation at the upper end of the income scale in cotton, wheat and feed grains, and reduce program costs, at least modestly, by placing a ceiling on payments to farmers in these commodities without seriously damaging the supply management aspects of the programs.

In this matter I shall follow the lead of my former colleague, John Schnittker, and recommend a ceiling on payments of $10,000 per farm per commodity program.[8] This means, according to Walter Wilcox, that in 1968 some 15,097 cotton producers, 5,428 feed grain producers and 4,861 wheat producers would have been affected by a ceiling of $10,000, since they received payments on those commodities in excess of $10,000.[9]

These 25,386 producers received payments totaling $515 million in 1968. But placing a ceiling of $10,000 on the payments received per farm per program does not mean, for several reasons, that program savings to the government would be equal to $515 million. In the first place, we would expect and want a high proportion of the larger producers to remain in the commodity programs up to the ceiling payment limits to help achieve the supply management objectives of the programs. To this end, I recommend the further program provision that each producer, now receiving a payment in excess of $10,000 for removing from production a specific acreage allotment based on his total acreage, be required to remove from production that same acreage allotment for a total payment limited to $10,000. This means, of course, that payment rates for removing an acre from production would in effect be reduced to large producers, and the larger the producer the smaller would be his payment rate for removing an acre from production. As a consequence of the operation of this provision very few producers of feed grains now receiving payments in excess of $10,000 would remain in the program, but for cotton and wheat probably all but the very largest producers would remain in the acreage removal program for the reduced payment rates. This follows from the fact that payment rates in feed grains are set at levels just high enough to induce producers to remove acres from production, whereas in cotton and wheat payment levels far exceed rates required to induce producers to take acres out of production.

To maintain the same level of acreage control in feed grains, and possibly wheat, it would be necessary then to remove from production some additional acres on farms of participants falling below the $10,000 ceiling and/or drawing some currently non-participating farmers into the program, to offset the acres lost to the program from the imposition of a payment ceiling.[10] Thus, it might be necessary to develop some kind of special payment provisions for feed grains and wheat to selectively expand the number of acres removed from production on farms that fall within the $10,000 ceiling limit. Taking into account, then, various provisions that would be necessary to achieve the supply management objectives of the current commodity programs, it seems unlikely that program savings to the government would exceed $250 million, and it is more probably that they would not exceed $200 million. However, a $200 million saving is not to be scorned.

Several further comments relating to the payment limitation recommendation are in order at this point. First, to achieve the cost reduction and equity objectives of the payment limitation provision the government would need to administer the provision with care and vigor so as to prevent large operating units from being divided into smaller units, under some new ownership status, wherein the newly divided and now smaller units became eligible for the full payment rate. Clearly, if the latter were permitted to occur the equity and savings objectives of the payment limit provision would be circumvented. Second, actions comparable to that recommended above for cotton, wheat and feed grains should be worked out and placed in operation in other program areas in which payments are made (e.g., wool, sugar and conservation). Third, since the very low income farmer and farm worker have been overlooked so often in the past, it would be appropriate for the savings effected by the payment limitation provision to be devoted to programs aimed at helping the very poor in rural areas (e.g., low-cost housing, job training, public works and welfare type payments).

The Agricultural Act of 1965 is silent on the question of protection for hired farm workers, as are all previous pieces of farm legislation dealing with protection for American farmers and farm people. Thus, I argue here, as President Johnson's Food and Fiber Commission did argue, that "Rural workers should have protection equal to that of urban workers in such important areas as workman's and unemployment compensation, Social Security, collective bargaining and minimum wages."[11] It is my recommendation that the Agricultural Act of 1965 be amended to include, or a companion piece of legislation be enacted to include, the following mandatory provisions: (1) that farm workers not be denied by Federal or State exemptions the benefits of policies and standards that are deemed to be in the interests of other wage earners; (2) that farm workers be included under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act to the extent feasible, and wherever necessary, to achieve equivalence of personal and social protection for those workers; and (3) that farm workers be covered under minimum wage legislation.

To contribute to the passage of legislation that would provide this kind of protection to hired farm workers, organized labor should make its support of farm legislation involving price and income support to producers conditional on the inclusion of the provisions listed above. Urban and labor representatives in the Congress now have the political power to include these farm worker provisions in farm legislation; if they are not included soon we will all know that labor leaders and urban leaders have no more concern for the downtrodden in agriculture than did the old style farm leaders.

Since it seems likely that other farm product prices (e.g., oilseeds, beans, and peas, livestock and livestock products) would follow grain prices down in the domestic market as world grain prices decline, and we should have learned by now that isolated attempts by farmers to maintain prices through withholding products from markets are ineffective, it would seem wise to consider other means for assisting farmers to stabilize product prices on the domestic scene. In this connection, I recommend that Marketing Orders be reexamined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and promoted with producer groups whose products are destined primarily for the domestic market (e.g., eggs, pork, potatoes). I am not suggesting that the public interest be ignored in efforts to assist producer groups to develop Marketing Orders to regulate the flow of products to market and thereby stabilize prices. But I am suggesting that the USDA seek more inclusive enabling legislation with respect to Marketing Orders and then assist producer groups to develop Orders and place them in operation where the majority of the producers want such programs.

Marketing Orders have definite limitations. They cannot control production over long periods of time. But they can regulate the flow of supplies to market during a particular production period, and thereby help regularize the operation of a market and stabilize prices. Thus, wisely used, Marketing Orders can assist farmers to market their products and bargain for price and handling advantages.

These are the principal program modifications, or provisions, in the Agricultural Act of 1965 that I would press strongly for inclusion at the present time. But there are other modifications to the Act of 1965 that would be desirable. One such change would involve the elimination of backdoor program financing through the Commodity Credit Corporation; each commodity program should be required to operate within a fixed appropriation; such a change would force the USDA to make more reliable estimates of program costs and give the Presi-

Footnotes at end of article.

dent more control over fiscal operations of the Federal government. Another change would include an expansion of the Long-Range Land Retirement program; such a program would contribute to overall supply management, improved land use and, if properly designed, be made to contribute to the establishment of parks, wildlife sanctuaries and open space needs of various kinds.

Finally, let me say in this discussion of a desirable farm program for the early 1970's, that I have assumed the continuance of P.L. 480 operations. I would expect such operations to decline steadily throughout the 1970's as the result of the grain production development in the less developed countries. The continued loss of this "market" is probably the principal way that the projected world grain surplus will be converted into growing grain stocks in the United States and an increased downward pressure on domestic grain prices. But so long as the surplus grain producing capacity of the United States can be used effectively to provide food supplies to deficit areas through the mechanism of P.L. 480—that mechanism should be maintained to help both the United States and the food deficit countries.

v

I am not convinced, however, that the conditions which made possible the kind of farm program described above will continue through the middle 1970's, hence that the kind of overall program outlined above can be maintained. I expect, first, that grain production in both the developed and the developing countries will continue to increase relative to population growth, and that the P.L. 480 program of the United States will wither away concurrently with an intensified drive from commercial export sales on the part of both developed and less developed countries. In this situation how is the excess production capacity in the United States, now centered to an important degree in wheat, to be handled? I cannot say exactly how it will be handled (assuming that I am correct about the future state of affairs), but before it is handled satisfactorily, I am certain that it will have transformed itself into drastically lower wheat prices and/or surplus stocks, lower feed grain prices and/or surplus stocks and lower livestock and livestock product prices.

I expect, second, that the pressure to "do-something" about the problems of the cities will become intense during the early and middle 1970's. An urban dominated Congress and an urban elected President are going to turn every existing civilian program upside down, and possibly even the defense program, to shake out some spare dollars to support new programs to build and rebuild the service-systems in the cities, before they further increase taxes. The President and the Congress will probably end up both shaving money off of old programs and further increasing taxes to meet the crisis of the cities. But in this process, I feel certain that the financial support of farm programs will be pruned severely.

How is this budget cutting in Agriculture likely to occur? It could occur in one of two ways: a rational way and an irrational way. The rational way would involve the Office of the President, including the Bureau of the Budget, *forcing* the USDA to reduce the cost of farm programs by say one billion dollars, and working with the USDA to effect that reduction in the least disruptive ways. The irrational way would involve an uprising on the floor of the House of Representatives in which urban Congressmen slash a billion dollars or two from the Department of Agriculture's appropriation bill, and then the House and Senate agree on some sort of a compromise in conference. What would get slashed and how much through this meat-axe operation is anyone's guess, but it would most likely be larger than budget cuts initiated by the Office of the President, and it would certainly be unpredictable in its program consequences. It is likely to happen on the floor of the House, because, with the last handful of farm congressmen concentrated in the Agricultural Committee and the sub-committee on Agricultural Appropriations, it could not happen in the deliberations of those committees, and because the House more accurately reflects the urban dominance of the country than does the Senate.

The remainder of this section will be concerned with the kind of farm program for commercial farmers that might be worked out between the White House and the Department of Agriculture, where the Bureau of the Budget acting for the President takes the lead in reducing farm program expenditures. I will not concern myself with the kind of farm program that might emerge following a major slashing of funding support on the floor of the House; I do not because I have no idea what form those reductions might take with what consequences, except that I believe that magnitudes of such cuts would be large indeed and the consequences chaotic. And that brings to fore one of the purposes of this paper—it is to advise farm people and farm leaders that they would be most unwise to sit, like ducks on a pond, with respect to farm program costs, and wait to be blown out of the water. The wise course of action for farm people, it seems to me, involves (1) coming to understand and appreciate the forces—economic and political—which have come to bear on the commercial farm program, (2) disciplining themselves to take those actions required to survive the brunt of those forces, and (3) working with the leadership in the Department of Agriculture and the Office of the President to carry out those actions in the farm economy.

Given the requirement that farm program costs must be cut significantly, one way to proceed might be as follows. The decision could be made to place a ceiling on payments per farm per program at $5,000; reduce payment rates to cotton and wheat producers (I would suggest that the market certificate value of a bushel of wheat be reduced by one-third, and that the price-support payment rate on a pound of cotton be reduced by one-half); and lower levels of price support by 10 to 20 percent depending upon the state of the international commodity markets for cotton, wheat and feed grains.

Such actions would have a number of sought after effects. The limiting of payments per farm per program would still leave over 95 percent of all participants unaffected. Taking account of the $5,000 payment ceiling on all three commodities, and of the reduced payment rates for wheat and cotton on one hand, and the additional acreages that would need to be signed up under the wheat and feed grain programs to realize the same level of total production control on the other, budget savings to the federal government could run to one billion dollars or more. There should be no trouble in obtaining the additional acres removed from production at the lower levels of price support. And we would not expect cotton production to increase as the result of released acres under the $5,000 payment ceiling, since cotton payments are made primarily to supplement incomes, not control production.

There is, of course, one great disadvantage to commercial farmers from the actions suggested above; they would cut gross farm income drastically. The reduction in gross farm income in total from the above set of programmatic decisons could run as high as 5 billion dollars per year depending on the extent of the decline in the level of price support. Such a decline in total gross receipts is not something that farmers or their leaders would care to think about. And it is not suggested here as something desirable; it is suggested only as one possible way to live with a White House request for a significant cut in the agricultural budget concurrent with a deteriorating level of world grain prices.

This might or might not be the end of the story. If the reduced levels of price support for the United States were at or near world levels then cotton, wheat and feed grains could compete effectively for export markets without an export subsidy, and farm program costs would not start rising again either in the form of an export subsidy or storage costs. But if the suggested reductions in the levels of price support for cotton, wheat and feed grains were not sufficient to permit the domestic prices of those commodities to decline to world levels, then program costs would begin to rise again and offset, or possibly wipe out, the reductions in program costs discussed above.

Given this kind of a world grain situation, or even prior to it, the United States might join with other developed grain exporting nations in an attempt to reduce the total flow of grains onto the world market. Rarely have international commodity arrangements aimed at controlling, or managing, marketable supplies met with success, but in the desperate situation postulated here attempts in this direction would certainly be tried, and it is always possible that an agreement could be worked out among grain exporters from the developed countries that would meet with some success. In this connection, the International Coffee Agreement, currently in force should prove to be a valuable experiment in international efforts to stabilize and enhance export earnings for a commodity subject to fluctuating prices and chronic surplus production.

I have not suggested that the less developed countries be included in such a grains arrangement, since in almost all cases they lack the administrative machinery, the financial resources and the storage and handling facilities to withhold supplies from the market either before or after the act of production. There are, however actions that the developed countries might take in cooperation with the developing countries, that would be helpful in diverting localized, or pocket, surpluses in the developing countries from the world market.

It is reasonable to expect some part of a localized grain surplus in a developing country to move onto the world market, in spite of the fact that many people in that country are suffering from poor diets or are actually hungry, because the transport and the distribution systems tend to be directed toward the seaport cities rather than toward interior points. Hence, it is easier in a developing country to move a grain surplus from a local area into export than it is to distribute it to needy people within the country. Thus, any help that the United States and other developed countries provided potential exporters of grain among the developing countries to improve their internal transport systems, storage facilities and capability with regard to food distribution would operate to reduce the irregular flow of grains onto the export market, as well as contribute to the steady improvement of diets in those countries. Along parallel lines, any help that the United States and other developed countries might provide potential exporters of grains among the developing countries to develop a broiler industry, a dairy industry and possibly other livestock industries would operate to improve the world market for grains.

If, despite realistic internal farm program actions and external commodity arrangements, the situation continues to be one in which world grain and related commodity prices are well below domestic price support levels, and the domestic pressure on the farm budget continues, then farm policy leadership in the United States may be forced to take a step that has not seriously been considered for over 40 years. The United

States might be forced to give up its historic policy of supporting farm prices through production control or supply management, and seek to maximize the export of farm commodities in a completely uncontrolled world market. This would become necessary, first, because national budget policy would not provide sufficient funds to meet the storage and commodity program costs under voluntary programs that would result from the agricultural situation postulated here; and, second, because the United States would find itself in the impossible position of trying to support world farm commodity prices by controlling, or reducing, production within its borders alone. In such a policy situation, the United States would be forced into a position of further curtailing production at home and experiencing a reduction in farm commodity exports, even as competing nations were increasing production and exports.

Given such a development it might be wise for the United States to take the following policy actions. First, eliminate all price support operations and voluntary production control programs, and let domestic commodity prices move to world levels. Second, pursue vigorous, but nonsubsidized export policies, and seek to maximize the volume of farm commodity exports from the United States. Third, use commodity program funds available to domestic agriculture from the federal government to make parity wage payments to commercial farm producers. Parenthetically, I do not have a specific program in mind for measuring and distributing these parity wage payments, but they should be made, insofar as funds permit, to commercial farm producers to bring the annual wage of each commercial farm producer up to the average income level of managers of small businesses (e.g., a plumbing establishment, or farm machinery outlet). Fourth, wait for high input prices in conjunction with low farm commodity prices around the world to slow down the rate of aggregate output expansion, or possibly contract it, and thereby cause the general level of grain prices, and commodity substitutes, to start moving upward once again.

Since I am not omniscient, I cannot attach specific years to the story of grain surplus conditions and farm budget stringency that has unfolded here, but in general terms I have been talking about a process that might involve five to ten years, hence involve a part or all of the decade of the 1970's. But I would be surprised if the process described at some length here extended beyond a ten year period. I say this not because I think the squeeze on the farm budget from the urban sector will suddenly disappear. It won't; it will be with us for a long time to come.

It will be the stagnancy of farm production efficiency, touched upon early in this paper, in conjunction with the consequences of environmental control that will turn the trick. If the rate of farm technological advance in the developed countries remains slow because either the easy technological developments have been creamed off, or efforts to protect and improve man's environment force farm producers to employ more costly production methods, then increased food production in the aggregate must be achieved primarily through the employment of more non-farm produced inputs, and more costly inputs. Given this situation, low farm product prices should bring about a reasonably quick adjustment, namely, a reduced rate of increase in food production.

VI

In conclusion, let me say that I can already hear some of you saying—"What a fairy tale!" And perhaps it is. But let me make these additional comments. The farm policy conclusions and recommendations in the latter part of this paper stem in large measure from the nature of the forces described in the early part of the paper, *and the continuance of those forces into the 1970's.* If the forces, as described, were and are meaningful and relevant then the policy discussion is meaningful and relevant.

Of course, any one of the forces described could, and probably will, develop in some way different from that suggested by me, becoming more or less intense or more or less applicable. For example, the tendency for farm production efficiency in the aggregate to hold constant could well change in the 1970's. Perhaps a whole new complex of improved technologies is just around the corner, and the index of production efficiency will shoot upward again in the 1970's. But, if such a development actually occurs, Cochrane's fairy tale could be transformed into a nightmare for American farmers. Or maybe the farm budget crunch will never really take place; one of my most respected economist friends tells me that it won't. In this event, the policy story developed in this paper is far too pessimistic. Thus, each of you can and will make your own corrections to, and adjustments of, the forces described in this paper, and to an important degree the policy conclusions and recommendations change accordingly.

For myself, I have formulated and described the important forces bearing on American farm policy as I see them in 1970, and as I think they are most likely to develop through the 1970's. Given, then, this set of forces, some economic analysis and my own value system, I have developed for you a farm policy analysis which might just have considerable meaning for the 1970's.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Some Observations of an Ex Economic Advisor: Or What I learned in Washington, *JFE*, Vol. 47, No. 2, May 1965, p. 460.

[2] *Congressional Quarterly*, June 27, 1969, page 1137.

[3] For a good summary of this production revolution in grains, as well as its export implications, see the article "U.S. Export Potentials and the Green Revolution," by Ralph W. Cummings, Jr. *Farm Program Choices*, CAED Report 35, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa, 1970.

[4] "The Green Revolution: Production and World Trade," *Columbia Journal of World Business*, Vol. V., No. 2, March-April 1970.

[5] For a balanced approach to this controversial subject see *Agriculture and the Quality of Our Environment*, Nyle C. Brady, Editor, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., 1967.

[6] John Walsh, "Environment: Focus on DDT, the 'Uninvited Additive,'" *Science*, Vol. 166, November 21, 1969.

[7] Statement by the Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, before the Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Washington, D.C., June 4, 1969.

[8] In a statement presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate, Washington, D.C., February 24, 1970.

[9] *Economic Aspects of Farm Program Payment Limitations*, Legislative Reference Service, The Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., November 6, 1969.

[10] I ignore cotton in connection with production control, since it is not clear that the program is, in fact, controlling cotton production; payments in cotton may be serving to hold production up to the control limits rather than down to them. Thus, there is no realistic possibility of cotton production increasing with the imposition of payment ceilings as envisaged here. There is, however, the problem of the so called "snap-back" provision. Unless this provision is repealed, program costs to the government might rise, rather than fall, with the imposition of a payment limitation for cotton. But we assume here that the "snap-back" provision would be repealed without going into a lengthy discussion of this special treatment for cotton.

[11] Report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber, Washington, D.C., July 1967, page 119.

THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, trying to sum up the 91st Congress as we recess until after the 1970 elections is like trying to review a murder mystery without reading the final chapter. The plot has been partly unraveled, the victim has been identified, and we have a good idea who did it.

What we will not know until after election day is whether the culprit is going to get away with his alibi or whether he will be caught, convicted, and properly punished.

The victim, as usual, is the American voter. The people of this country, just 21 months ago, put President Nixon in the White House and made it pretty plain that they wanted some changes made. The President responded with the most comprehensive and fundamental program of reform and redirection of national priorities the United States has seen since the early New Deal.

This Congress has not murdered the Nixon program. Neither has it breathed legislative life into it as a whole. It has merely muddled along, unable to finish its business even at this late hour, unwilling to face the electorate with a clean-cut record of having accepted or rejected the initiatives of a Republican administration and let the voters act accordingly.

The Democrats, I say with due respect, have the power in this Congress and must bear the responsibility. They have controlled the Congress for 36 of the past 40 years and continuously since 1955, under both Republican and Democratic Presidents. If the American people will consider what has happened in the last 15 years under Democratic Congresses, the chances of a Republican 92d Congress will surely soar.

Mr. Speaker, while this is the season to speak with partisan vigor, and I shall, fairness requires me to say that so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, the Democratic leadership in this Congress has upheld the Republican President in his efforts to bring the Southeast Asia war to an honorable end, to prevent a renewal of large-scale fighting in the Middle East, and to maintain a decisive defense posture for the United States while seeking to reduce tensions wtih our potential adversaries. I wish that I could commend the other body with equal sincerity on this score.

But in the very important sphere of domestic concerns, the Democratic leadership of this Congress has failed to measure up to the needs of the Nation in its support of President Nixon's reform program. It goes without saying that a new Administration would do better with a compatible Congress of its own party, as has usually been the case in our history.

Back in August, when we took a long recess which we supposed would be the last one of this session, I noted that of 100 major legislative requests which we had received from the White House, only 39 had been finally acted upon by the Congress—not always favorably—with five more pending in conference. Thus a total of 56 items remained unfinished business 6 weeks ago.

Since then we have disposed of a few more—notably the organized crime bill with important antibombing amendments—but half of President Nixon's priority requests will still be facing the lameduck session when we return after election day. Fully one-quarter of them have not been acted upon by either body, seven have passed the House only and 10 others the Senate only. A dozen remain in the conference stage.

It is conceivable—though not very likely—that after reading the election returns we will come back in November to buckle down and deal with all these key portions of the Nixon program. What is certain is that we should have done so by now, one way or another, to give the voter a clear choice for the next Congress. Instead the Democratic majority decided to duck lamely.

Now we must wait to see whether the American people will see through this transparent alibi and hold the real culprits—the Democratic majority in this Congress—accountable at the polls. The final chapter in this whodunit will be read November 4.

Personally, I would not want to predict the end of the story, but I will share with you the year-old observations of a prominent Democratic prophet who is currently trying to prove he is not without honor in his own house. In September 1969 columnist Marquis Childs quoted former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey as follows:

In 1970 President Nixon can go to the country with the same battle cry that President Truman used in 1948. He can talk about the legislative failures of a Congress with solid Democratic majorities. The President has put one program after another up to you and you haven't acted. He can appeal for the election of Republicans to help him get his programs through. And if the Republicans make substantial gains in the Senate and the House the chances for a Democrat winning in 1972 will be a lot worse than they are today. Unless the record of Congress improves in the second session and unless the Democratic Party gets behind its own legislative program, I can see Nixon aiming a campaign at the "90 worst" Congress just as Truman went after the "80 worst" Congress and won against all the odds.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

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

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

How long?

RETIREMENT OF CROPLAND

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, on August 5, 1970, during floor consideration of H.R. 18546, I offered an amendment to the committee bill. My amendment, which was printed on page 27496 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would have permitted the long-term retirement of up to 6 million acres of cropland a year for 3 years, or a total of 18 million acres.

I was pleased to have the support of several of my colleagues for my amendment. The purpose of the amendment was to make possible the conservation and economic use of land and to assist farmers who because of advanced age, poor health, or other reasons, desire to retire from farming. We did not intend to disturb the grazing balance or to waste taxpayer dollars. Even those who spoke against the amendment admitted that it had appeal. However, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture had made clear that all amendments would be vigorously opposed and my amendment suffered the same fate as all others; namely defeat.

During the committee consideration of the House-passed bill in the Senate, language similar to my amendment was offered and agreed upon. The Senate passed the bill with such language contained therein, and I was optimistic that it would be retained. But, I find that the conference committee has agreed to drop this language and I regret that action.

The American Farm Bureau Federation had supported a long-range retirement program of 50 million acres. The original U.S. Department of Agriculture bill called for an increase in cropland conversion of four times the present amount. We need land retirement to help fight pollution and to preserve nature. We need it to assist smaller farmers to give up some of their land and to be able to retire on what is left. Our cropland adjustment programs have experienced an average cost to the Government of about $20 an acre. This is probably as economical a resource adjustment as can be feasible under any of the governmental efforts. And we do have programs in existence. The machinery is now available to operate such a program and we have failed to take this action which at a reasonable cost would permit the conservation and improvement of natural resources, soil, water and woodland, and provide more opportunities for recreation, improve wildlife habitat, and help abate pollution, as well as enable many farmers who need to retire from farming but are unable to do so without assistance to make a graceful and dignified retirement possible.

I am hopeful that at an early time next year, the Congress will take favorable action on this proposal.

CREATING DISORDERS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Sklenar, editor of the Des Plaines Valley News, is a veteran journalist who in his career has had experience in every phase of news gathering.

Therefore, his penetrating comments on the relationship between disorders and the media merits review. The article appeared in the Thursday, October 1, Des Plaines Valley, Ill., News.

The article follows:

CREATING DISORDERS

(By Harry Sklenar)

Vice President Agnew called attention to the public to distortions of information in the press and on TV and became a national figure because of his criticisms. As the nation observes Newspaper Week, the topic of distortion should be reviewed.

It becomes clear that when reporters of TV networks and their cameramen are "invited" to a demonstration prior to its occurrence, objectivity is lost, for the demonstaration is then "staged" as a play or drama and biased reporting results.

How the general public views the situation thus can be manipulated to fit the sensational image, thus coloring the information to fit the newspaper bias, or the TV station demand for live action.

Several instances where dissent blossomed into riots due to the presence of invited TV cameramen and news photographers were observed by this writer and is a convincing argument that minor episodes can escalate into violence at the wave of the TV camera crew, or sometimes at their direction.

Since foreign newspapers draw largely upon facts as presented by American newspapers, the image presented may be decidedly negative in relation to what really happened.

Take a few examples. On Sept. 24, 1969, TV cameramen and Milwaukee news reporters were invited to a staged burning of draft induction office records. Action was not started until cameramen and reporters arrived. On the following day, a protest "demonstration" took place in a Milwaukee Catholic church where the same individuals that burned the draft records again were filmed in a "pulpit protest." Now no action occurred until the cameramen were present.

In both "incidents," why hadn't the police or federal authorities been notified, too? Or was the urge for some sensational action dominating the reporting?

Incidentally, the draft records burning characters were convicted for their offense and jailed.

In certain instances, the demonstrations were called off simply because not enough reporters or TV cameramen were present as evidenced when a noted Chicago teen gang leader called a "press conference" for violence.

To be sure, such action makes headlines, but what about distortion? When demonstrations are so controlled that action only takes place when the lighting is focused and camera ready, then information is manipulated. The truth is distorted. The readers are deceived.

Similarly, take those war dispatches from Vietnam. Note the number of American serv-

icemen killed in ratio to the enemy. How often have you read of a defeat similar to the spy ship, Pueblo?

Note the heavy emphasis on violence in news stories. How often does a peaceful settlement get coverage, or aren't there any peaceful solutions? And if not, why not "stage" a peaceful solution for the benefit of invited TV cameramen and reporters? Must blood be shed to draw viewers to watch that color TV?

Parades are staged, movies are filmed, conventions are pre-planned. Are riots and violence in the same category? Must one shed blood to get attention, as several persons did by dousing themselves with gasoline and setting themselves on fire?

The topic is one for debate. This writer invites readers to give their views by signed letters of the above observations.

WILLIAMS AND HAMPSHIRE COLLEGES IN MASSACHUSETTS CONFER HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAW DEGREES ON THE HONORABLE SILVIO O. CONTE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this body the very deserved dual honors recently visited upon one of our distinguished colleagues and my very good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE.

For 12 years in the Congress, and before that for 8 years in the Massachusetts State Senate, our colleague has fought a variety of battles on a great many fronts. But most constant of all has been his support for public education in this country. It was primarily this fervent dedication to education that caused two great colleges in his First District of Massachusetts to honor him this autumn with honorary doctor of laws degrees.

The first honorary degree was conferred upon Congressman CONTE September 20 by Williams College in Williamstown, acknowledged to be one of the finest institutions of higher education in this country and one of the oldest. Williams was founded in 1790 and has built an enviable record for both the quality of its education and its students.

In conferring that degree at the school convocation Williams College President John E. Sawyer told Congressman CONTE:

We honor today the courage and purpose you have shown in aggressive support of education and conservation programs and your independent stand on policies in the national interest.

Less than 2 weeks later, Congressman CONTE was similarly honored by Hampshire College, the new experimental college which opened this year in Amherst, Mass.

On October 3, at the school's first convocation, our colleague was honored along with Poet Archibald MacLeish and Amherst College Historian Henry Steele Commager.

While conferring the honorary degree upon Congressman CONTE, the newly inaugurated Hampshire College President Franklin Patterson said:

Your devotion to the interests of your constituents is equalled by your independence of conscience and action in serving the larger public interest. Both show in the record innumerable quiet acts of assistance to individual citizens who need a voice to speak for them, and a willingness to stand and be counted in public on issues of the war, of integration, of dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to take this opportunity to inform this body of these memorable honors conferred upon our distinguished colleague.

At this time I would like to include with my remarks the texts of the citations from Williams College and Hampshire College which accompanied the honorary degrees to Congressman CONTE.

The citations follow:

CITATION TO SILVIO O. CONTE

Silvio O. Conte, United States Representative from the First District of Massachusetts, *Doctor of Laws*.

Graduate of the Pittsfield public schools and of Boston College and its Law School, following Pacific service in World War II as a Seabee, your election to the State Senate from the Berkshire District launched a vigorous political career exactly 20 years ago. You have since remained attentive to local concerns and attracted bipartisan backing during six terms of increasing responsibilities as a highly regarded member of the United States Congress and of its crucial Appropriations Committee. We honor today the courage and purpose you have shown in aggressive support of education and conservation programs and your independent stand on policies in the national interest.

JOHN. E. SAWYER.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1970.

CITATION TO SILVIO O. CONTE

Member of the House of Representatives of the United States; member of the Massachusetts bar; member of the Senate of the Commonwealth from 1950–1958—and since then continuously representing the First District of Massachusetts in the Congress; member of the House Committee on Appropriations; active leader in federal support for education, conservation, environmental quality, racial justice, and small business; public servant in the truest sense. Your devotion to the interests of your constituents is equalled by your independence of conscience and action in serving the larger public interest. Both show in the record innumerable quiet acts of assistance to individual citizens who need a voice to speak for them, and a willingness to stand and be counted in public issues of the war, of integration, of dissent. I think for example, of your June 30, 1970 speech against the segregationist amendments proposed by Messrs. Whitten and Jones in which you said: "Mr. Speaker, By now it should be abundantly clear that this malicious, misbegotten and discredited policy of the past is doomed to well-deserved oblivion. . . ." We have called you to Hampshire College to recognize, as we begin, a true public servant who helps without stint, who stands for the right things as he sees them, who works for equal rights now, and believes with us that education is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Under the Charter granted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and by virtue of the authority vested in me by The Trustees of Hampshire College, I confer upon you the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereto.

FRANKLIN PATTERSON,
Hampshire College.

OCTOBER 3, 1970.

"THE GRADUATE EDUCATION ACT OF 1971" WOULD GIVE FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR GRADUATE SCHOOLS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the President's Task Force on Higher Education has recommended institutional support for universities to cover the high cost of graduate education.

H.R. 11542, reported by the Science and Astronautics Committee in September 1969, is an excellent proposal of this type designed to further the education of scientists.

Another proposal, "The Graduate Education Act of 1971," H.R. 19711, sets out a $300 million yearly program for Federal aid to graduate schools. The text appears below.

Congress should give early consideration to the question of financing graduate education. The following excerpt from the task force report is a call to action that should not be delayed.

Priorities in Higher Education (excerpt).

II. The Support of High Quality Graduate and Professional Education.

The United States depends heavily on a relatively small number of major public and private national universities for the overwhelming proportion of the training of graduate and professional students. These institutions are costly to develop and are becoming increasingly costly to maintain. Private resources and state funds alone cannot meet these rising costs.

Graduate and professional students, unlike the graduates of most two-year and even four-year colleges, often move away from home, first to places of professional training, and then later to places where professional employment opportunities lie. In their mobility, they draw on national resources and contribute to meeting national needs that transcend local areas. These students and the institutions that prepare them reflect national rather than strictly local interests. The teaching and research these institutions perform and the teachers they produce are of basic importance to the strength of the nation.

It is, therefore, decidedly a national problem of the highest order that most of the major national universities are now experiencing severely debilitating financial pressures caused partly by inflation but also by cutbacks and shifts in federal support of research and training. It is no exaggeration to say that effective new support patterns must be developed quickly if we are not to see the partial collapse of a system of higher education unique in the world and fundamental to the strength of the United States. Already, a number of national universities are being weakened, with consequences that may be irreparable.

In order to maintain and develop these major national academic centers, we strongly urge the prompt establishment of a comprehensive system of direct in-

stitutional grants in support not only of professional education in the natural sciences, but also of the humanities and the social sciences.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress and the administration to act on this national problem.

H.R. 19711

A bill to promote higher education at the graduate level through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Graduate Education Act of 1971".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that support of and investment in higher education at the doctor of philosophy level are essential to the security and welfare of the United States and to its economic social, and material progress;

(2) that the project grant and contract method through which the Federal Government now supports higher education at the doctor of philosophy level needs to be supplemented by additional means of financing;

(3) that, to meet this need, there is hereby established an institutional grants program for the support of and investment in education and research at the doctor of philosophy level.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $300,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972 and for each of the succeeding four fiscal years, and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding year thereafter, to be allocated to institutions of higher education in the United States granting doctor of philosophy degrees in accordance with the following formula:

(b) The funds appropriated under this Act shall be allocated to institutions of higher education in proportion to the ratio that the total number of doctor of philosophy degrees (except degress in sectarian theology) awarded by the institution to citizens or permanent residents of the United States during the immediately previous three years bears to the total number of such degrees awarded by all institutions of higher education within the United States.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation such sums as may be necessary for direct expenses in administering this Act.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) The institutional grants program shall be administered by the Director of the National Science Foundation who shall consult frequently with the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts.

(b) There is hereby established the Graduate Education Council.

(1) The Council shall be composed of twenty-one members, including the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the United States Commissioner of Education, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, and eighteen members, three each of whom shall be appointed by the following national associations representing American institutions of higher education: American Council on Education, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of State Colleges and Universities, and Association of Amercan Colleges. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (1) of the members first taking office from each association, one shall be appointed to serve for a term of one year, one shall be appointed to serve a term of two years, and one shall be appointed to serve a term of three years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term to which his predecessor was appointed. No appointed member shall be eligible for reappointment during the three-year period following the expiration of two consecutive terms of the Council. The Director of the National Science Foundation shall serve as Chairman of the Council.

(2) Members not otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Director, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(3) The Council shall advise the Director in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to matters arising in the administration of this Act and other programs providing institutional grants-in-aid. The Council shall review the effectiveness of the program and, at least one year prior to the expiration of the initial authorization limitation, make recommendation to the President and Congress as to needed changes in the program, if any, and as to level of appropriations required to make the program fully effective. For these purposes, the Council shall meet on call by the Chairman of the Council but not less than once each year.

(4) The Director shall engage such technical assistance and make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data as it may require to carry out its functions.

(c) Institutions receiving grant-in-aid under this Act may be required to report on their use of the funds provided, and shall be encouraged to anticipate future funding in order to design long-range plans for the development, maintenance, and expansion of research and educational programs for the achievement of such national goals and objectives as the expansion of educational opportunities and the improvement in the quality of the educational and research programs provided.

(d) The Director shall adopt policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under his Act for any fiscal year will be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds which are available from State and other sources for purposes of conducting and improving higher education at the graduate level.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Director" means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(b) The term "project awards" means grants-in-aid for projects where the awards are based on the merit of a proposal submitted by an individual member of the staff or faculty of an institution of higher education and on an evaluation of the competence of the individual to carry out the work required, as opposed to awards of grants-in-aid made to institutions as such.

(c) The term "institutions of higher education granting doctor and philosophy degrees" means those colleges and universities whose doctoral programs are accredited by the several regional accrediting associations.

AGREEMENT TO A FOREIGN MILITARY SALES PROGRAM

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when the Congress reconvenes in mid-November, it is my firm hope that Senate-House conferees will be able to work out a foreign military sales program. This legislation has been tied up in conference since July; with related amendments now part of the Military Procurement Authorization Act and with the President's peace proposals for Indochina now public, it would appear that Members in the other body could now accept the core of the Cooper-Church amendment as part of the foreign military sales bill.

Hopefully, an agreement with the House conferees can yet be worked out after the election.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an Associated Press report printed in the Washington Evening Star of October 12 be inserted in the RECORD.

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

COOPER-CHURCH PERILS CREDIT ARMS SALE BILL

The Cooper-Church amendment to outlaw U.S. military operations in Cambodia has tied House-Senate conferees in knots for three months and cast a shadow over a $250 million foreign military credit sales program.

Congressional sources see only a slight possibility of breaking the impasse, although at least one refuses to rule out agreement during the waning days of this session.

The amendment is attached to the Senate's version of the foreign military credit sales bill, passed in widely varying form by both houses and sent to a sharply divided conference committee in early July.

SIX SESSIONS HELD

Only six sessions have been held in the intervening three months, just one of those since Congress returned from a 3½ week recess early last month.

And now Congress is getting ready for an election recess on Wednesday.

Meanwhile, the program under which U.S. weapons and other military equipment is sold to foreign nations on credit or under guarantees is stalled. There has been no money since January because Congress didn't extend the basic authority for the program last year. However, cash sales, which makes up the bulk of the nearly $2 billion program, are continuing.

Smaller American allies, who say they can't afford cash for weapons, are left without a way to get them from the United States.

ISRAEL EXCLUDED

One exception is Israel. A special provision for Israel was made in a separate military procurement bill.

"I firmly believe we need a military sales bill and I'm not going to say it can't be worked out even after we return for the lame-duck session," said Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, D-Pa., who heads the House conferees. "We're going to try."

But progress reports have been dim. The State Department, at the initial conference session, sent a memorandum urging the House conferees are reported lined up with the administration, while all but one of the

Senate members on the panel voted for the amendment, adopted after extended debate in the Senate.

The amendment, sponsored by Sens. John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky., and Frank Church, D-Idaho, would prohibit funds for U.S. troops, advisers, air combat operations or support of Asian troops in Cambodia unless authorized by Congress.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SECOND SESSION, 91ST CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice at the close of each Congress to prepare a brief summary of its major actions. Such a final accounting, I believe, is necessary if we are to have an informed citizenry and maintain a viable system of representative government.

Although the record is incomplete at this point, due to the failure of the majority leadership to finish the work of this Congress and adjourn before the November elections, I submit this interim report with respect to legislative activities of the 91st Congress.

VOTING RECORD

During the 91st Congress I was present and answered to 96 percent of all record votes.

NEW DIRECTIONS: VIETNAM

Understandably, the situation in Southeast Asia has continued to be a matter of paramount concern throughout the session. The President's tough decision concerning the situation in Cambodia has been justified by subsequent events. The President has kept his pledge to the American people not only with regard to the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Cambodia but even more significantly with respect to the scheduled withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. In fact, with the most recent announced withdrawal of an additional 40,000 by Christmas, this will bring the total troop-level reduction to more than 200,000 since January 1969. It is even more encouraging to note that U.S. casualties have dropped to a 4-year low following the Cambodian operation. This is indeed a new direction in Southeast Asia.

A DECADE OF REFORM

President Nixon in his state of the Union message last January, issued a call to the Congress and the Nation to meet new challenges and to set new priorities:

> At heart, the issue is the effectiveness of government . . . as we enter the seventies, we should enter also a great age of reform of the institutions of American government. Our purpose in this period should not be simply better management of the programs of the past. The time has come for a new quest . . . a quest not for a greater quantity of what we have—but for a new quality of life in America.

Regrettably the reaction of the majority leadership of Congress has been less than responsive. With the present composition of the House—243 Democrats, 187 Republicans, and five vacancies—and the Senate—57 Democrats and 43 Republicans—this is perhaps not surprising in political terms. Nevertheless, urgently needed reforms have simply not been forthcoming in many areas because the majority leadership has not seen fit to schedule much important legislation for floor consideration.

MAJOR UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following major bills are among those that so far have failed to clear one or both Houses:

Electoral college reform, social security reform, welfare reform, organized crime control bill, revenue sharing, pollution control—six of seven major administration bills—manpower training reform, Federal education program reforms, draft reform, Federal grant-in-aid system reform, mass transit.

Occupational safety, Consumer Protection Act, women's equal rights amendment, farm program, Foreign Trade Act, Foreign Military Sales Act with Indochina amendments.

Appropriation bills for: agriculture, defense, foreign aid, Housing and Urban Development, Labor, Health, and Welfare, military construction, transportation.

NEW PRIORITIES

The substantial change that has taken place in Washington following President Nixon's inauguration is clearly evident in the budget he submitted to Congress for fiscal 1971 last January. Here for the first time in many years, more money is earmarked for human resource programs—education and manpower, health, income security, and veterans benefits, and services—than for defense.

PERCENTAGE OF OUTLAYS

Fiscal year	Defense unified budget	Human resources unified budget
1962	48	29
1963	47	29
1964	45	29
1965	42	30
1966	42	31
1967	44	32
1968	45	32
1969	44	34
1970 estimate	40	37
1971 estimate	37	41

This is made possible by a requested reduction in overall defense spending to a level some $8 billion below the defense budget of just 2 years ago. At the same time, the budget contained requests for increased funds for crime reduction, environmental quality, food assistance, manpower training, welfare reform, revenue sharing, and transportation.

A central purpose of the President's new budget is to pursue a noninflationary course while moving ahead on the Nation's problems. This effort, however, has been jeopardized by the attempts of the Congress to increase Federal spending. This has resulted in the President's use of the veto on several occasions which provoked attempts by the majority leadership to override.

For example, on August 13 the House, in separate actions, voted first to override the President's veto of a $4.4 billion education appropriation bill, which was $453 million more than requested and then voted to sustain the President's veto of the $18 billion appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which was $541 million over the budget figure.

I voted to support the President's position in both cases. In his veto messages the President pointed out that compared to the last fiscal year of the previous administration his budget requests for education were 28 percent higher, and for urban renewal, water and sewer grants and housing subsidies were 100 percent more.

The question, then, was not if certain programs deserved support, but whether this additional $1 billion could be reasonably justified in terms of the imperative need to control spending and continue to fight against inflation. Hopefully, with the most recent cost-of-living figures indicating an encouraging easing of upward pressures, the President's policies of fiscal and monetary restraint are becoming effective.

POSTAL REFORM

Clearly one of the most substantial decisions taken this year by the Congress was the approval of legislation converting the Post Office Department into an independent Government agency to be known as the U.S. Postal Service. Under the new plan, a nine-member Commission, appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, is established, which in turn selects the Postmaster General, who will not be a member of the President's Cabinet. Among other changes, the bill creates a new form of Federal civil service for all postal employees.

Of particular interest during debate was an amendment to strike language permitting union shop agreements in the new Postal Service. The bill, including this change, was adopted with my support. While it will undoubtedly require considerable time for the new reorganization plans to become fully effective, I am encouraged that action has been taken to help provide a better mail system.

POLLUTION CONTROL

The House has moved on three important fronts in an effort to improve environmental quality. First, it passed H.R. 17255, which authorizes a $755 million, 3-year extension of the Clean Air Act, with new authority for establishing nationwide air pollution standards, including the control of automotive and aircraft emissions. Under it the Attorney General is also empowered, if the States fail to act, to bring suit seeking abatement of pollution, with penalties up to $10,000 per day.

The House also cleared the Resource Recovery Act of 1970 authorizing a 3-year, $450 million expansion of the Solid Waste Disposal Act. This legislation provides for research studies, demonstration projects and construction grants to expand and intensify the development of new technologies for handling solid waste and for the recovery of useful natural resources.

In addition, the House approved the public works appropriations bill including $1 billion for the construction of waste treatment facilities. All of this legislation had my support. While the first two measures are in substantial agreement with the President's proposals in

the air pollution and solid waste areas, the Public Works Committee still has pending before it the administration's recommendation for a $10 billion—$4 billion Federal share—program for waste treatment plants.

CRIME

Although belatedly, Congress recognized the need for favorable action on the President's recommendations for crime control legislation which were among the first administration requests.

Finally approved in July of this year was the District of Columbia omnibus crime bill which is a comprehensive plan including reform of court, criminal and bail procedures; a public defender's system; plus new, court-supervised authority to prevent the destruction of vital evidence and further crimes by suspects awaiting trial. This bill is designed, as well, as a model for State and local governments to follow.

In early October the House passed a bill giving the Federal Government broad new powers to crack down on organized crime and terrorist bombings. This, too, I fully supported. Also, passed this year was a record authorization of $3.1 billion in Federal funds for law enforcement and crime control, with most of the money going to State and local police agencies.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

In another major action, Congress passed a bill extending for another 5 years the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Also included was a "rider" put on by the Senate which would lower the voting age to 18 years in local, State, and Federal elections beginning in 1971. As it has long been the prevailing view that the establishment of a uniform national minimum voting age would require a constitutional amendment, I shared the concern of many who questioned the Senate's simple statute approach and the untested interpretation of the 14th amendment on which it is based.

Consequently, I first voted to send the bill to conference where an effort could be made to separate the voting age Senate "rider" from the rest of the bill. When this failed the question was then whether to vote "yes" or "no" on the bill as a whole. With the Voting Rights Act due to expire in less than 2 months I voted for the bill on final passage.

FARM PROGRAM

After nearly a year of long and indecisive study, the Committee on Agriculture concluded by producing a farm bill calling for basically a 3-year extension of price support programs for wool, wheat, feed grains, and cotton. The final result means essentially a continuation of the same old policies and programs which have provided far too little in the way of income protection for many of our farmers and has failed to live up to the promise to hold down the cost of the program to the U.S. taxpayers, many of whom are also farmers.

While some sections of the bill were acceptable, such as the dairy provisions, I voted to rewrite the bill on the floor, but when these efforts failed, I opposed the measure on final passage.

In addition, I supported an amendment that would limit farm payments to any one producer to $20,000 a year instead of the $55,000 ceiling contained in the bill. I have long urged that steps be taken in this direction and even have introduced legislation that would hold such payments to $10,000. However, an amendment to this effect also failed. From the discussions I have had over the years with farmers in our area, I believe what is needed is a new direction which leads away from Federal controls in agriculture.

In an extraordinary maneuver to prevent the Senate from having to vote on the farm bill before the election the Senate majority leader refused to let the official House messenger enter the Senate Chamber to deliver the bill from the House.

MAIL POLLUTION

In August, the House gave overwhelming approval to the final segment of President Nixon's three-part request for legislation to combat pornography. This bill (H.R. 11032) prohibits the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, to transport unsolicited obscene advertisements, the legislation would provide penalties of up to 5 years and/or a fine of $50,000, with double punishment for subsequent convictions.

Last April the House passed H.R. 15693, outlawing the delivery of sexually oriented matter to persons under 17 years, or to adults who have notified the Post Office they do not want such mail. It is apparent from the continuous flow of complaints that I receive that additional steps are needed to protect against this polluting of our mails. These bills had my full support. To date, the Senate has acted on only one of these proposals.

LEGISLATIVE REFORM

The first wide-range reform provisions of congressional procedures since 1946, the Legislative Reorganization Act, also gained approval. These changes include provisions for opening more committee meetings to the public, permitting for the first time live TV coverage of House committee hearings, restricting proxy voting in committees and the modernization of congressional research capabilities.

In addition, new rules will also require the recording of names of Members on "teller" votes. Under present procedures Members walk between two tellers and are counted. Since important issues are sometimes decided by these votes, without further opportunity for a rollcall vote, I supported this change as well as the much needed total reform package.

COMMITTEE WORK

Much of the key legislation to come before the House this Congress originated in the Ways and Means Committee on which I serve. This includes the first major revision of our tax system since 1913, the revision of unemployment compensation as well as its extension to cover an additional 5 million workers, and a 15-percent increase in social security benefits effective January 1, 1970. Other actions included the following:

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

In May the House passed the Social Security Amendments for 1970 which among other provisions included both an additional 5-percent raise in benefits and an increase in permissible outside earnings without loss of benefits from the present $1,680 to $2,000 per year.

While I personally had hoped that this provision could have been further liberalized, and sponsored legislation to raise the annual limit to $2,400, I believe that the recommended increase will be of considerable help to those who have to work to supplement their retirement incomes.

In addition, the bill is designed to improve the effectiveness and hold down the cost of the medicare, medicaid, and maternal and child health programs. Just before the vote on final passage a Republican-sponsored motion was offered to provide for automatic cost-of-living increases in benefits along the lines that I have been urging for several years. This reform would assure that benefits would not lag behind the rest of the economy and hopefully remove social security adjustments from the political arena. This, of course, had my support and was approved.

Although this legislation does not include all the reforms that might be desirable, it does make definite and much needed progress in a number of areas and provides greater equity in the social security program. Similar, though not identical, legislation is still pending in the Senate.

WELFARE REFORM

Recognizing the present welfare system for what it is "a failure that grows worse every day," the President submitted to Congress a new plan designed to reverse this trend through a work incentive program. This new system, whose basic features were approved by the committee and passed by the House, is specifically designed to discourage broken homes, welfare dependency and the compounding of urban problems through the migration of recipients from low to high benefit cities and States. Although I realize that our complex welfare problems cannot be solved by any legislative magic, I am convinced that society's greatest hope lies in a new approach, one which encourages work and neither stifles nor destroys initiative.

DRUG ABUSE

The tax and import control aspects of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 also came before the committee. This bill, a major part of the President's anticrime program, recognizes the many aspects of this problem by providing a multiple-pronged attack including stiffer penalties for drug pushers and a 3-year $403 million program of intensified research, rehabilitation, drug abuse education, and law enforcement. There can be no doubt as to the seriousness of this problem nor of its close connection with the causes of many crimes, with some estimates indicating that one-half of all violent crime is committed by persons under 25 years of age seeking to support their addiction or drug dependence. The bill, of course, had my support.

TRADE

In August, the Ways and Means Committee concluded action on a bill (H.R. 18970) covering a wide range of trade, tariff, and quota recommendations.

Basically, the Trade Act of 1970 extends Presidential authority through fiscal 1974 to lower tariffs; establishes a new mechanism to insure that U.S. workers and businesses who may be seriously injured from increased imports may be provided with tariff adjustment or similar assistance needed to remedy such injury; sets temporary quotas on imports on certain textile and footwear articles pending negotiated international agreements; and authorizes the Domestic International Sale Corporation—DISC—plan for encouraging U.S. export sales through tax incentives. In taking these and other steps the committee said that the Nation had been well served by U.S. leadership in promoting freer world trade, but noted:

However, the hope that other countries would move toward greater access to their own markets has been realized all too infrequently . . . The time has come for other countries to realize that the United States alone cannot accept all of the surplus products stemming from increased productivity abroad. Other industrialized countries must move much more rapidly to open their markets, not only to competitive products of other industrialized countries, but also to the exports of developing countries.

I share this concern.

SKY-JACKING

The rash of late summer hijackings prompted early committee action on President Nixon's request for funds to train 2,500 special guards to travel aboard aircraft to help deter future hijack attempts. Since May 1, 1961, there have been 73 aircraft hijacks and 20 unsuccessful attempts, 66 of these have occurred in the last 2½ years and in this year alone there have been 19.

To finance this force the administration proposed an increase in the ticket tax on domestic flights from 8 to 8½ percent and an increase in the head tax, now paid by passengers on international flights. While getting this problem fully under control will require the cooperation of other countries, something the President is also seeking to obtain and it is hoped that the need for these guards and added taxes will be temporary, it is clear that we cannot tolerate the continuation of these criminal acts.

AUTO EXCISE TAX EXTENSION

Finally, the committee is currently considering the administration's tax requests for a proposed antipollution tax on leaded gasoline, and accelerated schedule for the collection of estate and gift taxes and the postponement for another year of the scheduled reduction in automobile and telephone excise taxes set to take effect in January. At the outset, I made it clear that I intended to oppose in committee any further delay in the already 4-year postponed repeal of the 7 percent auto excise tax. It has been 5 years now since Congress finally branded this tax for what it is, an unfair burden on many businesses, workers and low- and middle-income consumers which can no longer be justified and wrote into law its phase-out.

According to our action in 1965, this discriminatory excise tax should have been all but eliminated in January 1969. No one questions the need for tax revenues, but since everyone concedes this to be an unfair tax, it is nothing more than a revenue ruse that should be stopped.

While final committee action has been deferred until after the election, I am hopeful that we can develop a new approach by extending the phase-out in order to minimize the adverse revenue impact, and that some way may also be found to make the public more aware of this hidden tax. We have voted for truth in lending, truth in packaging, and I think the Congress should be willing to go along with a little bit more truth in taxation.

COMPLETED ACTION

Other legislation approved by the Congress this session included the following actions:

The Emergency Home Finance Act, providing 512,000 mortgage loans for low-, moderate- and middle-income family homes.

Vietnam educational benefits, increases from $130 to $175 per month educational allowances for Vietnam veterans.

Airport and Airways Development Act, a $5 billion multiyear program.

Maritime program, 10-year revitalization, including recommendation for finanical aid for construction of a new *Delta Queen*.

Extended the Hill-Burton hospital construction aid program for 3 years.

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

Approved the medical library assistance bill extending Federal assistance for an additional 3 years.

The Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act, ends cigarette advertising on radio and television after January 1, 1971.

Establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

Golden Eagle Passes for National Parks extended for 1 year, cost $10.

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities extended.

House Delegate, District of Columbia granted a nonvoting House Delegate.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Act, a new agency to coordinate major Federal programs.

Commission on Population Growth and the American Future established.

GOOSE LAKE INQUIRY

The flagrant violation of Federal and State narcotic and drug laws at the "Rock Festival" at Goose Lake in August brought the Nation's drug problem very close to home. While I agree that the control of these gatherings is primarily a State or local responsibility, the extraordinary difficulties posed to law enforcement officials by such volatile mass assemblages raised the question in my own mind of what, if any, is the responsibility of the Federal Government in such situations.

Consequently, last month I asked the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER of New York, to arrange a special meeting between the law enforcement officials who were confronted with this problem and the members of his committee to explore this question. This was held on September 30 with Jackson County Prosecuting Attorney, Bruce Barton and Jackson County Sheriff, Charles Southworth, among those giving a specially designated subcommittee a detailed briefing.

CHAMBERLAIN BILLS

During the 91st Congress, I introduced a number of bills to prompt action in many areas, including the following that would—

Call on North Vietnam to abide by the Geneva Convention with respect to prisoners of war (H. Con. Res. 362).

Enact the President's seven major environmental quality proposals (H.R. 16024, 16025, 16026, 16027, 16028, 16029, 19030).

Raise social security benefits, provide an escalator clause for future cost-of-living increases, and liberalize the outside earnings allowance without loss of benefits (H.R. 14134, 1018).

Exempt persons working after 65 from payment of social security tax (H.R. 15704).

Raise the personal income tax exemption to $900 (H.R. 2347).

Extend head of household benefits to single persons over 35 (H.R. 1021).

Equalize tax exemption treatment for servicemen in Korea and Vietnam (H.R. 618).

Enable members of the armed services to vote from age 18 (H.J. Res. 1111).

Provide for sharing Federal revenues with State and local governments (H.R. 1398).

Create a work oriented welfare program (H.R. 14173).

Prohibit use of the mails to transport unsolicited pornography (H.R. 11068, 11316, 11317).

Establish a National Cemetery at Fort Custer (H.R. 1016).

Establish a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore (H.R. 15421).

Establish a National boating safety program (H.R. 15422).

Limit types of questions asked by the Census (H.R. 2494).

Begin a 5-year phaseout of Federal controls over agriculture (H.R. 14469).

Limit Federal farm program payments to $10,000 per producer (H.R. 416).

Amend the Constitution with respect to equal rights for men and women (H.J. Res. 879).

Amend the Constitution to permit voluntary prayer in public schools (H.J. Res. 433).

Provide tax incentives for small business (H.R. 1017).

Require the retirement of committee chairmen at age 65 (H. Res. 976).

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

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

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

How long?

NURSING REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL HOSPITALS MUST BE CHANGED

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced an amendment to the Social Security Act of 1936. This amendment will change the nursing staff requirements for small hospitals receiving benefits under the medicare program and make the requirements conform more realistically to the health care needs of rural America.

Under present laws a hospital, to be eligible to receive medicare benefits, must have at least one registered nurse on duty during each of the three 8-hour operating shifts. While this requirement may be appropriate for big city hospitals having a ready supply of registered nurses to draw from, it is extremely impractical for hospitals located in small rural communities.

In the State of Texas alone, more than 150 small hospitals run the risk of having their participation in the medicare program terminated simply because they do not have enough registered nurses available to meet Federal medicare regulations. In the Texas panhandle at least 10 hospitals in Carson, Hale, and Lamb Counties are affected:

Community Hospital and Clinic, Olton, Tex. Littlefield Hospital and Clinic, Littlefield, Tex. Medical Arts Clinic-Hospital, Littlefield, Tex. South Plains Hospital-Clinic, Amherst, Tex. High Plains Hospital, Hale Center, Tex. E. O. Nichols Memorial Hospital, Hale Center, Tex. General Hospital, Plainview, Tex. Groom Memorial Hospital, Groom, Tex. McLean Hospital, McLean, Tex., and Hemphill County Hospital, Canadian, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, this burdensome requirement must be changed, and it must be changed quickly, for rising hospital and health care costs make it impossible for small rural hospitals to keep their doors open without the aid of Federal funds supplied by the medicare program. If rural community hospitals are forced to close their facilities by virtue of the operation of this regulation, it will be tragic indeed. After all, it must be remembered that hospitals exist to meet community health needs. Artificial rules must not be permitted to frustrate this basic goal. I say artificial because the facts of the matter indicate that licensed vocational nurses working with skilled physicians and trained registered nurses can provide an adequate level of nursing care to hospital patients on an around the clock, 7 days a week basis.

In my judgment such an arrangement will permit small community hospitals to continue meeting local health care needs. Accordingly, I believe the amendment I am proposing is clearly in the public interest, and I urge my colleagues to give it their unqualified support. This problem must be resolved before the 91st Congress adjourns.

CRIME CONTROL ACT 1970

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Crime Control Act of 1970. This measure seeks not only to fight the spread and effectiveness of organized crime, but also to combat the recent spread of terror bombings throughout our Nation. Over the last 18 months, we have witnessed 4,330 actual bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings, and 35,129 bomb threats. The cost in terms of destroyed property and loss of life has been tragic. The cost in terms of fear experienced by our people and the strain on the very fabric of our society cannot be accurately determined in terms of dollars or statistics. The legislation which we are considering makes an effective attack on the criminally insane element responsible for these terror tactics. Its enactment is imperative.

Under existing law the transportation of explosives in interstate commerce for use to damage or destroy personal or real property, or to injure or intimidate any persons using the property, is prohibited. With some improvement, this will remain in the law. The penalties, however, for violation of this provision will be substantially increased. The reach of the law, however, is greatly extended by making it unlawful to damage or destroy property which is used in or affects interstate commerce. Nearly all types of property will now be protected by the Federal law. Using the constitutional power of the Federal Government to protect its own property, the law further provides that it will be a Federal offense to use explosives to damage or destroy property owned, leased, possessed, or used by the Government of the United States. This will apply equally to all property of institutions or organizations receiving Federal financial assistance, covering most of our educational institutions.

In addition to the actual damage caused by the unlawful use of explosives, we are experiencing losses due to threats of bombing. These losses encompass a loss of productivity because of forced evacuations as well as the loss of our personal freedom because of the fear of bombing attacks. This legislation approaches this problem in a comprehensive manner. The use of interstate communication facilities to maliciously report false information of bombing attacks will be punished by not more than 5 year's imprisonment, $5,000, or both. Hopefully this specific treatment of bombing threats and the increased penalties will reduce their occurrences.

This legislation will also greatly strengthen our ability to fight organized crime. Traditionally organized crime has pursued "big-money" crime, notably gambling. Their activities, however, run to all forms of crime and to their own form of "legitimate" business. The Crime Control Act of 1970 deals specifically with these aspects of the crime problem. By placing stringent regulations on gambling, by alerting communities to the danger of organized crime through the use of grand juries, by precluding the use of funds derived from illicit means for legitimate business, a forceful blow will be directed at organized crime.

We have experienced a spread of terror tactics throughout our country as well as a spread of effective organized crime. We must enact this legislation to provide our law enforcement officials the weapons necessary to insure a safe and stable society. We cannot afford to delay further the passage of this vitally needed legislation.

POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the Polish National Alliance on the occasion of their 90th anniversary.

The founding of the Polish National Alliance in 1880 by a group of leading Polish immigrants was inspired as the unification of numerous Polish organizations scattered throughout the United States. At their first Sejm in Chicago in September of 1880, the delegates adopted a declaration stating the purposes of the Polish National Alliance:

To lay foundation for material and moral growth of the Polish element in the United States through development fund which is to be the sole property of the Alliance and from which Polish Homes, Schools and other welfare projects are to be financed.

To provide protection for the Polish immigration.

To provide political enlightment to the Polish immigrants, as citizens of the United States.

To commemorate Poland's historic anniversaries.

With these purposes in mind, the alliance set out to serve the best interests of the Polish immigrants and to aid Poland in her struggle for freedom and independence.

Today, the Polish National Alliance embraces more than 326,332 members in 1,458 local groups. The alliance engages in fraternal, educational, charitable, and life insurance activities, and publishes a Polish daily called Zgoda, a semimonthly, and a biennial youth magazine entitled Promien. One of the alliance's proudest achievements was the founding of Alliance College in 1912. Beginning as a high school academy and technical institute, Alliance College is today a fully accredited, coeducational, 4-year liberal arts institution of higher learning. By the end of 1971, the alliance will have provided in excess of $1,300,000 for support of the college since 1967.

While the alliance has carefully preserved and perpetuated the Polish heritage, it also has stressed the importance of integrating the Polish immigrants into

the mainstream of American life. In this dual effort, the alliance has been totally successful. It has demonstrated to the American nation that our pluralistic society is one in which each ethnic group, by contributing of its heritage to the cultural and spiritual fabric of the United States, can enrich the whole.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in congratulating the alliance upon its 90th anniversary and to wish them continued success.

VIOLATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my support and to encourage this body to support my colleague and the able chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security.

I do this because a local district judge, Judge Gesell, has issued an order at the request of the American Civil Liberties Union restraining one of the committees of Congress from having printed a report which has been written pursuant to the committee carrying out its delegated duties.

I am amazed to hear the suggestion made that the committee's request for information relating to the financing of revolutionary groups should be opposed on some vague claim that the inquiry would violate first amendment rights. The Congress as a whole, the Internal Security Committee members, and most certainly Chairman ICHORD are not insensitive to the rights assured by our constitutional system.

It is apparent to me that we the Members of Congress cannot allow another branch of Government, the judicial as in this instance, to interfere with our discharge of the duties required of us under the Constitution. The House Internal Security Committee is a properly constituted committee of this body, and its duties require that it investigate and make reports into areas relating to the security of this Nation and the activities of those who would disrupt the orderly process of our society.

It seems unconscionable to me that an inquiry made of university administrations which placed them under no compulsion to participate can now be charged as a violation of first amendment rights. This is to say that Congress or its committees charged with the investigation of subversive activities cannot make such an inquiry and would work to deny Members of Congress and others their own first amendment rights to acquire pertinent and necessary information upon the basis of which they may make reasoned judgments in attempting to resolve some of the great issues confronting our Nation. It is a rule as old as the history of this country that Congress may investigate any subject upon which it may legislate, and I urge that each Member of this body seriously consider that the House Committee on Internal Security has been mandated to make relevant inquiries on the subject of Communist and other subversive activities for the purpose of aiding Congress in any necessary remedial legislation; and it seems to me that the activities of radicals have been commonly known to be of such character that the very life of our educational system has been challenged. It seems to me that the real threat to academic freedom comes from that source and is assisted by the court order we heard about today which would support the charge that the committee's inquiry is in violation of first amendment rights or a subsidiary concept described as "academic freedom."

Today I have written the Attorney General and asked that he proceed immediately to seek the dissolving of Judge Gesell's order on the following grounds: First, for a Federal court judge to enjoin the Government Printing Office from printing any material handed it by a legislative committee violates freedom of the press as provided in the Constitution; second, under the separation of powers as provided in the Constitution, the judiciary has no authority to prevent the legislative branch from issuing reports and having them printed when the legislative branch is carrying out the duties assigned to it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and desire that all Members of the Congress will be as concerned about the intrusion of Judge Gesell into the functions of the legislative branch of government as I am, and I would also hope that the press would be as concerned about preserving freedom of the Government press as they are about preserving freedom of the individual press. In any event, we cannot stand idly by and see Judge Gesell attempt to prevent the Congress from carrying out its constitutional duties nor can we stand aside and see him attempt to prevent freedom of the press.

The following is a copy of my letter to the Attorney General:

OCTOBER 14, 1970.

Hon. JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I understand that members of the House Committee on Internal Security have been in contact with your office for representation in the matter of the Temporary Restraining Order entered by Judge Gesell against the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents to restrain the printing and publication of a House Report filed this date.

This is a matter of great concern to me and most Members of the Congress. I regret the action of the Court as unwarranted interference with the legislative prerogatives and a direct violation of the speech and debate clause and of freedom of the press—the Government Press.

Certainly, the Government is entitled to enjoy the same freedom as are enjoyed by other citizens. I trust that you will immediately move to obtain a dissolution of the restraining order and that you will press this matter with greatest diligence. Your attention thereto will be greatly appreciated.

Kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

FLETCHER THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

THEN AND NOW ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a still timely and very appropriate Independence Day address delivered by Dr. Bruno J. Rolak, professor of history at the University of Texas at El Paso. Dr. Rolak, with an in-depth understanding of past events and a perceptive insight into the future, wonders aloud as to the nature of the obstacles that early American patriots would have faced if endowed with today's attitudes, cultural sophistication, and concepts of "justice." He also observes that while the times between the winning of our independence as a nation and present-day struggles to preserve liberty and freedom are markedly different in material terms, the stakes are still "liberty, independence, and security."

To the critics that nothing is right with America, Dr. Rolak retorts:

You have not exhausted all possibilities. Try supporting your country, your soldiers, and your President!

Mr. Speaker, in these few days before the event of one of America's greatest heritages—free elections—it would be well worth while taking the time to give serious thought to Dr. Rolak's appraisal of history as it might have been. His address follows:

THEN AND NOW ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY

As a history teacher, I have frequent discussions with conscientious students who are troubled by conditions in America today, and who are eager for guidance and advice.

Quite a few students, who disapprove of the recent turmoil in college towns, nevertheless try to excuse or justify the undisciplined behavior of their generation by insisting that they are a lost generation. "Never before," they tell me, "have young people had it so tough. The problems America faces today are insurmountable!"

The students are vague about their sources of information. Usually they mention a Supreme Court justice, some college professors, and self-appointed prophets who are either on the FBI wanted list or out on bail.

I then remind these troubled students of the "insurmountable problems" young people faced in the past; such as the young people in the South during Reconstruction days, whose entire world suddenly collapsed, or the 1930 depression when men with college degrees stood in long lines on street corners waiting for their bowl of soup! Today, I would like to recall a time in the past when other Americans faced insurmountable problems.

The year was 1775, and a divided people was going to war; only about one-third of the population in the colonies supported the revolution; about one-third was not interested in the conflict; and one-third was pro-British.

The nations of Europe were anti-British rather than pro-American, but their sympathies were with the colonies. Yet, they predicted a quick and easy victory for the British. The only question, they said, was how long the colonies would survive.

As for the colonies, they did not even have a national government when the fighting began. The Articles of Confederation were

drawn up after the war started, and were not adopted by all the states until after the Declaration of Independence.

There was no national army, only poorly trained militia units, some of which refused to fight outside of their state boundaries.

In the winter of 1777–78 the Continental Congress had to flee Philadelphia, as the British occupied it.

States printed their own paper money; the Continental Congress printed Continental paper dollars. People had little confidence in these currencies and the expression "Not worth a Continental" was used to describe things of little value. There was immediate runaway inflation, the cost of living rising 50 percent in the first four years.

Soldiers serving in the militia sometimes did not receive their pay for six months. Some soldiers in the Continental Army were not paid for 12 months. Those who kept diaries noted that in the march on Trenton, there was blood on the snow from frozen feet.

George Washington arrived at Valley Forge with 24,000 men. After a bitter winter, sometimes with one meal a day and often no fuel with temperatures below zero, Washington marched out in the spring with 12,000 men.

That war was fought on American soil. Property belonging to patriots was confiscated or destroyed.

The British blockaded the ports and stopped almost all imports and exports. This ruined merchants and threw thousands of men out of work—and there was no unemployment compensation. Yet, despite all these difficulties, a small group of patriots refused to quit. They provided the leaders who set the example which led the nation to independence.

I think you will agree that those early Americans surmounted quite a few "insurmountable obstacles." Surely, our difficulties today are not as formidable as those they faced.

Of course, if Washington and his contemporaries had to fight that war today, they would face a few problems not present in their time.

For example, if the war for independence were being waged today, we could expect that some "peace at any price" groups would send relief and medical supplies to George III.

A picture magazine would run a story on the deplorable conditions at Valley Forge, and would ask, "Is this war worth such suffering?"

We could expect a feature article in a large metropolitan daily, quoting a reliable source to the effect that a New England school teacher named Nathan Hale was a spy for the CIA.

The mayor of New York City would say there was no validity to the "domino theory;" therefore, we do not have to defend Massachusetts.

A powerful civil liberties group would assign its best lawyers to defend Benedict Arnold. Several tax-exempt foundations would pay the costs. Benedict Arnold would be tried in absentia, of course, since he would be leading a British regiment in a raid against the Southern colonies at the time of the trial. And, when the case reached the Supreme Court, one of its justices would read the majority opinion which condemned Army justice and ordered Benedict Arnold restored to his full rank, with back pay.

Next, newscasters would interview Benedict Arnold, while six publishers would bid for the rights to his memoirs, which would appear under the title *I Was a Victim of the Establishment*. Several hundred college professors would make the book required reading in their courses, while campus organizations called "Students for a Decadent Society" would arrange for Arnold to speak at their schools.

Today we are engaged in another struggle, where the stakes again are liberty, independence and security. A few months ago, it was called the war in Vietnam. Today it is "the war in Indochina." Where are the critics who ridiculed the domino theory when it was advanced by our far-sighted statesmen?

We are being told, "The United States does not have to be fighting in Vietnam!" That is true; we do not have to be fighting in Vietnam. We could be fighting in Alaska or Hawaii or California.

Prominent public figures have stated, "This is the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time." This is a nice-sounding phrase, but the speakers should be asked: "Where is the right place, and when is the right time to confront world communist expansion?" Would they prefer Canada and Mexico in 1975? Or Florida and Texas in 1976?

In his writings and speeches, Winston Churchill correctly pointed out that leaders of the peace and pacifist movements in the 1930s did not prevent World War II. What they did do by appeasing Nazi Germany was merely to postpone the war so that when it did come in 1939, it was far more terrible, and lasted much longer, than would have been the case if the world democracies had resisted Nazi expansion.

We are gathered here today to affirm that our soldiers of the past did not die in vain. Let us be honest: if we permit Southeast Asia to fall to the communists, we shall be the first generation of Americans who have left our fighting men die in vain.

Whether we admit it or not, the world views that war in Southeast Asia as a test of strength and of will between world communism and the United States.

Four American Presidents have promised to support South Vietnam until that nation is assured independence and a just peace. I remind you that the United States is a member of NATO. The time could come when we might have to ask NATO members to come to *our* assistance. If we break our promise to South Vietnam, how could we expect NATO nations to keep their promises to us?

We are being told that American democracy cannot long survive the war in Indochina. I say to you: American democracy cannot long survive an American defeat, or a betrayal of an ally, in Indochina.

Are we willing to admit that the United States, with its vast resources and talent, with its population of 200 million, is no match for a primitive communist nation of about 17 million? If we *are* willing to admit failure, let us then also admit to our children that American democracy was a satisfactory system in the past, but that it is no longer a match for militant world communism.

Let us admit that Marx, Lenin and Stalin were right, and that Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln were wrong. Let us then quickly scrap this American democracy, with its roots in Christianity, as a system which breeds weaklings and complainers; and let us adopt a totalitarian form of government, similar to the type which drove us out of Asia.

So, what is the answer?

The answer I do not have, but some suggestions I would like to offer.

Several months ago, at a social function, a university professor was bemoaning our involvement in the war, and he said: "We have tried protesting. We have tried marching. We have tried praying. We have even tried rioting! Is there no hope? No solution?"

Somewhat unkindly, I suggested: "You have not exhausted all possibilities. Try supporting your country, your soldiers, and your President!"

For this has not yet been tried.

This nation which played a major role in defeating powerful Nazi Germany and Japan, could end that war in Asia in months if we give our President today the support we gave President Roosevelt during WW II.

But to my colleague professor, support of the country, its soldiers and its President was the one unacceptable solution. He belongs to that new breed on college campuses: that group of students and professors who will defend to the death your right to agree with them.

There is in the United States today an over-publicized minority which interferes with the war effort, which laughs at American traditions, especially patriotism, and which ridicules our servicemen, past and present.

The news media, too, generously refer to them as impatient idealists. Vice President Agnew refers to them as "bums."

My first suggestion is this: let us hereafter call them by their right name: immature, and spoiled children. Let us stop asking them: "Why are you rioting?" Let us ask them: "Why are you prolonging the war?"

Next, let us realize, and let us remind others, that the "insurmountable problems" we face today, are nowhere near as difficult as the "insurmountable problems" which were surmounted by Americans in the past.

Third, let us realize, and let us remind others, that unless we resist communist expansion with all our energy, in a matter of a few years our problems will indeed become insurmountable.

Next, let us realize that patriotism is the sword and the shield of our nation, and that patriotism is the concern of all people—not only that of the soldier: every person who makes this nation a better place in which to live is a patriot; the employer who hires youngsters he does not really need; our public officials who work long hours knowing they will not be paid for overtime; our conscientious but underpaid school teachers; every person who condemns proved cases of discrimination and prejudice; doctors and other professional men who donate their services to the needy; all who gave unselfishly of their time and skills to assist their community, their church, their schools, their ethnic group—each of these deserves the honorable title of patriot.

Finally, I would like to leave this parting thought with you: When a nation ceases to honor its patriots of the past, it ceases to have a future!

ITALIAN TRIBUNE NEWS HONORS CONGRESSMAN RODINO'S EFFORTS IN BEHALF OF A NATIONAL COLUMBUS DAY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, for years Columbus Day has been celebrated as a State holiday in many of our States by millions of Americans. I am pleased that as the result of enduring efforts Congress has too given rightful recognition to Columbus for his unique and everlasting contribution to history and that Columbus Day will become a national holiday as of 1971.

While many individuals, organizations, and Members of Congress urged such recognition, my friend and colleague PETER RODINO was an original sponsor of this legislation. And, I commend to my colleagues in the House, the following

recent editorial from the Italian Tribune News:

COLUMBUS DAY A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

A long campaign will finally be crowned with glory next year when Columbus Day will be celebrated in this country as a National Holiday.

Leading the campaign in the House of Representatives to give Christopher Columbus his proper recognition for discovering America was Rep. Peter W. Rodino (D-10th Dist.)

Congressman Rodino began his campaign to gain proper recognition for Christopher Columbus many years ago and continued unceasingly in his efforts despite the fact that at times they seemed doomed to failure.

Columbus Day is an occasion on which Italian Pride reaches a high point throughout the world, as well as in this country.

Christoper Columbus not only stands out for his great discovery but the patience and courage which it required. A lesser man would have never started on the voyage even if he envisioned the new lands across the sea.

That Columbus had the patience, courage and foresight is a tribute to the man and to his Italian background which provided him with these attributes.

Without question, Columbus Day is the one occasion when all Italians not only feel a common pride for the Great Navigator but a common pride in their ancestry and for one another.

While it is very well that such a feeling should pervade among Italians on Columbus Day it leaves open the thought feeling should prevail among Italians on every day of the year. That truly would be a wonderful and memorable happening for which all Italians could be proud.

In the meantime, we must be satisfied with a partial victory in the cause of unity and love among Italians for one another on this occasion of the day when one of their own found a new world in which men of all races, color and creed could have a new way of life under democratic processes.

COLUMBUS-PHENIX CITY-FORT BENNING CHAPTERS

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Fort Benning, Ga., is the home of the Infantry, Queen of Battle. Its shoulder patch reads "Follow Me."

This is illustrative of the Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army—AUSA. Within its ranks are to be found the top leadership in both the civilian and military communities. Its standard of excellence and achievement could well serve as a model for the entire country. Its example and its contributions in the national defense effort are reflected in the morale and esprit de corps of Fort Benning and its hometowns: Columbus Ga., and Phenix City, Ala.

The AUSA is having its national convention in Washington this week and the splendid delegation from the Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning chapter is composed of the high caliber men who have become synonymous with that outstanding chapter.

Every citizen, both civilian and military, in our communities contribute to the superb military-civilian relationship, of course, but special commendation goes to Maj. Gen. Orwin C. Talbott, commanding general of Fort Benning, and the curent officers of the local AUSA chapter: Mr. Joseph J. Flowers, Jr., president; Col. Jacob L. Riley, Jr., retired, first vice president; Mr. Charles S. Daley, second vice president; Col. William R. Guthrie, secretary-treasurer; and Lt. Col. Peter J. Foss, assistant secretary-treasurer.

To illustrate the exceptional performance of this chapter of AUSA, I would like to list below the 1970 chapter and company awards, made during the national meeting this week, and the frequent appearance of the Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning chapter among these is indicative of the very fine leadership and hard work of each member which won for them the coveted award of Best Chapter Overall:

CHAPTER AND COMPANY AWARDS—1970

BEST CHAPTER AWARDS

Largest Overall Membership, June 30, 1970: Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning Chapter. Runners-up: Braxton Bragg, Central Texas-Fort Hood.

Greatest Percentage Increase in Membership, July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970: Bavarian Alpine Chapter. Runners-up: John C. Persons, Ryukyus.

Greatest Membership Input, July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970: Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning Chapter. Runners-up: Braxton Bragg, Central Texas-Fort Hood.

Greatest Civilian Membership Input (Other than active duty) July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970: Tennessee Valley Chapter. Runners-up: Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning, George Washington.

Greatest Percentage Increase in Civilian Membership (Other than active duty) July 1, 1969–June 30, 1970: John C. Persons Chapter. Runners-up: Mid-Palatinate, Susquehanna.

Greatest Corporate Membership, June 30, 1970: Daniel Boone Chapter. Runners-up: Braxton Bragg, Pikes Peak.

Best Single Meeting: Central Texas-Fort Hood Chapter and Minutemen Chapter. Runners-up: Coastal Empire, Douglas MacArthur, Greater Los Angeles.

Best Overall Meetings: Tacoma-Fort Lewis-Olympia Chapter. Runners-up: Coastal Empire, East Bay, Leonidas Polk.

Best Overall Projects: Braxton Bragg Chapter and Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning Chapter. Runners-up: Central Texas-Fort Hood, Newton D. Baker, Southwest Oklahoma.

Most Active in Telling the Army Story: Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning Chapter, Runners-up: Central Texas-Fort Hood, Greater Los Angeles, Southwest Oklahoma.

Most active in Pursuit of AUSA Objectives: Braxton Bragg Chapter. Runners-up: Henry Leavenworth, Newton D. Baker, Tacoma-Fort Lewis-Olympia.

Best Performance Overseas: 3d Infantry Division Chapter. Runners-up: Berlin, Heidelberg.

Best Chapter Overall: Columbus-Phenix City-Fort Benning Chapter. Runners-up: Braxton Bragg, Central Texas-Fort Hood, Leonidas Polk.

POST OFFICE BUILT WITHOUT PERMIT

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the following assorted articles from Washington area newspapers:

HUGE POSTAL FACILITY RISES WITHOUT HAVING BUILDING PERMIT HERE

(By Don Beaupre)

Most homeowners know they must get a building permit before they begin a porch addition, build a garage or construct a patio. Forget to obtain one, and it isn't long before an inspector from the Prince Georges County Building Inspection Division is on the scene.

Yet, officials of the building inspectors office did nothing while a prominent Baltimore contractor proceeded rapidly with construction of a $700,000, parcel post handling facility in Prince Georges county. The contractor did not have a building permit.

The Henry A. Knott Construction Company, with headquarters in Baltimore, is pushing completion of the building located at 10101 George Palmer Highway, Lanham. The building is to be leased to the federal government to house its regional parcel post operations now located in the District.

Stipulations in the contract require that the facility be useable by Oct. 15 and fully operational by Nov. 1. The building at this time is nearly 75 percent complete.

Until last Friday, the only permit issued to Knott Construction was for the buildings foundation. There is no sewer available at the site, and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, estimates it will be 18 months before a sewer line is available.

Henry A. Knott Construction was founded by the now-deceased father of Henry J. Knott, also a prominent contractor. The younger Knott headed the Mandel for Governor Steering Committee, and made contributions to Gov. Marvin Mandel's campaign for reelection. Instead of making the usual application to the Prince Georges County Health Department for sewer connections, the contractors went directly to the State Health Department in Baltimore, seeking an exception to the ban on sewer hook-ups instituted in Prince Georges last summer by Dr. Neil Solomon, secretary of the State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.

The post of secretary of health and mental hygiene was created by the Maryland General Assembly in July, 1969, Governor Mandel appointed Dr. Solomon to this post.

Dr. Solomon granted the request for a special exception to the contractors in a letter to Dr. Perry Stearns, acting health officer for Prince Georges. Dr. Solomon wrote Stearns, ". . . while it is necessary to continue close control over sewage flow, it would not serve the public interest to deprive population groups of such essential facilities as hospitals, schools and post offices." Nearby sewer lines were still not available, however.

The contractors then made application in Baltimore to provide the * * * noted the request and the Prince George's Health Department voiced disapproval. The area where the huge building is being erected is unsuitable for septic tank operation, local health officials noted.

Dr. Stearns told The Sentinel he was unaware of the construction of the facility until it was 50 per cent completed. "They made no application for sewage approval through my office," Dr. Stearns said.

Joseph E. Bartell Sr., who heads the County's Department of Inspection and Permits said he first became aware of the construction when he was informed of the situation by a Sentinel reporter last Thursday afternoon.

Bartell admitted that a later inspection revealed that the Knott Company had exceeded the amount of construction covered in the permit issued for the building's foundation. Bartell said he halted the construction for a short time on Friday, and then issued a permit covering the construction already completed and authorizing the builder to complete the job.

When asked why the permit was issued, Bartell, apparently contradicting his orig-

inal statement, said, "We have been keeping a close watch on what was happening there. We have inspected their building plans, and they conformed to county requirements."

On Thursday, when Bartell was first asked about the George Palmer Highway construction he refused The Sentinel permission to see the files covering the work. When the files were examined on Monday they contained the permit issued on Friday. There were no records of job inspections in the folder.

"Those records," Bartell said, "are in the hands of our inspectors out in the field, and you'll have to have a special appointment to see them."

Bartell said the sole authority governing his belated granting of the building permit came from County Attorney Lionel Lockhart. Lockhart wrote Bartell, "I have reviewed the application and the facts, and the letter from Dr. Stearns that they (Knott Construction) were exempt from the sewer moratorium, and it is my opinion that you were justified in issuing the building permit at this time."

Dr. Stearns told The Sentinel, "We have a written agreement, maybe not legally binding, but written, with the Inspection and Permits Division that they would await approval from the Health Department before issuing any building permit." According to Dr. Stearns, this is the first time the Building and Inspections office has ignored the agreement.

The original permit listed the owner of the facility as Sea Land Services, located in Elizabeth City, N.J. but in an application dated Sept. 24 for permission to construct holding tanks to handle sewage from the building, the applicant was listed as Mail Express Inc. Its address was given as 10101 George Palmer Highway, the construction site.

In this application, a request was made to permit construction of four holding tanks to retain sewage until it could be hauled away by a sewage contractor. The sewage would be dumped in existing sewage facilities. Average sewage flow at the site was estimated at 4000 gallons a day. The application said 75 persons would be working at the facility.

Dr. Stearns indicated to The Sentinel that he was not sympathetic to this appeal. "These contractors took it on themselves to push ahead the completion of this job without proper building permits," he told a reporter. "I feel they must comply with the county's sewage regulations and receive no special consideration from this office. I couldn't authorize holding tanks for this project. I could not recommend them," Dr. Stearns said. "I am writing a letter that basically says this to Dr. Solomon: If he wants to go ahead and grant approval after we have said that we cannot approve these holding tanks, then the approval will have to come from his office." Marvin Vaughn of the Inspections and Permits Division agreed that Bartell was acting properly in granting the permit to complete the construction job.

"I don't deny that he (Knott) broke the law; but if you expect all the citizens in the county who inadvertently go beyond the law to be slapped down, then this county would be a cruel place to live," Vaughn said.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 8, 1970]

POST OFFICE BUILT BEFORE PERMIT ISSUE

(By James Macnees)

HYATTSVILLE, October 7—A Baltimore construction firm has nearly completed a new federal post office facility in Prince Georges county without first having obtained a building permit and with no provision for sewage disposal.

The Henry A. Knott Construction Company was given permission only to set the foundation for the $700,000 parcel post handling facility in mid-August.

Under the contract awarded the owner, Sea Land Services, of Elizabeth City, N.J., the lease-back plant was to have been usable by October 15 and fully operational by November 1.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT COMPLETED

It is now about 75 per cent completed. The construction permit was belatedly issued last Friday after it was brought to the attention of the county Department of Inspections and Permits that work had gone far beyond the foundation stage.

However, no provision for disposal of the waste has been made. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission estimates its line, now 2,000 feet away, will not be extended to the site at 10101 George Palmer highway, Lanham, for about a year.

ALTERNATE METHODS

Both Montgomery and Prince Georges counties have been under a sewer hookup ban for five months because of health hazards from raw and inadequately treated sewage being discharged into waters of the state.

The builder proposed two alternate methods of sewage disposal to the state Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The use of septic tanks and a lagoon-spray system were denied at the county level because the soil at the site would not "percolate," or adequately absorb the wastes and because the lot size was inadequate.

Under a special exception, application has been made to install four steel holding tanks underground, to receive wastes from the facility's toilets, showers and kitchen. A scavenger would be hired to empty the tanks periodically.

In general, holding tanks are intended as temporary measures to be used until permanent facilities are provided, but only as a last resort and only in isolated premises.

APPROVAL REFUSED

Dr. Perry Searns, the state-appointed acting health officer for the county, said he would not approve the holding tanks. He said state regulations on them "do not cover this facility."

He said Dr. Neil Solomon, secretary of the state health department, would have to rule on this special exception.

Dr. Stearns said the builders had "cut several corners, to put it most kindly. In this case, they built the facility without a permit and without applying for a sewer hookup. The whole thing was irregular."

"In a county where one health officer has been taken to court [for approving septic tanks without making percolation tests] and had to pay his own legal expenses, I can't afford to do anything illegal," he said, adding "The way they've gone about this is embarrassing to everybody."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1970]

PERMIT LACK PERILS POST OFFICE FACILITY

(By Douglas Watson)

A $750,000 mail-sorting terminal in Lanham, which is three-fourths completed and scheduled to begin processing mail for the entire metropolitan area soon, lacks an approved sewage system and cannot open without one.

The delay in opening could be a year or more.

Until last week, a building permit had not been issued for the building at George Palmer Highway and Lottsford Vista Road, although construction was well under way.

The facility, to be called the Capital Beltway Truck Terminal, was started this summer and was originally scheduled to be ready for use by Oct. 15. It will replace Washington's Union Station as the center for sorting truck-transported mail sacks for the Washington area. It will employ 100 persons who will sort 12 million sacks of mail a year.

Joseph E. Bartell, director of Prince George's County's department of inspections and permits, said yesterday that the required building permit was issued belatedly last Friday after his department was informed that construction was proceeding without one.

However, he and Dr. Perry Stearns, acting county health officer, said that occupancy of the facility won't be allowed until a sewer line is extended there—and this is expected to take at least a year—exceptions to regulations may be made to permit a temporary on-site sewage system.

The facility is being built for Mail Express Inc., a subsidiary of Sea-Land Service Inc., which has a contract with the U.S. Post Office Department, a Baltimore Builder.

The Henry A. Knott Construction Co., of Baltimore, the contractor for the project, which had been given a foundation permit but not, until Friday, the building permit needed to go ahead with the main structure, Bartell said.

"We don't know why it was that far ahead," Bartell said, adding that he is investigating.

The nearest trunk sewer line is 2,000 feet away, according to a Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission official, who said his agency only received a sewer application for ths project this week.

CONGRESSMAN BILL CLAY REPORTS ON THE ISSUES AND WORK OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my report to the First Congressional District of Missouri after serving my first term as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives during the 91st Congress:

REPORT TO THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

DEFENSE

The draft

There should be a volunteer Army. The draft unfairly casts the fates of our young men, discriminating against some in favor of others. I have sponsored legislation to terminate the draft and to institute a volunteer force.

Cambodia

I sponsored a resolution calling on the United States to refrain from any military action in Cambodia. In a letter, I called to the attention of the President my protest to the extension of this war. We paid too great a price for the President's action which was taken without consent or consultation of the Congress. As a result, we suffered the spilling of American blood on American soil. That tragic deaths of Kent State and Jackson State students stand as a sad and shameful reminder of the alienation and division this war has wrought.

Vietnam

Troops should be withdrawn immediately. This war has torn our own nation apart, economically, socially and politically. Instead of Vietnamizing Vietnam—where we have no moral, legal or just reason for being, this Nation must start Americanizing America. We must serve our own people and meet our own overwhelming problems. We can achieve peace with honor by returning Asia to the Asians. I supported the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment to End the War, which directed the President to pull out—not only from Cambodia—but from Southeast Asia on a prescribed timetable. I shall continue to work towards such an end.

EDUCATION

Funds

Since my election to Congress, President Nixon has vetoed four appropriations bills. Twice, he has said "NO" to education and health spending. It is hard for Americans to understand how the price-tag for education which is currently at $4.4 billion is considered too much to pay, when $70 billion for defense isn't given a second thought. It costs us $20,000 just for the ammunition to kill one Vietcong—yet we spend no more than $53 per year of the federal money on the education of each American child.

Education and Labor Committee

As a member, I have had the opportunity to voice educational concerns of people in the 1st District. I have fought to maintain programs of vital assistance to school districts with large concentrations of disadvantaged students. I have fought to continue aid to higher education and federal assistance to students who want to attend college. It has been a frustrating struggle to hold funds for all educational programs—against efforts to terminate or to limit every item of school aid at all educational levels.

St. Louis public schools

It was my privilege to bring members of the House Education and Labor Committee to St. Louis last April for a look at the St. Louis Public School System. As a result of a first-hand look at the problems of our school system, legislation is now incorporating proposals to meet those needs. Every member of Congress should have one look at Pruitt-Igoe and one visit in the schools of that area so he may know what we are talking about when we ask for equal educational opportunity.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

Equal opportunity law

The law says that a person should have job opportunities—without regard for his race, creed, or color. But job discrimination runs rampant in this Nation. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have participated in hearings on equal employment opportunity law. We haven't begun to make the law worth the paper it is written on. There must be new powers of enforcement with a directive that the federal government act forcefully and finally to secure lawful compliance. The federal government itself is guilty of job discrimination and does not pursue its obligation for granting contracts only to employers which comply with civil rights law. Until these laws mean as much as the laws against inciting violence, there can never be any more than "rhetoric" implied in the "law and order" campaigns.

CRIME

Law and order

I am disturbed by the seeming implication that unless you ride under the "law and order" banner of the George Wallaces—or unless you ride shotgun for Attorney General Mitchell, you must be against law and order—therefore, for crime. The right wing and the reactionaries of politics have tried to make it seem that they are the only people interested in making streets safe for Americans. But they have no monopoly on the issue of crime and certainly, they have not advanced any reasonable solutions. I have grown very weary of the racial overtones which accompany these loud clamors for law and order. The discussion of crime should not be used to increase the fears and hatreds of Americans for other Americans.

Implied in the loud demands for law and order—is a total repression of all who attempt to effectuate social change. When politicians make claims about their ability to "control crime"—it usually means they will maintain the status quo—economically, socially and politically. Social reform has no place in the kind of social order they seek. "Law and Order"—couched in racist's jargon—carries many frightening implications.

Black people and poor white people are the real victims of the crime in the streets—and our sympathies are with the victims—not with the criminals. We know the fears, the death, and the tragedy. We cannot continue to be the prime victims of crime—and also the people who have the least protection from criminals.

Black citizens want to curb crime—but in a way that does not bring about a police state. We cannot pretend to have a "safer, more secure society"—when we give policemen the right to enter our homes without knocking—or when we permit the jailing of persons who have only been "accused" of a crime. The law must respect as well as protect the rights of our citizens. And the law must distinguish between criminal acts and the exercise of legitimate rights. I have yet to hear a "law and order" fanatic say he is out to rid society of murderers or of rapists. Too often, it is implied that he is out to put down citizens who by speaking or marching call attention to the need for change.

The ability of the American people to distinguish between the campaigners against crime and the campaigners against change will determine our success in any battle against crime. Moreover, the ability of the American people to make that distinction will inhibit or contribute to the progress of the United States on other domestic fronts.

POVERTY

Backsliding on a commitment

The federal government must increase—rather than decrease its commitment to the poor and underprivileged, not only because it is right, but because it is economically sound. The challenge since I have been in Congress has been just to hold on to any commitment to the poor.

During the very first months of my membership in the House, I was appointed to serve on the Special Ad Hoc Task Force on Poverty. For months, hearings were held, witnesses were called, debate was active. The new Administration wanted to let the Economic Opportunity Act expire so they could take a new direction. But finally, an extension of the Act was won—not without damaging compromise.

The Administration shut down 59 Job Corps Centers over the protest of Committee members—and the St. Louis Job Corps Center for Women was among them. A new and better and less expensive program was promised by the Administration—but we have yet to see more than a few new centers operating.

The Administration has fought to give States control over poverty programs—even though State governments have traditionally and systematically denied responsibility for the poor. The present dispositions of many State administrations are not inclined toward the eradication of poverty. In fact, many of them still maintain that poor people are responsible for their poverty. The Congress chose to leave what is left of the poverty program in the hands of the Office of Economic Opportunity—and other federal administrators.

But the challenges to destroy the program keep coming. I have fought against the demise of the Legal Aid Services program—which is again being threatened. A lawyer—to a poor man—is a person who keeps rich people out of jail. Lawyers and legal services have never before been possible for the poor—so why shouldn't the poor people believe laws are written for the rich. The impact of this program has been significant. It has made a difference, not only in the lives of the poor—but in the outlooks of the poor. I shall continue to work to protect the program.

Community Action has involved the poor in ways which stimulate self-determination. This concept has always been under attack. The Administration sees this as place where funds can be drastically reduced. There is also a move to terminate Head Start in favor of a program for everybody's child. Head Start is meant to prepare disadvantaged children for school—those children who are behind before they start. If other children are to have a program, it must not be at the expense of Head Start.

Too many generations of families have lived in endless poverty. During the 1960's, this country began efforts to end that cycle. We must not let those efforts and hopes for a better future die at the hands of an insensitive leadership.

INFLATION-UNEMPLOYMENT

An inflationary recession

The President has a strange way of fighting inflation. The Congress gave him the authority to control credit, slow interest rates and help homebuilders and small business. The President signed the bill—but announced he will not use that authority. The House also gave the President stand-by authority to impose wage, price and rent controls. The Senate sustained this vote. Yet he has made it clear that this is a power he does not want and will not utilize.

The President has not shown any interest in dissuading big business from continuing price increases. Instead, with every price increase and the demand then created for increased wages and salaries, the President imposes another freeze on federal programs such as education.

The White House is fighting inflation by increasing unemployment and they have stated that the rising rates of unemployment are encouraging. Banks and big money lenders showed record profit increases of from 5% to 55% or more in 1969—but the White House observes progress against inflation in the crumbling of the everyday existences of the common man. Following the White House reasoning on inflation to its logical conclusion, we can only assume that trumpets will blast forth on Pennsylvania Avenue when the average man on the street has holes in his pockets.

The unemployment rate in St. Louis is now 6.3%—and among minorities, the rate is more than double that. We are now in the midst of the worst inflationary binge the country has experienced in 20 years—and the first recession since 1961—and, we are getting them simultaneously.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Conducting a holding action

Black Americans have learned there is no virtue in patience—that it contributes to the injustices which fall upon us. Incredible as it is, the suggestion is still offered, seriously and repeatedly, that if black Americans will only be "patient"—this Nation will finally surrender the rights and liberties due us. Since the 91st Congress convened, those of us involved in the struggle for equal opportunities, voting rights, fair housing and equal educational opportunity—have been conducting a holding action.

Since April of this year, the nine black members of the House of Representatives have sought an appointment with the President to discuss the concerns of 25 million black citizens. The President says he does not have time to see us.

On the desegregation of schools, the President had to make a special speech just to tell the Nation he would "obey" the law calling for school integration.

On Voting Rights, the President urged that the landmark law be allowed to expire—in favor of new legislation providing for spreading the federal registrars all across the country instead of concentrating action in the South.

The President talks about directing funds into the hands of black business to produce minority-group capitalists. And he emphasizes the creation of a special office of

minority enterprise to coordinate programs to serve minorities. But in truth, the capitalist program assigned to the Department of Commerce never came up with the funds and the office of minority enterprise was never given any authority or directive to act.

The Administration is responsible for removing from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the Chairman who took his job "too" seriously.

On programs vital to the progress of minorities and disadvantaged citizens, this Administration has consistently recommended reduced funding—notably for housing, job training, health services and education.

The President's posture on civil rights and the conscious, well-publicized effort on the part of this Administration to retreat from the pursuit of freedoms for black citizens have been at issue since this leadership assumed office. As a result, the alienation between the black populace and this President is severe.

HOUSING

Great American housing hoax

To say that we are in a housing crisis is to put it mildly. It is a tragedy. Even middle-income Americans are finding it difficult and often impossible to buy a home. Needless to say, low-income Americans are subsisting in housing conditions which are a disgrace to our Nation.

More than 12 percent of the American families cannot afford decent housing—and of those 8 million—one half of them are surviving on incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

Public Housing Authorities are broke—and St. Louis holds the distinction of standing at the top of the crisis list. The strike by public housing tenants is history—but during the midst of the strike I introduced legislation to keep the rents for public housing tenants down to a reasonable level. Twenty-five percent of income is the absolute limit of reasonableness—particularly when we consider that the national average of percent of income paid for housing is only 15 percent.

The House did not take favorable action on my proposal—but similar legislation introduced in the Senate was passed. Unfortunately, when it came time to appropriate money for rent reductions and for payment on public housing authority debts—an Administration reluctant to implement the new law requested only $33 million of the $75 million authorized by the Congress. The Department of Housing and Urban Development cooperated with the White House by writing regulations for the program which virtually nullify the congressional intent of the law. As a result—public housing tenants and authorities have seen little reward for the legislative effort.

This is only one chapter of the story of federal housing efforts and the administration of these programs which are intended to help people in need. It all adds up to what is popularly known as the "Great American Housing Hoax."

We have yet to get to the bottom of the problems with the Section 235 program—a federal housing program whereby low-income families may purchase new or existing housing for a minimum down payment and manageable monthly payments. I receive complaints from people who want to take advantage of the program, for which there is never enough money. I also receive complaints from persons who have bought homes under Section 235, only to later learn that the house is in substandard condition.

It is scandalous that poor people should be exploited at government expense. The House Banking and Currency Committee has taken an interest in these complaints. I shall cooperate with Chairman of that Committee, Wright Patman, in hopes of determining and/or taking action against whatever or whomever is at fault.

In 1949, this government made a promise of a "decent home for every American." While I am a member of Congress, I shall work to see if that promise can be made good.

OTHER ISSUES

Guaranteed income

Our government is spending $3 billion a year to subsidize rich farmers. Last year, four thousand farmers collected more than $100,000 each for not growing food. This is a guaranteed income. But when the President proposed a family assistance plan for the welfare of the poor, he felt it necessary to apologize for recommending that $4 billion would be required to implement what is clearly a "minimal" effort. The legislation is still stalled in the Senate.

Hunger

There is hunger in this country. For 22 million poor Americans and 13 million "near-poor", hunger is a daily fact of life. The hunger which exists in America is shameful, but the lack of social action to combat it is disgraceful. Our two basic government food programs serve only 6 million of the people in need. Seven states in the Nation refuse to participate in the Food Stamp program and 1413 counties have no food program at all. School lunches don't go around for the children who cannot afford to pay. If we want to beautify America, let us start by feeding a child.

Pollution

There is lots of talk on the subject, but when the Congress voted to double the funds for water and sewer systems, the President vetoed the bill.

Older Americans

I sponsored legislation for a 15% increase in Social Security benefits. The bill passed. As a result of legislation passed in the 91st Congress, widow's and widower's benefits at age 65 have been increased to 100% of the spouse's benefits. Railroad Retirement was also increased by 15%.

Still we have not met the problems older citizens have with housing, health, and retirement opportunities. Much remains to be done to extend to our senior citizens the dignity and respect they have earned.

FOREST RESOURCE LOSSES THROUGH FIRES

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of acres of valuable forests are destroyed each year by fire. Timber resources lost through fires run into millions of dollars annually. Losses to other forest values, such as recreational facilities, soil conditions, water quality and wildlife habitat add additional millions of dollars to the value of the wood fiber that is destroyed. This scourge of the land required the expenditure of many more millions for fire control, for reclamation to prevent soil erosion and flooding, for reseeding and replanting of new timber crops, and in salvaging the burned timber before decay makes it worthless.

The forest fires that raged on Federal, State, and private lands in north central Washington and Oregon during July, August, and early September, and in Southern California just a few weeks ago, have been the most destructive and costly in recent years. The acreage of national forest timberlands burned this year is the highest in the past 28 years, the fourth highest in the past 40 years, and the ninth highest in the past 50 years.

Forest lands in the Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests of Washington State were particularly hard hit. In July, some 25,000 acres in the Okanogan National Forest and about 33,000 acres of State and private lands in the area were destroyed by hundreds of lightning-caused fires. Around the same time, lightning storms ignited fires which burned about 20,000 acres in the Wenatchee National Forest. The fires spread rapidly because of the extremely dry ground conditions and high winds.

In August, lightning storms again caused several hundred fires in the same area. In the Wenatchee National Forest over 135,000 acres of national forest lands and State and private lands in the perimeter of the national forest burned. Dry ground conditions, strong winds, and lack of roading for firefighting crews allowed the fires to spread rapidly out of control before fire crews could be moved into the area.

The Forest Service has completed estimates of the damage and the cost of emergency measures needed to prevent flooding and soil erosion. The agency has also completed planning and estimates of the funds that will be required for long-term rehabilitation.

Over $1 million in emergency flood prevention funds and supplemental appropriations will be needed immediately to prevent on- and off-site flooding, to control soil erosion, and for other prompt restoration work on national forest lands in California, Oregon, and Washington. Surveys indicate additional appropriations will be required for long-term rehabilitation of the burned-over areas within a 6- or 7-year period. The Forest Service estimates that a grand total of between $5 and $6 million must be spent to restore all national forest timber, soil, water, wildlife, recreational, and grazing values over the long term.

Estimates of the timber burned are not yet available. In the Wenatchee National Forest, a significant portion of the Entiat and Lake Chelan watersheds were destroyed. Burned areas of the Wenatchee supported about 800 million board feet of timber. All of it was not burned, however, and an estimated 120 million board feet may be salvageable. The Forest Service is making plans for salvage operations to begin as soon as possible before decay and infestation preclude salvaging marketable timber.

Estimates of long-term reforestation costs on national forest lands in Washington are being set at $3 million.

The August fires destroyed the forest cover on the Entiat Experimental Watershed, which is estimated as a $120 million water yield research loss. Forest Service campgrounds, cabins, and trail bridges destroyed by the fires represent a loss of approximately 12,000 visitor days for the remainder of the season.

Game losses have not been estimated, but valuable forage for game was consumed in the fire. The Entiat River bottom and the lakesite zone along Lake Chelan were heavily damaged along a 105-mile landscape management zone.

Long-term rehabilitation will include programs for reforestation, rodent control, wildlife habitat restoration, recreation restoration, timber salvage, and repair and replacement of irrigation pipelines, powerlines, and roads.

Controlling fires the size and intensity of those on the Wenatchee and Okanogan national forests is a gigantic operation. At the height of the fires on the Okanogan National Forest, over 5,000 men were on the firelines. In the Wenatchee fires, approximately 8,500 men—many from as far away as Gulf Coast States and the Great Lakes—manned the firelines. Some 20 air tankers, 30 helicopters and upward of 60 tractors and other equipment were mobilized into firefighting duty. An unofficial estimate of the cost of controlling all the fires on Federal, State, and private lands, including clean-up but not rehabilitation and salvage costs, is between $50 and $60 million.

Forest Service fire control crews were greatly assisted by State and company personnel. Between 700 and 800 employees of the Biles-Coleman Lumber Co., Omak, Wash., manned the firelines for days on end. At the height of the fires, many of the workers remained on the lines for periods of 22 hours. Company supervisors right up through main office personnel worked as teams with mill and woods personnel and with company equipment. Many other forest products industry company workers and equipment also joined Forest Service and State firefighters on the firelines.

Firefighting on much of the national forest areas was difficult to control because the terrain generally is rougher and steeper than State and private lands. In many areas there are no access roads which made it impossible to get men and equipment in to fight the fire. The Safety Harbor fire on the Wenatchee National Forest, involving more than 15,000 acres, was extremely difficult to control because fire crews could not move in to fight the blaze.

The forest fire story is a yearly one. The number of fires reported this year caused by man and by nature were divided—7,743 due to lightning and 6,503 caused by man. The most severe fires were the result of lightning storms.

In the months and years ahead the Congress will be asked for the funding necessary to rehabilitate burned-over areas. Emergency funds are needed immediately to prevent soil erosion during the forthcoming rainy season and flooding next spring. Emergency funds also are required to restore river and lake quality and for forage planting to provide food for wildlife. The long-term funds that will be required for extensive reforestation will come from appropriated funds.

The rehabilitation of the burned-over areas is of vital importance to the State of Washington, to the timber-based economy of the State in the area, and to the recreational facilities used extensively by the citizens of the State. It is my hope that Congress will respond wholeheartedly when the appropriations for this much-needed rehabilitation work, are considered.

AN INJUSTICE TO THE CHILDREN OF AMERICAN SERVICEMEN IS REMEDIED

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Chairman MAHON and the Appropriations Committee and the staff of that committee for their efforts to incorporate section 807 in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

Section 807 of the Department of Defense Appropriation for fiscal year 1971 provides a remedy for a little-known but nonetheless grave injustice to the children of American servicemen.

Section 807 provides that, under regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense, schooling in a Department of Defense operated school may be provided without tuition for the minor dependents of civilian and military personnel of the Department of Defense who died while entitled to compensation or active duty pay. This provision will allow widows who are foreign nationals to educate their children in American schools if they return to their country of origin.

This provision substantially incorporates H.R. 16725 which I introduced along with other members of the Committee on Education and Labor. In introducing H.R. 16725 members of the committee also wrote on April 1, 1970 to Chairman MAHON of the Appropriations Committee explaining how the need for this legislation was brought to light by the investigations in the field that were undertaken by the Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee headed by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN DENT. The trips made by the subcommittee and the reports filed on the educational conditions in our overseas schools have for the past 5 years resulted in extensive improvements in the quality of education received by dependent children overseas.

The report filed in June of 1970 by Congressman DENT's subcommittee contained recommendations on the specific problem which section 807 of this Department of Defense Appropriations bill remedies.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my other able colleagues on the committee for acting to effectuate another advancement in the educational system for our dependent children overseas.

I am especially encouraged by the overriding concern for the quality of education which is apparent in the close cooperation that existed between Congressman DENT's subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations in working to solve this problem. This cooperation has been very productive in past years. And I look forward to continued opportunities for those who share concern and responsibility for the schooling of our children overseas to work together toward continued educational improvements.

AUTO SAFETY: BUMPERS—NO. 8

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the March 1970 issue of Traffic Safety, published by the National Safety Council, contains a very important article on the subject of bumper safety. The article describes a new shock absorbing auto bumper which may constitute a major breakthrough with respect to the problem of low-speed auto crashes.

AEROSPACE PRODUCTS COMPANY INTRODUCES SHOCK ABSORBING AUTO BUMPER

An auto bumper shock mount system, which is said to show a vehicle damage reduction of 82 per cent in a 30 m.ph. rear-end collision, has been developed by Menasco, a major U.S. supplier of aircraft landing gear and aerospace products.

The four-unit system, which utilizes a compressible silicone compound for shock absorption, is an outgrowth of research done by the company to design and produce shock isolators for the Polaris and Minuteman missile programs.

The four units are installed behind the automobile bumper in an "M" configuration. "Because of the high compressibility of the silicone compound," inventor Giles A. Kendall explains, "total chassis crush in a 26 m.p.h. rear-end collision between automobiles equipped with the system is reduced from the 17" that would be normal with conventional bumper equipment to essentially zero.

"Solid media shock mitigation involves an elastomer, a solid but highly compressible silicone compound which acts like a liquid only when under high pressure.

"On impact, a rod-like piston moves forward into an elastomer-filled chamber, forcing the elastomer through openings in a damping head. The resistance to flow of the elastomer absorbs the major energy of the crash. The compression of the elastomer serves to act like a mechanical spring to return the piston to its initial extended condition. The use of the solid state media combines the functions of a hydraulic damper and a powerful mechanical spring.

"At the end of the stroke, the elastomer is under a pressure of 40,000 pounds per square inch. This makes possible almost immediate return of the piston, enabling the shock mount to be in rapid readiness for additional impacts.

"Since the elastomer is a solid, leakage is eliminated and only simple seals are necessary. The solid state shock mount is not affected by normal temperature change, requires no maintenance and, if not otherwise damaged, will last the life of the car."

Development of the system began in 1966 following an earlier successful design of a similar system for railroad draft gear, which absorbs shocks of coupling railroad cars. Eight months of testing by the Digitek Corporation, an independent research firm, confirmed Menasco theories of a significant potential contribution to automotive safety.

During the first public introduction of the new shock mounts last summer, automobiles equiped with the new system were driven by Bob Harris, noted professional driver who conceived and drove chase and crash scenes for *Bonnie and Clyde* and *Bullitt*. A professional automobile and motorcycle racer, Harris reported that it was almost impossible to cause damage to another car with the new bumper equipment in collisions at up to 30 m.p.h.

The first test shown was a rear-end impact of two vehicles, both with the bumper equipment, at 15 m.p.h. No damage was evident on either automobile.

During the second test, the same two automobiles were impacted at 15 m.p.h. at a 15 degree oblique angle. In this test, while only a portion of the bumper retracted significantly, there was no apparent damage.

According to Kendall, who is Menasco's chief engineer for new product development, an oblique angle crash still provides at least one-half the protection of the entire system because of the "M" configuration of placing the shock mounts.

"The rear-end collision of two autos, one going 45 m.p.h. and one 60 m.p.h., would have a similar effect as if one were standing still and one hitting at 15 m.p.h.," he said.

The third test was a rear-end collision at 26 m.p.h. of two cars with the bumper equipment. Since 72 per cent of all recorded U.S. accidents occur at 30 m.p.h. or less, the company has concentrated on testing at mileages under or near 30 m.p.h.

Only slight sheet metal damage was evident in the 26 m.p.h. crash. According to Kendall, the tests indicate that damage at 25–30 m.p.h. in an accident of this type would be reduced by at least $600 per car average compared to damage with conventional equipment.

Forces experienced by the driver were in the range of 6 to 10 g's. Deceleration of one g exerts forces on an individual's body equivalent to his weight. A deceleration of 10 g's, therefore, would equal 10 times the person's weight. Aircraft fighter pilots regularly experience forces of this magnitude with no apparent injurious effects, Kendall pointed out.

Menasco president Gerald J. Lynch pointed out that economic loss in the U.S. from automobile accidents in 1968 alone was $11 billion, according to the National Safety Council, and that 42 per cent of all U.S. accidents are rearend collisions.

The system has been designed to conform with modern bumper styling and could probably be mass produced at low cost, Lynch stated. He said that the company would enlist the participation of the automotive industry in its final development and marketing plans. The viscoelastic shock isolator principle, which has been patented by Menasco, could also be applied to freeway guard rails and abutment barriers he said.

THE PLIGHT OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, now that November elections are fast upon us, voices are being raised in a chorus of concern over the plight of our environment and the ecological balance that affects it. Many members of that chorus hail from the majority side of the aisle. Ironically, it was under the Democratic years—1960–68—that our environmental problems were allowed to reach such alarming proportions that in some cases remedy now may be virtually impossible, and in any case far more expensive than it would have been had the Kennedy and Johnson administrations shouldered the responsibility for the Nation's environment that was assigned to them when they were elected. Fortunately for the national welfare, President Nixon has assumed that responsibility and through his leadership and example, we are now beginning to see improvements in our environmental situation.

The records of both the past 20 months and the previous 8 years are well documented. In 8 years of Democrat administration, we saw the destructive forces eroding America's environment go largely unchallenged. Some amendments which sounded good were added to laws initiated in the Eisenhower era, but failed to cope with the problems. Commissions were established, elaborate plans were made. But instead of improving, the situation worsened. The country had to wait until the advent of the Nixon administration before the Government began to make the kind of firm, purposeful response that was needed to halt the further deterioration of the environment and begin the improvement of our surroundings. To better illustrate what I am talking about, let me point to a few specific instances.

PESTICIDES

As early as 1957, the Nation was alarmed to learn that in Clear Lake, Calif., the DDT level was high enough to kill fish. By 1962, Rachel Carson had authored "Silent Spring," a widely read and discussed book which alerted the Nation to the danger of careless and indiscriminate use of pesticides. What was done by the Democratic administration to cope with this problem? Judging from the results, nothing. Ten years later, in 1967, DDT problems were rampant throughout the country. DDT sprayed to kill beetles near Lake Michigan found its way into lake waters, killing nearly 1 million coho salmon, and still today many Lake Michigan fish have DDT levels up to 10 parts per million, as compared with the maximum safe level of only seven parts per million. Other pesticides caused similar problems.

It was not until the Nixon administration took office, that we began to see action on this problem. In 1969, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare identified some 900 active pesticidal chemicals formulated in over 60,000 preparations. In January 1970, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare strengthened an interagency agreement to regulate the use of pesticides and placed some 32 on a restricted list; in April they suspended the use of 2-4-5-T, and in June, in a Federal effort to set an example by leading the way, DDT, aldrin, 2-4-5-T, dieldrin, endrin, DDD, mercury compounds, and nine other pesticides were banned on 360 million acres of public land.

MERCURY

Mercury has been accumulating for years in the Nation's streams and waterways, building up to toxic levels, poisoning fish and wildlife and threatening humans as well. This was not discovered, however, until 1970. Fortunately, the Nixon administration was in office—rather than those who had responded so lackadaisically to "Silent Spring"—and prompt action has been taken to bring mercury pollution under control.

AIR POLLUTION

In November 1967, President Johnson pointed out that the Nation was "pouring at least 130 million tons of poison into the air each year." A year later, his envoy to the United Nations stated that 142 million tons of noxious fumes and smoke were being dumped into the atmosphere. But by that time, these statistics were superfluous. It was obvious—from the increasing rates of lung cancer, emphysema, and higher death rates at times of high air pollution, like Thanksgiving 1966, in New York City—that the condition of the air we breathe was woresening at an alarming rate. Despite the fact that clean air legislation had been updated in 1963, 1965, and again in 1967, very little had been done by the Federal Government to move against the problem. An action brought against a Maryland chicken plant was 5 years later, in 1970, still tied up in the courts. No other enforcement action had gotten beyond the conference stage.

President Nixon has submitted a proposal to Congress that would strengthen the government's enforcement powers. Because motor vehicles are the major source of air pollution, Nixon has also proposed a strengthening of the Federal automobile emissions standards and procedures as well as regulation of gasoline additives. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Treasury, and the FAA Administrator have reached agreement with 31 airlines to reduce air pollution from jets by 27,600 pounds of pollutants each day by 1972.

SOLID WASTE

Over 75 percent of all collected solid waste is dumped in open fields and the rest is burned, contributing to air pollution. One source of solid waste, abandoned automobiles, is growing at alarming rates. According to HEW, between 1960 and 1970, somewhere between 12 and 20 million abandoned automobiles accumulated.

The Nixon administration's work on trying to solve this solid waste problem has yielded good results. Just this summer the Bureau of Mines perfected a process of destructive distillation to convert waste and refuse into usable forms of solids, liquids and gases, thereby enabling waste products to be reused. The administration has also proposed a system of incentives and regulations to encourage the prompt re-use of scrapped autos.

NOISE

The Federal Government has only recently assumed the responsibility for leadership in fighting to combat unnecessary noise—a problem that had been growing in severity over the past 10 years. Examples of the administration's efforts in this area include the Department of Labor's action in May, 1969, to regulate, for the first time, the limits of acceptable occupational exposure to noise; the Department of Transportation's action in November 1969 to regulate aircraft noise, and NASA's 1969 demonstration of ways that noise can be cut in jet aircraft.

WATER POLLUTION

During the 1960's, water pollution became so bad that it was no longer possible to ignore—beaches were closed, fishing was prohibited, rivers and lakes ceased to support certain fish and wildlife, the stench often became unbearable, and one river even caught on fire periodically. Examples are abundant. Pollution in the Long Island Sound doubled in the 1960's according to a survey released by the Interior Department and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, causing the prohibition of shellfish harvesting in large areas of the sound because of the high bacteria counts. DDT and mercury pollution, which I have mentioned already, reached levels toxic to fish and dangerous to humans who ate those fish. In the Great Lakes, polluted material was dredged up out of the lake bottoms and then dumped back into the Lakes, causing further pollution and contamination of the waters—in 1967, U.S. Government dredging projects at 14 Lake Erie harbors, for example, produced a total of 7.6 million cubic yards of polluted dredged material, most of which was dumped back into the lake. Lake Erie, the world's 12th largest lake, experienced a devastating ecological change during the 1960's as pollution killed most of the commercial and game fish, ducks, and other wildlife. Some 137,000 pounds of phosphorus were dumped into the lake daily together with tons of industrial wastes, sewage, detergents, and other municipal wastes which have nourished microscopic organisms to the point that the lake has now become, literally, too clogged to support the forms of life that existed there before. Although Lake Erie is only 12,000 years old, scientists estimate that in the last half century it has been artifically aged by at least 15,000 years. Some even proclaim that Lake Erie, for all commercial, recreational, and esthetic purposes, has "died." The Cuyahoga River, which oozes its way through Cleveland to Lake Erie, catches fire periodically, earning it the dubious title of the "only body of water ever classified as a fire hazard." The bacteria count of the chocolate-brown river water, which bubbles like a witch's brew because of fermenting gases on the bottom, often matches that of pure sewage.

Much of the water pollution comes from industrial sources, but much also comes from municipal sources—untreated and partially treated sewage. Upon taking office, the Nixon administration discovered that less than one-third of the Nation's people are served by a system of sewers and treatment plants, that one-third have no sewers at all, and that of those who do have sewers, less than 60 percent have adequate treatment of the sewage. With all the money that was spent by the 1960's, most of it in the name of doing something for the people in our crowded cities, why was not something done about the sewer situation which is so important to not only the health, but also to the recreation, esthetic, and commercial interests of our citizens?

The Nixon administration has made a determined effort to clean up our rivers and lakes. Although water pollution control legislation was enacted in 1956 and again in 1965, it was not until 1969 that the Federal Government finally launched its first action to curb violations of water quality standards. On October 7, 1970, President Nixon called for legislation to ban or rigorously limit the dumping of harmful materials in the Great Lakes, and in April 1970 he called for legislation to control dumping of dredge spoil in the Great Lakes. Nixon's program to fight water pollution included the authorization of $4 billion for the construction of municipal waste treatment plants and a tripling of Federal operating grants to State pollution agencies.

COORDINATION

Under the Democrats, concern over various forms of environmental damage was allowed to "grow like Topsy" with the result that responsibility was fragmented among dozens of separate offices, bureaus, and agencies, with each Department haphazardly following its own course and no one really exercising any control over the total effort.

One of the major Nixon administration initiatives in the environmental area has been the reorganization of the responsibilities into two agencies. One, the Environmental Protection Agency assumes responsibilities previously distributed among five separate agencies—including such matters as air pollution, solid waste management, industrial responsibility for controlling pollution, pesticides, and radiation control. The other new agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will bring together into one administrative agency within the Department of Commerce all the major Federal programs dealing with the oceans and the atmosphere.

THE NIXON PROGRAM

The Nixon administration has outlined a lengthy program designed to help the Nation clean up the results of a decade of decline in the quality of our environment. What is more, under the Nixon administration we have been alerted to dangers that had gone unnoticed before—like mercury pollution. And for the first time, we are proposing measures designed to prevent, rather than to clean up after, serious pollution—the prohibition against dumping harmful materials in lakes and oceans, for instance.

Because the Nixon administration has compiled so long a record in its 20 months in office, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include the following 37-point program of Executive action and legislation proposals as well as an outline of Republican environmental policy initiatives:

NIXON'S 37-POINT PROGRAM

Water pollution

1. Authorization of $4 billion to cover the Federal share of $10 billion needed for construction of municipal waste treatment plants. To be allocated at a rate of $1 billion per year over the next four years, with a reassessment in 1973 of further needs for 1973 and subsequent years.

2. Establishment of Environmental Financing Authority to ensure that every municipality can finance its share of treatment plant construction costs.

3. Revision of statutory formula governing allocation of grants for treatment plant construction, to permit construction of plants where need is greatest and where greatest improvements in water quality will result.

4. Requirement that treatment plants be built to prescribed industrial users sufficient to meet costs of treating industrial wastes.

5. Requirement that municipalities impose users fees on industrial users sufficient to meet costs of treating industrial wastes.

6. Requirement of comprehensive river basin plans, to assure that construction of municipal treatment plants is complimented by abatement of all other sources of water pollution.

7. Encouragement of construction of large-scale, regional treatment facilities.

8. Extension of Federal-State water quality standards to include precise effluent standards for all industrial and municipal sources.

9. Provision that violation of established water quality standards is sufficient cause for court action.

10. Revision of Federal enforcement procedures to permit swifter court action against those in violation of water quality standards.

11. Provision that violation of established water quality standards is subject to court-imposed fines of up to $10,000 per day.

12. Authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to seek immediate injunctions where severe water pollution threatens imminent danger to health or irreversible damage to water environment.

13. Extension of Federal pollution control authority to include all navigable waters, both inter- and intra-state, all interstate ground waters, the United States' portion of boundary waters, and waters of the Contiguous Zone.

14. Tripling of Federal operating grants to state pollution agencies—from $10 million now to $30 million in 1975.

Air pollution

15. Publication of new, more stringent motor vehicle emissions standards for 1973 and 1975.

16. Revision of auto emissions enforcement procedures, to ensure that all new autos are in compliance with Federal standards.

17. Authorization for the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to regulate gasoline composition and additives.

18. Initiation of a research and development program to produce an unconventionally-powered, low-pollution auto within five years.

19. Initiation of testing and evaluation programs to assist private developers of unconventional, low-pollution autos.

19. Establishment of national air quality standards, with the states preparing abatement enforcement plans to meet national standards.

21. Accelerate designation of inter-state air quality control regions.

22. Establishment of national emissions standards for pollutants that are extremely hazardous to health and for specified classes of new facilities.

23. Extension of Federal air pollution control authority to both inter- and intra-state situations.

24. Provision that violation of air quality standards and national emissions standards are subject to court-imposed fines of up to $10,000 per day.

Solid waste management

25. Re-direction of solid waste research toward techniques for re-cycling materials and producing packaging materials that are easily degradable.

26. Council on Environmental Quality to develop bounty payment or similar system

to ensure prompt scrapping and re-cycling of junk automobiles.

27. Council on Environmental Quality to work with appropriate industry and consumer groups to develop other incentives or regulations for re-cycling or easier disposal of consumer goods.

Industrial involvement

28. Establishment of National Industrial Pollution Control Council.

29. Priority treatment for patent applications which could aid in curbing environmental abuses.

Parks and recreation

30. Full funding of the $327 million available under the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

31. Review of all Federally-owned real estate to identify properties that can be converted to public recreational use, or sold, with proceeds used to acquire additional recreational areas.

32. Relocation of Federal installations that occupy locations that could better be used for other purposes.

33. Provision that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is maintained or increased as a source of funds for purchase of Lands in future years.

34. Authorization for the Department of the Interior to convey surplus real property to State and local governments for park and recreational purposes at public benefit discounts of up to 100%.

35. Revision of budget accounting procedures to encourage Federal agencies to make more efficient use of their properties.

36. Assistance to State and local governments for making constructive recreational use of idled farmlands.

37. Authorization of long-term contracts with owners of idled farmlands for reforestation and other improvements for public recreational use.

II. HIGHLIGHTS OF PRESIDENT'S ENVIRONMENT PROGRAM

Water pollution

Municipal Pollution

Major Problems:

1. Federal funding for construction of water treatment plants has been far below the nation's needs.

2. Municipalities with serious pollution problems have often been unable to finance their share of treatment plant construction costs.

Administration Proposals:

1. Federal funding to provide waste treatment in every community in the nation at the fastest rate possible. $10 billion program to begin now, with assessment in 1973 of needs for 1975 and beyond.

2. Environmental Financing Authority to ensure that all municipalities needing treatment plants can finance local costs.

Industrial Pollution

Major Problem:

1. Regulations on disposal of industrial wastes (regulations apply to municipal wastes as well) have been too weak to prevent increasing water pollution.

Administration Proposals:

1. Reform pollution control program to greatly strengthen regulations on industrial and municipal polluters and permit swift enforcement actions.

Agricultural Pollution

Major Problem: 1. Agricultural pollution sources are diffuse, necessitating control of agricultural methods and materials.

Administration Proposal: 1. Phasing out of DDT and other hard pesticides. Water quality controls on concentrated animal feedlots.

Air pollution

Automobile Pollution

Major Problems:

1. Emissions from motor vehicles must be reduced greatly if air pollution is to be brought under control.

2. It may be impossible to reduce emissions from conventional automobiles sufficiently to reduce air pollution beyond 1980 in the face of increasing numbers of autos.

Administration Proposals:

1. Strengthen Federal automobile emissions standards and reform enforcement procedures to ensure that they are applied to all new autos. Regulate gasoline composition and additives to achieve maximum possible pollution reduction.

2. Begin a research and development program to produce an unconventionally-powered, low-pollution auto by 1975 if we cannot reduce pollution sufficiently from conventional vehicles.

Pollution From Stationary Sources

Major Problem: 1. The present program for regulating air pollution from stationary sources is extremely limited in scope and does not provide sufficient enforcement authority against polluters.

Administration Proposal: 1. Establish national air quality standards and extend abatement regulations to all areas of the nation where air quality is below national standards. Establish national emissions standards for extremely hazardous polluters and certain classes of new facilities. Strengthen enforcement authority for swift action against polluters.

Solid wastes

Major Problem: 1. New consumer technologies and marketing methods are creating an increasing volume of waste and refuse. There are few incentives for reusing wastes or disposing of them efficiently.

Administration Proposal: 1. Develop incentives and regulations for reducing volume of wastes, by encouraging products that can be re-cycled or easily disposed.

Parks

Major Problems:

1. Metropolitan expansion is claiming potential recreation areas which will be irretrievable if not acquired *now*.

2. Federal funding for acquisition of recreation areas has been far below national needs.

3. The Federal government has not made imaginative use of its vast real estate assets.

Administration Proposals:

1. Full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund: $327 million for fiscal 1971.

2. Identification and conversion of Federal properties which could better be used for public recreation. Selling of some Federal lands for financing of additional recreation areas.

3. Increased use of idled farmland for public recreation.

CUBA'S INFLUENCE SEEN IN U.S. BOMB WAVE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, an article in the October 13 issue of the Los Angeles Times entitled "Cuba's Influence Seen in U.S. Bomb Wave" should be must reading for every American. I present it now for my colleague's attention:

PARADE OF RADICAL VISITORS: CUBA'S INFLUENCE SEEN IN U.S. BOMB WAVE

(By Georgie Anne Geyer and Keyes Beech)

Fidel Castro's Cuba has become a revolutionary factory for the processing and refining of American radicals for export back to the United States.

The pattern is clear:

—Mark Rudd, fugitive leader of America's violent left, visited Cuba in February and March of 1968 with 20 other activists of the Students for a Democratic Society.

Two months later, with Rudd at the helm, Columbia University was reduced to chaos.

Bernardine Dohrn, miniskirted Weatherman member, and 30 fellow activists met with Vietnamese Communists in Havana in July, 1969.

Three months later, with the fiery Bernardine in command, a shocked Chicago watched as several hundred ultra-radical Weathermen staged a wild, window-smashing rampage which they called "four days of rage" in protest against the Vietnam war.

—Angela Davis, the Negro UCLA philosophy instructor, visited Cuba in July 1969.

A year later she made the FBI's "10 most wanted" list for alleged complicity in a California courthouse kidnaping and shootout. Four men, including the judge, two defendants and the kidnaper, were killed.

—Two Black Panthers traveled to Cuba in August, 1968, and returned the following month. They immediately became key figures in the turmoil at San Francisco State University.

These are not isolated coincidencs. Evidence linking what the students call with bleak humor the "Yankee Doodle revolution" to Communist Cuba is overwhelming.

No one, not the FBI, not the CIA, not even the most professional anti-Cuban anti-Communist in the United States, believes that somebody is sitting in the Plaza de la Revolucion in Havana sending messages to American students to bomb the University of Wisconsin math center or kill policemen.

Nobody is talking in simplistic terms of conspiracy.

But the roster of American radicals, white and black, who have responded to Castro's utopian bugle call for world revolution, reads like a "Who's Who" of the American radical movement.

"Name any disturbance in the United States—on campus, in the streets, anywhere—and I'll name you the leaders of it who have been to Cuba," said a State Department official.

More than six weeks of investigation by a team of Chicago Daily News reporters, including scores of interviews, from coast to coast with security officials and the radicals themselves, have confirmed that assessment.

Beyond any doubt, Cuba has shaped, supplied technical training, given political indoctrination and perhaps most important of all, served as the inspiration for the American radical movement in its avowed aim to bring down the American system that it so fiercely despises.

It is their mecca, their shrine, the "first liberated territory in the Western Hemisphere", where they can see the model of the new society to which they aspire.

Experts in the field regard Mark Rudd as the first of the really violent white student radicals. And they look upon his offensive against Columbia as a masterpiece of its kind—far more important than the earlier student riots at Berkeley.

The ubiquitous Miss Dohrn, a brilliant University of Chicago law school graduate, mapped her antiwar campaign during an eight-day seminar with representatives of Hanoi and the Viet Cong. She journeyed to Havana at their request.

Now a fugitive sought by the FBI, Bernardine was heard from last week when she claimed credit for her group for blowing

up—for the second time within a year—a police memorial statute in Chicago's Haymarket Square.

Also present at the Havana meeting along with Bernardine were two now deceased, Weathermen. They were Diana Oughton and Ted Gold, both killed last March 6 when a Greenwich Village town house which they and others had converted into a "bomb factory" was ripped by a series of explosions.

While Bernardine and her friends were busy taking notes from the Vietnamese Communists, the Castro regime was entertaining another distinguished visitor—Angela Davis.

Whether Angela and Bernardine met in Havana is not known. In any case, Fania Jordan, Angela's sister, was a recent visitor to Havana, if she isn't still there.

"Regarding our struggle, we should note that the possibility of peaceful change in America has died," said Carl Davidson, a New Left writer and a frequent visitor to Cuba, in a speech in New York in December, 1967.

On Dec. 20, 1967, after having made his travel arrangements with the Cuban mission to the United Nations, Davidson and 20 other students departed for the Cultural Congress of Havana.

SOME TOP LEFTISTS

When they go there it was like old home week.

All the familiar faces were present—among them the durable Dave Dellinger, later to become one of the Chicago Seven; Tom Hayden, the New Left theoretician; Irving Silber, editor of "Sing-Out"; Sol Landau, the New Left writer, and Ralph Featherstone, the bearded black militant who was killed last March when his car exploded under mysterious circumstances in Bel Air, Md.

At some point during his stay Davidson conferred with representatives of Red China, North Korea and North Vietnam. He also was reported to have had a three-hour conversation with Fidel Castro. Conversations with Castro last a long time.

Two little-known radicals, Jacob Rosen and Wendy Nakashima, who met in Cuba in 1960 and were later married, deserve more credit than they have received for carrying Castro's cause to the United States.

Both belonged to the obscure Progressive Labor Party, a Maoist offshoot of the Communist Party, U.S.A., of New York. It was the PLP which organized and led a group of 85 students to Havana in 1964 and 59 more in 1968. The fruits of that earlier visit were recognized in a radio broadcast from Havana the day after large-scale rioting broke out on the Berkeley campus of the University of California in 1964:

"It can be observed that the incidents take place in a chain reaction. One day it is the youths who travel to Cuba contrary to the restrictions of the State Department, and who then bravely challenge the inquisitors of the Senate committee.

"This is a dramatic sign of the growing awareness in the United States universities. Today it is the turn of the Berkeley students who are fighting to break the straitjackets of the 'American way of life . . .'

"This is not much or definitive, but you have to start somewhere."

Black radicals began arriving in Havana in droves during the latter half of the 1960s, although many had visited Cuba before. Two of the more activist visitors in 1968 were Black Panthers Joudon M. Ford and George Mason Murray.

"We have vowed not to put down our guns or stop making Molotov cocktails until colonized Africans, Asians and Latin Americans in the United States and throughout the world have become free," Murray told a Cuban press conference.

Murray and Ford returned, almost immediately to become leaders of the riots at San Francisco State University.

What should now be clear is that the raw material for Castro's revolutionary factory was readily available in the form of embittered blacks and alienated white student radicals who looked upon Cuba as their spiritual home and the United States as "imperialist monster."

Reliable estimates on the number of American radicals who have journeyed to Cuba are hard to come by, even for U.S. intelligence agencies, but a fair estimate is that approximately 4,000 Americans have visited Cuba for varying lengths of stay during the last decade.

A doctrinaire testimonial to the solidarity of the friendship between Cuba and the American left was written by Julie Nichamin, a University of Michigan anthropology student, in an open letter to Verde Olivo, official publication of the Cuban armed forces.

Published Dec. 21, 1969, after a meeting with Cuban and Vietnamese Communists, the letter read:

"The meeting we had today with the Cuban and Vietnamese people has shown us the true meaning of internationalism:

"All of us are involved in the same struggle against Yanqui imperialism . . . we know that we will leave here with a new dedication to destroy the imperialist monster from within just as the rest of the peoples of the world are destroying imperialism from without."

A more revealing testimonial came from Yippie leader Jerry Rubin, later to become one of the Chicago Seven, after he traveled to Cuba in 1964 with 83 other students in defiance of a State Department ban. He had to travel via Czechoslovakia, 10,000 miles to get to an island 90 miles off the Florida coast.

"Cuba just took me totally," he said later. "I remember saying to myself, 'This is the first place, outside of Berkeley maybe, where the atmosphere is healthy, the first place where people care about one another, where people really feel bad when someone else gets hurt.'

"You could feel mass enthusiasm on the streets, energy everywhere." Rubin reported. "In factories, guys would say, 'Look, this is my factory.' It was like fantastic. I just never slept."

Rubin noted Cuba's flaws—suppression of political opposition, the controlled press and the spreading bureaucracy. But these criticisms were more than outweighed by a Cuba which he called a "land of idealism" with "no trace of cynicism or a 'What's in it for me?' attitude.' "

But action, as the young revolutionaries would be first to agree, speaks louder than words. Action is what it's all about. And as any newspaper reader or television watcher can attest, the American scene has not been lacking in action these last few years.

Part of the action is killing policemen—killings that are always widely applauded in the Cuban press.

Or take the bombing of the Wisconisn University Army math center, an event clearly related to the Cuban revolution. The "communique" left behind by the four young fugitives charged with the crime was addressed to the mysterious "Marion Delgado collective."

It acknowledged that "revolutionary cadres of our organization" were responsible for the bombing. Destruction of the math center, the note went on, was not an isolated act by a "lunatic." Rather, the note stated, it was a "conscious action taken in solidarity with the Viet Cong, the Tupamaros and the Cuban people and all other heroic fighters against U.S. imperialism."

Most law-abiding Americans are probably unaware that their country is faced with what amounts to urban guerrilla warfare.

But it is a fact well understood by the principal combatants—such wildly disparate types as Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell and Bernardine Dohrn, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Black Panther leader Huey Newton.

During the last 18 months there has been a spectacular increase in the number of politically motivated police slayings and bombings. At least 20 policemen were killed and 100 wounded in apparently unprovoked attacks.

Seven were Chicago policemen, four of whom were gunned down without warning.

"To a black radical, killing a Chicago cop is like a Viet Cong shooting down an advanced gunship," said Joseph Rhodes, the black Harvard student who sat on President Nixon's Commission on Campus Unrest.

Not a day passes that a bomb doesn't explode somewhere in the United States. A federal survey covering a 15-month period that ended last April recorded an all-time high of 4,330 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings and 35,129 bomb threats.

White student radicals take credit for most of the bombings, although by no means all of them are politically motivated. The same New Left sources give black militants, notably the Black Panthers, credit for the police killings.

Federal authorities and local police speculate on political kidnapings almost as if they had already occurred.

A veteran intelligence officer who was in Havana in the years before and after Castro came to power recently recalled the sequence of events.

"You know," he reminisced, "Castro never fought a real battle. It happened this way. First, bombs went off in the ball parks until finally people stopped going to the ball parks. Then they went off in theaters and so people stopped going to the theaters."

He paused a moment, as if reliving those days of Cuba's humiliation at the hand of the United States. And Castro's hatred of us for supporting the wicked dictator, Fulgencio Batista, then went on:

"I said in 1961 that before this thing was over with there would be bombs going off in ball parks and theaters and ladies' rest rooms in the U.S."

That was a very good prediction.

CHOCK FULL OF LIFE

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, this country's natural resources are unsurpassed by those of any other nation in wealth and beauty. But in our efforts to exploit the land and waters economically, we have often been shortsighted and we have done irreparable damage to much of the environment. Amidst the smoke and thunder of the increasing pleas to save the environment lies a blaze of haphazard industrialism and a tendency toward unproductive and destructive overdevelopment which threatens our remaining wildlife, seashores, marshes, and timberland.

We have pursued the natural riches of the earth and ravaged the land. We have plastered layer upon layer of concrete over untold stretches of the earth. We have erected skyscrapers, bulldozed parking lots, drained marshes, and leveled mountains.

Mr. Speaker, the achievements of our technology are great. But development progress is a two-edged sword. We must come to the realization that future land use has to be approached rationally and carefully to preserve the wilderness that is left. With this in mind, earlier this

year I introduced the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1970, which would establish a national policy for the coastal zone, encourage a systematic approach to coastal zone planning and development, and assist the States in establishing coastal zone management programs.

In the Third Congressional District of Connecticut we are extremely fortunate to have salt marsh whose origins date from about 4,000 years ago. It is carpeted with some of the most fertile soil in the world. This ecological system provides a home for an endless variety of plants and animals in a delicate, natural balance. This is a good example of the type of natural resource we ought to make a determined effort to save. I know that many Members of this Congress have joined me in expressing an interest in conservation. We have written some good legislation that has become law. But we cannot afford to rest on our past record if we are to preserve the environment for future generations.

A fine article on Guilford's Neck River salt marsh appeared in a recent issue of the Sunday Pictorial of the New Haven Register. It is a pity that we do not have the facilities to reprint the photographs by Robert Holland along with William Longgood's text here in the RECORD. However, I do commend the article to my colleagues, as follows:

CHOCK FULL OF LIFE

The water sparkled in the morning sunlight, framed by woods to the right and left, and running down to the shore was the marsh, now brown and gold after an early freeze. Charlie Clark pointed ahead, to a railroad track just below the high ground we stood on. "That's the northern boundary of the marsh," he said. "Our property goes over to those trees on the west and takes in that woodland on the east. See that peninsula?" He indicated a gently rising knoll, covered with a tangle of bare trees and undergrowth, that jutted into the inlet, "They say a doe lives out there with her fawn."

Briefly he was silent, squinting under his visored cap, watching the sun shimmer on the water, the gulls soaring overhead, the breeze rippling the golden meadow below. "And that's just the way it's going to stay forever," he said softly. "It gives you a good feeling. . . ."

The source of his pleasure was the Cottrell Marsh, part of an estuary on Long Island Sound just east of Mystic. The tract consists of 50 acres, 35 in marsh and 15 in woodlands. Clark explained that the estuary, one of the finest in the state and possibly one of the best on the entire eastern seaboard, was saved recently when it was purchased by the Nature Conservancy, of which he is the retiring state chairman, after a developer had drawn up plans to "reclaim" the marsh for housing lots.

"Let's go take a look at it," said Clark. "From here it appears to be dead, but it's full of life; even at this time of year all kinds of things are going on out there."

Our expedition consisted of three. Besides Charlie Clark (formally Charles A.), an engineer retired from General Foods, there was F. Walker Johnson, head of exploration for Esso Standard Eastern, a Standard Oil Co. affiliate, and myself. Johnson, like Clark, is an avid conservationist; until recently, he was chairman of the Natural Areas Committee for the Greenwich Audubon Society and he serves on various other conservation committees.

On our drive to Mystic, we had talked about conservation and the need to protect the remaining estuaries, those vital tidal flats where salt and fresh water mingle. Without the estuaries that fringe the world's continents, the life of the sea would diminish and possibly cease, for it is here that land and sea meet in a marvelously intricate system and nourish one another.

In a typical estuary there are myriads of creatures—clams, scallops, oysters, crustaceans, fish, microscopic life, insect, and birds. There may be 50 or 60 bird species in a single estuary, and all kinds of animals—mice, muskrats, racoons, foxes—all living together in delicate ecological balance. It is an endlessly recurring cycle of life and death.

Into the brackish water of an estuary, organic matter is delivered by freshwater streams running off the land, and also, by incoming tides. This material breaks down and feeds the marine life in the estuary. Outgoing tides carry organic matter that feeds fish in the sea. Biologists point out that even oceanic fish have complex life cycles that bring them into estuaries at early life stages when they need food and protection.

In recent years there has been an awakening to the importance that estuaries play in the life of the sea, as buffers against the force of storms, as recreational areas, and as quiet retreats to refresh the human spirit.

Many states and the federal government have realized that large numbers of estuaries have been completely lost, and others are in jeopardy. Along the North Atlantic coast, from Maine to Delaware, a government report claims 45,000 acres of salt marshland were destroyed between 1955 and 1964: filled in or dredged for housing developments, industrial sites, parks, beaches, marinas, roads, parking lots, and airports; suffocated with dredge spoil, garbage, and trash; or gouged out for gravel and sand deposits. In the last 10 years alone, one-third of Long Island's magnificent coastal wetlands has been lost. Nearly half of Connecticut's total is gone. Maryland is losing 1,000 acres a year.

Recently, however, spirited efforts by conservationists have begun to slow and even halt the destruction of these resources. At least three states—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut—have passed laws to protect their remaining estuaries. Several states have requested federal funds to buy and preserve unprotected tidal wetlands, and the government has completed an estuary survey as a guide to proposed new protective federal legislation. Some states also have stepped up their own vigilance in protecting this dwindling heritage. Rhode Island, for example, now patrols its coastland by helicopter; fines are levied against anyone who alters these areas without state approval.

A more subtle threat to the estuaries is pollution from raw sewage, industrial wastes, agricultural runoff of fertilizer and pesticides, radioactive fallout, and use of the ocean as a vast dumping ground. Pollution is blamed for the disappearance of several species of fish along the Atlantic Coast.

Despite the seriousness of the pollution problem, Clark noted that this threat can be eliminated through public awareness and determination to reverse it. Because of the urgent need to preserve estuaries and other vanishing natural resources, he decided to take early retirement from his firm to become state chairman of the Nature Conservancy, a full-time, non-salaried job. This nationwide organization, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., has been instrumental in preserving some 350 properties covering nearly 85,000 acres, from Maine to Hawaii. In Connecticut it has 50 properties totaling 6,000 acres—most of them acquired in the last five years.

Clark considers the Cottrell Marsh one of his prizes. A member of the Nature Conservancy heard that it was about to be sold to a developer last year for $70,000. The owner, a woman in her 70s whose home overlooks the estuary, was asked if she wouldn't like to see the marsh preserved just as she had known it all her life. Indeed she would, she loved her marsh; but she needed the money. However, she agreed to sell to the conservancy for $60,000.

Clark embarked on a heroic fund-raising drive. Within weeks, title to the marsh had changed hands and the property was safely preserved in its natural state "forever and ever."

As we crossed a railroad embankment and entered the marsh, the carpet of bent marsh grass was spongy and wet underfoot. An endless accumulation of grasses had grown and died, nourished by the incoming and receding tides, gradually building up the soil so it is among the most fertile in the world. A good salt marsh is considered about seven times as rich as the best wheat lands.

"In a hundred years it adds maybe a half inch," Clark said. "They say it takes thousands of years to build a marsh. You can destroy it in a day."

Walker Johnson, who is a geologist, estimated that the marsh dates from about 4,000 years ago, the time when the present sea level was established on topography created by glaciers some 9,000 years earlier. He had brought along his camera, binoculars, and a telescope on a tripod. Through the telescope, he scanned the scintillating water, now gently ruffled by a cool Fall breeze and warmed by the sun. "I thought I saw a hawk," he said, "but it's just a heron."

Overhead, gulls screamed at the invaders of their sanctuary, and ducks floated majestically on the water. We walked through the thick grass, dotted with cattails, brown and brittle now, swaying in the wind; past dried-up goldenrod, bayberry, rustling dead sheaves of reed grass; past wild rose, their "hips" clinging incongruously to the dead branches like red ornaments.

We stepped carefully to avoid falling into the almost hidden mosquita drainage ditches that laced the meadow. Water in the main channel was about two feet deep and incredibly clear; algae waved below the surface, the fronds swaying gracefully in the incoming tide. Crisscrossing the meadow, among the ditches, were small animal trails, worn bare from long use. Clark touched one with a stick he had picked up. "Could be coon or skunk," he observed. "Probably a coon. He goes to the water to drink and catch crayfish, fiddler crabs, and mollusks."

Around us was the deep silence of dormant nature. Most of the animals and birds were gone now, or hibernating, but evidence of past life remained. We saw osprey nests high on poles, neat holes bored in dead limbs by last summer's flickers, deserted cocoons left by vanished moths, squirrel nests in the bare trees. A marsh wren darted out of the thick underbrush. We looked for the doe and her fawn but had no luck.

At the point of the peninsula we stopped. Clark touched the mossy edge of land with his stick. "This is the real estuary, where land and water join. It's a typical marsh as it could be and should be—clear water, and plants and animals in their natural habitat and natural balance."

He pointed to a film on the water.

"That looks like scum, but it's only pollen washed down from the land. Here we have the deep broth of decaying matter, and that green at the edge is new growth. The land accumulates as this stuff washes up and decays; there's a constant buildup if it's left alone."

We returned to the meadow, cutting back toward the railroad track. Suddenly Clark paused. "It's beautiful," he said. "The marsh is beautiful." He bent over and picked up a dried plant. "Lavender. In the fall it's blue. The whole area looks blue, and underneath is the brown grass and new green plants. In the summer it palpitates with life. It's always changing."

Over lunch at a nearby restaurant, I asked both men how they had become so interested in conservation. Clark said that he had been trained as a biologist and had always remained interested in wildlife.

Johnson said he grew up on a farm in Nebraska. "In those days each farm had a prairie-grass hayfield. Those fields were full of life—wildflowers, coyotes, field mice, meadowlarks, and hawks. As a boy I saw those things being plowed up, with the coming of mechanization, and I felt that something beautiful was gone forever and I was sad." Later, at the University of Nebraska, he studied geology under a professor who excited his interest in preserving the natural environment and the balance of nature. "He had a beard and I thought he knew everything. I still do. He made me understand what was happening and it stuck with me."

Johnson, and men like him not only have this sense of dedication to nature in their private lives but carry it over into their jobs. Johnson says that many companies, like Jersey Standard, "are aware of the need to be good corporate citizens and are spending millions of dollars to protect the environment and help heal its wounds."

But it's still men like Clark and Johnson whose efforts will insure that the estuaries and other natural areas will be preserved just as they were meant to be, "forever and ever. . . ."

MURPHY BEST CHOICE FOR SENATE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Senator GEORGE MURPHY'S record for the past 6 years is one of legislative accomplishment in many fields. The San Diego Union has endorsed Senator MURPHY'S reelection bid and I heartily share the Union's feelings. California needs GEORGE MURPHY in the Senate and I am pleased to share with my House colleagues the San Diego Union's endorsement:

SIX-YEAR RECORDS COMPARED: MURPHY BEST CHOICE FOR SENATE

In just three weeks the people of California will be asked to make a highly significant choice on the general election ballot square labeled "United States Senator."

Opposite one of the squares will be the name of U.S. Sen. George Murphy. Opposite another will be the name of U.S. Rep. John V. Tunney.

We think that the logical choice is to mark the ballot for Sen. Murphy.

Both men have been in the United States Congress for six years, Mr. Murphy as a senator and Mr. Tunney as a representative.

In those six years Senator Murphy has exhibited outstanding maturity and judgment. His broad experience, which ranges from working in the coal mines to the United States Senate, and his knowledge of California and its problems are impressive.

The product of Senator Murphy's six years of public service also is impressive. California has taken the national lead in the fight against air pollution because of the Murphy Amendment of 1967 that permitted us to have the most rigid standards in the United States.

His personel stamp is included in a panoply of measures and legislation that have improved housing laws, created jobs, sought realism in farm labor relations, resulted in bilingual education, improved health, enhanced conservation and curbed the rise in crime.

Further, Senator Murphy has consistently supported the President in regard to our international commitments. The senator is an outspoken champion of Israel. He stands for strong defense.

It is difficult to think of comparable accomplishments by Rep. Tunney in the same span of public service. His name is not associated with a single area of major legislation. He has generally oriented himself with the eastern liberal establishment which consistently harasses the commander-in-chief over our overseas commitments, which seeks more and more excessive spending for social programs and which is intellectually alien to California. Rep. Tunney would reduce the defense budget far below the level that even his own party leaders in Congress deem prudent or safe. He has been equivocal in the issue of agricultural strikes and boycotts.

There are other reasons for electing Senator Murphy on Nov. 3. The United States has a Republican president. California has a Republican governor. There is a strong probability that Republicans will have a majority in the Senate in the next Congress. To elect a second—and junior—Democrat to the Senate would be folly. Neither of California's senators would then be able to communicate effectively with the leadership of the United States of America or the state.

We urge the re-election of Senator Murphy on the basis of his solid accomplishments, his Senate seniority, his maturity, his stature, and his continuing potential of being able to do most for the problems of California and the United States of America.

EDUCATION—SURVIVAL IN THE SEVENTIES

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, change is inherent in today's American educational system. Those in administrative positions must recognize this fact and gear themselves accordingly. It is imperative that we deal with today's problems today.

Mr. Stanton Leggett, one of America's foremost educational consultants, outlines some of the new thoughts boardmen will have to have, and the new actions they will have to take—if public education that is really free is to have a chance of survival in the seventies.

Following is an article of Mr. Leggett's that appeared in the October 1970 issue of American School Board Journal, outlining his survival suggestions for education:

THIRTEEN IMPERATIVES FOR BOARDS IN THE SEVENTIES

(By Stanton Leggett)

Whatever you do this decade as a school board member or administrator, if you are seriously committed to having free public education survive as an effective force in a free society—then make up your mind that things can *never* be what they were a few years ago.

Do not, in fact, even begin to read this list of survival notes if you are like the generals, fighting the last war all over again. Nothing—nothing that is going to happen or that you can wish for with any realistic hope—will change the cold fact that the beards and the longhairs are going to join you on the school board and in the administration during the Seventies (I wonder sometimes why women's skirts can rise and fall and never bring forth much more than a condescending comment or superior smile, while any variation in the length of men's hair is viewed as, of all things, a moral issue; maybe it has to do with the slowness of cycles—either in male fashion or in our brains).

The 13 suggestions that follow are essentially optimistic since most of them are possible to achieve right now, and a sufficient number should work. They will work, at least for those boardmen and administrators who are willing to meet the demands for enlightened use of our resources of people, their time and energy and enthusiasm.

1. Cogent school boards must recognize that competition keeps the Establishment honest. They will let competition flourish as an organizational devise to educate youngsters.

Performance rating is a very nice piece of competition and many ripples will flow from that move. The voucher system is a mind blower in this respect because it not only legitimizes but helps pay for dissent. Every school system should foster and reward groups of faculty or students who develop different and perhaps better ways to accomplish the goals of the organization.

If an inner city school staff in consultation with its community seeks to teach mathematics with greater relationship to the community setting, it should be encouraged to do so even though the usual syllabus approaches the task differently. Who knows, headquarters might be wrong.

SEVENTIES

2. There is a deep, pervading strength in community control of the schools. Build on it—not against it.

Where the big cities have been a battleground over community control, this has generally been a camouflage for a basic power struggle. The teachers and the administrative personnel learned to play the power game when the Irish immigrants and the Jewish immigrants and other waves of people from Europe came to poverty in the United States and found that taking over the public schools represented one way toward middle class comforts. Having mastered the intricacies of control of the system, they have no desire to relinquish the power—and the jobs—to a new wave of immigrants to the city. The blacks and the Puerto Ricans are rightfully intent on capturing that road to the middle class, and the incumbents resist even though they no longer depend upon that avenue to make it.

So don't confuse this power struggle with the real needs and strength that can be expressed in the community. If our country is a democracy, put your action where your mouth is.

3. We have gone around the bend of a J curve of exploding population, exploding pollution and exploding consumption.

The problem of survival in Spaceship Earth cannot wait long to be solved. An informed moderate opinion is that we have 30 years to find a solution or nature will take over flattening the J curve into an S curve with loss of life on a staggering scale.

The school's role in the solution is to build an ecological point of view into the entire school system starting with nursery school. In short,[1] we live on a spaceship. All the kids know this. This means that we are on a trip with a fixed load of water, air and soil. Life on the earth spaceship depends upon the thin skin of the biosphere—like the skin of a balloon—eight to nine miles thick. The thin skin of life is now stretched so far that at some point in a short time period, the life support system will be seriously impaired or knocked out. Some scholars believe that the latter has already happened—to wit, on the spaceship, we add (births) 334,000 people per day while 134,000 persons leave (die). The net increase of 200,000 new passengers a day adds to the population of a spaceship where now 15 million people die of famine a year—of starvation or diseases that are related to serious malnutrition. On the consump-

[1] Information summarized by Tyler Miller, professor of chemistry, St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, N.C.

tion front, the United States, with 6 percent of the world's population, uses 60 percent of the world's nonrenewable resources. If we keep using up those nonrenewable resources at the rate we are consuming them right now, what we will have left by year 2000 will be less than what we will need when your current first graders are 36 years old.

To survive and to maintain a quality life on this spaceship, these four things must be done, and we have perhaps 30 years to do them:

The world's population growth must be halted, stopping the inexorable increase of population on the spaceship. If we let this one go, nature will stop this rapid growth of population with famine and war and pestilence. Nature bats last.

We must decrease the rate of consumption by using our resources wisely. This means to decide what is necessary for quality life. We don't need plastic containers. Aluminum cans are ecolcgically undesirable, pollute our countryside, require immense amounts of power to produce. Many similar examples exist.

We must learn to recycle essential materials, and our nonrenewable resources in particular.

We must learn what the rules for life on a spaceship are. Now we are operating with rules set in the days of the cowboy frontiers.

Right now we are not accomplishing *any* one of those four vitally necessary actions. And we must mount a massive multi-discipline struggle to find the answers in the next few decades. Meanwhile, we must use Band Aids or tire patches on the balloon until we learn more.

4. The intelligent management of resources for human needs must be a major concern in education for the 70s.

This is an overarching statement that can be paraphrased to say that man had better start using his intelligence to solve social and educational problems rather than relying upon his memory of how it used to be done. Memory tends to be emotional and unreliable. We tend to operate a ceremonial system and if the student conforms to the ritual, we tap him proudly on the shoulder and send him off to higher education or work or the army, with a smug satisfaction of having ushered more people through the tradition.

It would pay us, instead, to look with candid eyes upon what we are trying to do, stating it clearly enough so that we know if we have succeeded, mobilize what it takes to get the job done, and be profoundly honest in seeing if what we did worked. If it didn't, we should not hesitate to go back to the drawing board and do it over again more effectively.

This applies to teaching students how to *think*. Rather than piously exclaiming that Latin or mathematics or homemaking trains the mind and letting it go at that, we should create settings in which students have to think to get out of the bag.

If we really undertake the task of dealing with the educational effects of poverty and integration, we must do more than mix by the numbers. We must state the goals, figure out ways to accomplish the goals, get on with the task by using our resources as best we can, and coldly evaluating the results of our work.

This is accountability and school boards are increasingly being held accountable. The major thrust, systems analysis, is called Program Planning-Budgeting-Evaluation System, or PPBS.[2] This has been spearheaded by the Association of School Business Officials and that is really too bad. This is not to imply that school business officials are not properly concerned, but rather that the most profound effects of any honest systematic look at education make the greatest contribution when the process of learning is *central*. The academician is too prone to discount the work of the business official.

There will be a lot of quack systems analyses, complete with input, missions, options and cost-benefits, all full of sound and fury and designed to desiccate learning. One also is reminded of Mr. McNamara's ultimate disillusion, if I may interpret it that way, with the outcomes of the application of such analysis to the miltiary when the assumptions were faulty.

On the other hand, rigorous examination of school practices and the use of limited resources to support what works, provided that you have a pretty good idea of what does work, is far more effective and sophisticated management than that art form known as steering by the seat of the pants. It also is harder for unsuccessful coaches to master, thus confounding the major source for administrative talent.

5. The old must listen to the young. If the language is strident, it is, in part, because the issues are great.

"There are two cultures operating in this country. One is a dying culture, based on possession, on what is mine is mine, on controlling other people's lives. It is based on separation, isolation. Each person does his own little job and has his own little pleasures. Everyone buys things because GE makes better products for better living. The quality of our lives is defined by what we buy.

"But there is another culture emerging, and it is based on joy and community, on sharing and on life. And the old culture cannot tolerate the new. It will make every effort to crush it, through courts and the jails, through schools that shut us off from experience and each other, through every institution in this society. And all of us who still have the spirit of life within us feel the oppression of the great Computer through its lousy schools and the lousy jobs it has to offer and its useless products and its jails and just about everybody has been busted for enjoying themselves. We are the new niggers."[3]

Can we point to many things in our schools that speak seriously of "job" or "community" or "sharing" or "life"?

6. We need to do some serious reordering of our priorities in the way we use our resources for education.

Back in the 20s and 30s, the states discovered poverty in the rural areas. There the costs of providing proper education in sparsely populated areas were assessed. Systems were finally developed so that the rich industrialized cities shared their wealth with the poor agricultural areas. State aid and foundation programs poured money into a priority area. It was not too hard to do because the rural areas controlled the state legislatures and listened receptively to the exposition of their own needs.

Things have changed; and cities, impoverished by change and now the recipients of the agricultural poor who fled the industrialization of the farm, are the disaster areas of education. The financing system must change so that the poor in the cities are no longer given a poverty stricken education while the children of the more affluent in the suburbs receive an education two and three times as costly. The rural and the suburban team up to keep the money while the poor in the cities desperately need five and tenfold increases in the quality of education to survive.

7. Watch the nonschool grow and grow and grow.

Act on the bromide that more education takes place out of the school than in it. Everybody talks about this now, but schools still set up programs and rules that require children to be in their classrooms, and in their schools, all the time. Particularly at the high school level, more education should take place outside the classroom.

There are more examples than the Parkway School in Philadelphia or Chicago's Metropolitan High School, and there are many different models. Short periods of time can be spent in the community. In an experiment at Highland Park, Ill., high school district, the final semester of grade 12 is involved with study and research that no longer uses the confines of the school as a security blanket. The entire cooperative occupational education program, where a student learns on the job, is the most effective job training we now know.

The resources of the community contain fantastic riches. Use them.

8. Take a good look at the education of very young children.

Offer education for three and four year old children. The demand for "preschool education" is growing at a tremendous pace. The obsolete idea that education begins at six should end immediately. Schools must set up programs to reach even younger children with educational content, not just baby sitting.

The infant schools in Britain offer interesting insights into education of young children. The infant schools as well as some schools in this country have done well in using ungraded learning groups. This has been based upon the observation that children learn by imitating others. In ungraded schools, young children imitate—learn from older students. Instead of calling this cheating, we are learning to use the process of imitating to spur learning. In fancy talk, this has been called the importance of providing children with appropriate models.

The Head Start program offered leads. It said when education for very young children was related to the educational program, it was effective. Chicago now has operating a pilot project of its new magnet school, a voluntarily integrated school serving children from 3 years old to 14 or 15 years old or until a student is ready for secondary school.

At the same time, even younger children must be considered. Revamp your primary school curriculum to acknowledge how much children now know when they enter school. *Sesame Street* and other television programs are bringing your schools a new breed[4] of student—one who knows far more than did his older brothers and sisters when they first entered your schools.

9. Make sure that students have some voice in decision making.

If they don't, they'll get a voice through protest—and the protest will get the credit for instituting the change. If your high school student council is concerned only with so-called Mickey Mouse assignments, nobody is going to pay much attention to it, especially the faculty. As Ewald B. Nyquist, New York state commissioner of education, puts it: "I strongly urge teachers and administrators to bring students into the decision-making process involving the curriculum and the extra-curriculum, school policies, teaching and instructional methods, and school governance. This is the surest way of defusing the issues and of providing decompression chambers for aroused feelings and heightened tensions. We are witnessing an historic shift from the image of the student as a disciple to the student as a colleague. Student activism need only be feared by those who are conservative, or faced toward the past rather than being future oriented."

School board members who are reluctant to take a position on student activism until they are forced into it won't have long to wait. If the student council consists of the school's elite, you can expect student disinterest and gripes, some of which may be justified. There are administrative ways of accomplishing genuine representation, or at

[2] See "PPBS and several good reasons it shouldn't scare you off," Journal, August.

[3] From "The Occasional Clam," a semi-underground and, regrettably, anonymous newspaper.

[4] For a discussion of this topic, see "Tuned in," Journal, August 1970, page 4.

least of rebutting the charge that there's no meaningful effort in that direction. In one high school any student can become a voting member of the student council (called an assembly there) after he or she comes to seven meetings. If you don't show up for at least seven meetings, you're no longer a voting member—whether or not you were elected.

10. Try to define, in writing, what your curriculum really should be accomplishing—especially for students who won't or shouldn't go on to college.

Facts are becoming less and less important. There are simply too many of them. As Social Scientist Herbert A. Simon observed: "We will not fill one granary with current institutional knowledge of marketing, production, and finance because most of that knowledge is almost sure to spoil before the drought comes when we want to use it. I do not mean that people do not need to know anything in order to think and make good decisions. They need to know a great deal, but what they need to know changes, and cannot be taught—because it is not known—a decade before use. What people most need to know is how to *continue* to acquire new knowledge and revise the old."

11. Induct new teachers into your school system with care.

Education almost prides itself upon throwing the neophyte teacher into a room and closing the door. If after a suitable interval the noise subsides and relatively few parent complaints are received, the teacher is assumed to have become a member of the faculty. From there on, routine is encouraged.

A major need is in the area where populations change and where frozen attitudes of teachers can lead to the rejection by the school of children from poor families. A gut level reworking of staff with the community may be the only real way to keep the school sympathetic to its clients.

Many districts, especially those in inner city situations, are utilizing community people as teacher aides. Set up a program that makes it possible for these people to advance as aides, assistant teachers and, finally, to become teachers. The program should involve some college work, but more on-the-job training.

12. Master the computer.

The massive increases in data, need for information on which to base decision making, the need for monitoring of individualized educational programs, and the slow growth of computer assisted instruction suggests that you had better learn what the computer can do for you.

There are very few school districts that are too small to be able to use this kind of assistance. Even there, the growth of time-sharing systems brings computer capability within virtually any school district's reach.

School districts generally have lack of style in this field. Perhaps the up and coming high school students weaned on the computer, can help you get organized to use a device that, properly controlled, can be of immeasurable help.

13. The schools had better do more than just survive.

The new school should have a sense of senses, of savor, of differing flavors, texture, awareness, joy, humor, giggles, wonder, admiration, bursting energy, the delight of growing up, the exuberance of young people, in short all the vivid qualities of a really good life. There is no superiority in greying out the student's mind or building nonresistent conformity.

Look at your schools with your senses and try to assure that all kinds of young people will find stimulation and environments in which to grow and to flourish.

HOGAN NEWSLETTER REPORT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of a Member of Congress is to keep his constituents informed not only of his own performance in Congress but of the entire scope of legislative activity during the congressional session.

Throughout the 91st Congress I have tried to keep the residents of my congressional district informed of my legislative activities through periodic newsletters. I would like at this point in the RECORD to include my newsletter report on the entire 91st Congress:

CONGRESSMAN LARRY HOGAN REPORTS ON THE 91ST CONGRESS

DEAR FRIENDS: As the 91st Congress is rapidly drawing to a close, I am taking this opportunity to give you a full report of these two years.

During 1969 and 1970 the Congress has moved ahead on many vital issues even though at times it has been, in my opinion, too slow-moving. I have been privileged to be in the forefront on several major pieces of legislation which were enacted into law during this Congress. Because of my service on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as well as the District of Columbia Committee, I have been able to play a leading role in the passage of anti-crime legislation, postal reorganization, and legislation affecting Federal employee benefits.

Through periodic newsletters, I have tried to keep you informed as these bills were progressing through the legislative process. I also sent you a special report on crime and another report on my trip to Viet Nam. We took an in-depth look at the Nation's economy through a questionnaire and a newsletter report on the results of that survey. (Copies of all these newsletters and reports are still available if you missed them before.)

I want now to give you a summary of the 91st Congres. To do my job in Congress effectively, I need your help. I need your ideas, your thoughts, and your opinions. In this regard, I would again like to thank everyone who responded to our questionnaires. The results gave me an excellent indication of your views and helped me in my work.

LARRY HOGAN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN HOGAN SPEAKS ON FOREIGN POLICY

Viet Nam—The war in Viet Nam is ending. The President has kept every promise he has made regarding Viet Nam.

Two years ago, the Nixon Administration took up the reins of government while the war in Viet Nam was escalating. We were sending more troops and our casualties were mounting. President Nixon made the choice of de-escalating American involvement in the war by gradual troop withdrawals and transferring responsibility for their defense to the South Vietnamese themselves.

The President's plan has been working. More than 115,000 troops have already been withdrawn and another 150,000 American men are scheduled to return before April of next year. This indicates almost 50% troop reduction since the present Administration took office. In addition, casualties have declined to their lowest point in 4½ years.

Cambodia—Recently I had breakfast with President Nixon at the White House. He mentioned what a difficult decision it was to send troops into Cambodia. However, his action has speeded the end of the war and has reduced casualties on both sides.

Again, in this decision, the President kept his promise and all American troops were withdrawn from Cambodia by the specified time, July 1, 1970.

The success of the Cambodian operation and of the Vietnamization policy made it possible for President Nixon to offer his five-point peace plan on October 7, 1970. The five peace initiatives are:

An immediate cease-fire with both sides holding their present positions, with international supervision and no build-up of military strength.

Broadening of the Paris peace talks to include Laos and Cambodia as well as North and South Viet Nam.

Negotiated withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Viet Nam.

A political settlement that meets the aspirations of all South Vietnamese.

Immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war held by both sides.

Middle East—Since its birth 22 years ago, Israel and America have been the closest friends and allies. This small, but hardy, outpost of democracy is America's most valuable asset in the Middle East as she consistently withstands Soviet and Communist efforts for domination.

I, along with a majority of the members of the House of Representatives, have consistently supported efforts to bolster American assistance to Israel and to achieve a Middle East peace I was a signatory to the following:

A 1969 declaration for peace in the Middle East.

A January 1970, declaration in support of direct, unhampered negotiations.

A February, 1970, Congressional Resolution reiterating support of direct negotiations.

A June, 1970, letter to President Nixon urging the immediate sale of jets to Israel to preserve the military balance in the Middle East.

A vote on Sept. 29, 1970 calling for open-ended military aid to Israel.

This century has not known a generation of peace. We want not only peace now, but peace for the next generation. The Nixon Administration's efforts are not only ending the Viet Nam War but also prevented a full-scale war from erupting during the Jordan-Syrian crisis.

REFORMING CONGRESS—A PRIME TARGET FOR OVERHAUL

Reform in the operations of Congress is essential if we are to deal adequately with the many complex problems facing our Nation. Too often the great issues of our time which should form the nucleus of Congressional debate beg for attention while Members hammer away for weeks at a time at insignificant procedural details.

After weeks of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives, a Legislative Reorganization bill was passed on September 17, 1970, with the enthusiastic support of Rep. Hogan. Prior to this bill, the last major reorganization of the Congress occurred in 1946. Obviously, managerial techniques and efficiencies have progressed one hundredfold in the last 25 years while the Congress of the United States still operates under the inefficient and archaic systems of the past.

In a speech before his colleagues in the House, Congressman Hogan indicated his support for most provisions of the legislation and offered suggestions for areas which required amendment. Highlights of his speech include:

Removing the cloak of secrecy from Committee meetings where the vital elements of legislation are shaped;

Opposing the televising, broadcasting, or photographing of Committee meetings. In

Rep. Hogan's view, the circus-like atmosphere caused by the presence of TV cameras and crews is not conducive to the orderly conduct of congressional business;

Protecting the rights of the minority in Committee deliberations and in choosing staff employees;

Supporting computerized recording of all votes and disclosing all votes to the public;

Providing more resources for Congress to do its job—staff, information retrieval, computer analysis, etc.

EARTH DAY, 1970

In an "Earth Day" speech delivered at Prince Georges Community College, Congressman Hogan said,

"We are close to becoming the first nation in the history of the world to commit suicide by progress. Public officials bear the responsibility of preventing that suicide, because it is the decisions we make that lead—step by step—toward, or away from, the precipice."

Congressman Hogan has taken several steps in the direction of cleaning up our environment. He voted for a bill calling for $1 billion funding of the Clean Waters program, and has co-sponsored 13 pieces of legislation including seven national environmental bills, a measure to establish an environmental college. and a resolution creating an "Earth Day" each year.

RESPONDING TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

As the Administration's spokesman for the omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia and floor leader for the bill in the House of Representatives, Congressman Larry Hogan helped guide the omnibus bill (which contained 11 Hogan anticrime measures) through the Congress with a final vote of 332–64 on the House floor.

Several other anti-crime bills sponsored by Congressman Hogan have nearly completed the legislative process and are awaiting final action. Four bills aimed at destroying the grip of organized crime have been acted upon by the Congress in connection with the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 while an omnibus drug bill, providing for treatment, prevention, and control, is currently in a Senate-House Conference

No-knock provision—Both the omnibus crime bill and the nationwide drug control bill contain a "no-knock" provision. The news media has greatly distorted this provision. The fact of the matter is that the "no-knock" authority provides the citizens *more* protection than they had under the law before the bill was enacted. Existing case law and statutes already authorized the "no-knock" entries. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has specifically upheld "no-knock" entries and 29 states (including Maryland) allow "no-knock" entries either by statute or case decision at the present time.

In other words, the "no-knock" provision in these two bills does not extend the authority which police officers already have, it merely codifies it, clarifies it, and provides an additional safeguard for citizens by spelling out in detail those instances when the police officer need not announce his purpose before entering.

The authority cannot be used wantonly. The officer must have a valid arrest or search warrant or otherwise be acting legally. If he is not he is subject himself to prosecution and civil suit.

The legislation sets forth the general rule that an officer must knock and announce his identity and purpose before entering. The only exception to this, when he can apply "quick entry" without knocking, are as follows:

1. When his life or another's life is likely to be in danger. (When an officer knows that a criminal is armed and dangerous and has said he will not be taken alive, would it make sense to require an officer to knock and say "This is the police," and then get his head blown off?)

2. When evidence is likely to be destroyed. (Would it make sense to require an officer to stand at the door knocking, awaiting admission, while the narcotics pusher flushes his drugs down the toilet, thus destroying the evidence the officer was seeking?)

3. When the fugitive is likely to escape. (Should the police officer be forced to stand at the door knocking while the fugitive flees out a window?)

4. When it would be a useless gesture. (Suppose an officer sees a man commit a crime and is chasing him down the street and the man runs into a building and slams the door in the police officer's face. Wouldn't it be silly to force the police office to pause at that point, knock on the door and say, "This is the police?" That's what is meant by a useless gesture.)

Those are the only exceptions to the general rule that a police office must knock and announce his purpose and identity before entering. This was also the law before enactment of the D.C. crime bill. The D.C. crime bill placed an additional safeguard in the law by requiring the police officer to get a special "no-knock" warrant when he knows of the above circumstances. Before enactment of this bill he could use his own judgment; now he must get the judge's approval in advance.

There is no way this provision can be used to enter the private dwelling of a law-abiding citizen.

CAMPUS UNREST

Rep. Larry Hogan was one of 22 Congressmen sent to campuses throughout the country (at personal expense) to study the problems of campus unrest and report their findings and recommendations to the President. Among the recommendations which have seen action are lowering the voting age, reform of the draft, and establishment of an office of youth liaison.

Last Spring, when the University of Maryland at College Park was the center of protests and dissent, Congressman Hogan sent telegrams to the Governor of Maryland, the Director of the FBI, and the Price George's County State's Attorney to take immediate action against the troublemakers whose criminal acts were disrupting the campus.

Congressman Hogan has also voted to prohibit funds to any institution not complying with the anti-campus disruption provision of the Higher Education Act of 1968 and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for loans, grants or salaries to individuals engaging in threat, use of force, or illegal seizure of property, etc., at colleges.

PROBLEMS OF THE METROPOLITAN AREA

Pollution—There is not a clearcut choice between cleaning up the Potomac River and maintaining adequate sewage facilities. Both must be done. It is an act of irresponsibility to ignore the urgent need for expanded sewage treatment facilities and to neglect upgrading the treatment of sewage in conformity with the recommendations of the Potomac River Enforcement Conference.

Throughout the past two years, Congressman Hogan has convened several meetings in his office with Federal, State and local officials to discuss the problems of sewage treatment facilities at Blue Plains, Piscataway, and Mattawoman Creek. He has also testified before the House Government Operations Committee, the Potomac River Enforcement Conference, and the Interstate Commerce Commission on the Potomac River Basin in support of clean-up efforts.

Transportation—No one mode of transportation can solve Metropolitan Washington's transportation problems. Congressman Hogan has worked to provide the area with a balanced transportation system including rapid rail transit, adequate freeways, and better bus service. As a co-sponsor of the Rapid Rail Transit bill in the House of Representatives, Congressman Hogan entered into the floor debate on the bill and urged his colleagues to fully fund the Federal share of the construction cost because Maryland is already paying a disproportionate share of the total system. It is in the Federal interest to see that employees from the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia have ready access to their places of employment. He has worked diligently with the President and other Executive Branch officials as well as his colleagues to unsnarl the impasse between highways and rapid rail transit.

Retrocession of D.C. to Maryland—Contrary to charges that Congressman Hogan was in favor of retroceding the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, Congressman Hogan has always opposed retrocession. In fact, he was responsible for killing this proposal in the D.C. Committee.

Commuter tax—Congressman Hogan also opposed the concept of imposing a commuter tax on Marylanders who work in the District of Columbia and this proposal also died in Committee.

Police, firemen, and teachers pay raises—after a full year's delay in legislating salary increases for D.C. police, firemen and teachers, the Congress passed a retroactive bill which was modeled almost completely on a compromise measure offered in Committee by Congressman Hogan. He fought for the bill in subcommittee, full committee, on the House floor, and in conference with the Senate.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Postal reform—As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Congressman Hogan was in the forefront of the fight for postal reform. More than 30 public hearings and numerous executive sessions during the first and second sessions of the 91st Congress were devoted to study of various postal corporation proposals.

On August 12, 1970, Congressman Hogan and his colleagues on the Committee were present with the President and Postmaster General Winton Blount when the historic postal reform bill restructing the Post Office as an independent establishment within the executive branch of the Government, was signed into law. The major problems of the existing and very antiquated postal service, arose from numerous circumstances which combined to deteriorate the postal service into its present state. The new U.S. Postal Service is designed to operate on an efficient and business-like basis while retaining the public service character of the Nations' mail service.

Benefits for Government employees—as a member of the Subcommittee on Retirement and Health Benefits, Congressman Hogan was a prime sponsor of legislation which overhauled the Civil Service Retirement Financing system. Another bill sponsored by Congressman Hogan, increased from 20% to 50% the Federal Government's health benefits contribution for government workers.

Congressman Hogan also co-authored the 6% pay raise for classified and postal employees and the 8% salary increase for postal workers which was enacted as a part of the postal reform legislation.

INFLATION SLOWDOWN

The Nixon Administration inherited the inflationary conditions caused by years of excessive government spending. In his two years in office, President Nixon has pursued a policy of gradually cooling off the economy to avoid the hardships of a recession. This type of slowdown requires time, especially since the country is trying to slow down an eight-year spending spree.

Looking at recent economic indicators, however, we can see the Administration's policies beginning to work.

Consumer prices climbed only 0.2% during August which is the smallest increase since September, 1967. The May-to-August rise in the Consumer Price Index was the smallest since September, 1967.

Major banks across the Nation began cutting their prime interest rates to 7.5% from 8%.

Housing is perking up as mortgage money becomes more available.

Defense spending has been reduced over $12 billion in two years and by mid-1971 the reductions will approach $20 billion.

These developments indicate that the inflationary cycle is being controlled.

FEDERAL CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND LOANS RECEIVED FOR THE FIFTH DISTRICT

In fiscal 1969, the total Federal dollars paid into the 5th Congressional District of Maryland was $800,794,444. This figure includes everything from social security and veterans' benefits to project grants to cites. On a county basis, the breakdown of Federal payments for the 12-month period is $735,-741,401 for Prince George's County and $65,-053,043 for Charles County.

Below is a partial listing of major Federal grants, loans, and contracts for each county during 1969 and 1970.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

$1.5 million GSA contract to Bladensburg firm for demolition of Main Navy Munitions building on Mall.

$2,026,858 HUD contract to College Park Housing Authority for construction of an eight-story high-rise apartment for the elderly in College Park.

$1,050,662 HUD grant to Park and Planning Commission for acquisition of 12 additional park sites in Prince George's County.

$705,600 GSA contract for Phase I construction of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Beltsville.

$171,000 GSA contract for new Post Office building in College Park.

$1,454,307 HUD Code Enforcement grant for improvements to the Carmody Hills Conservation Area and for administration of the 1968 and 1969 Youth Opportunity Campaigns.

$2,088,000 urban renewal grant from HUD for Colmar Manor.

$284,878 NIMH grant to Prince George's County Health Department for a comprehensive Community Mental Health Center.

$712,383 to Prince George's County under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act allotment for fiscal 1970.

$198,399 HEW Follow Through grant to Prince George's County Board of Education.

$144,400 HEW Educational Opportunity grant to Bowie State College.

$20,000 Youth Opportunity grant to Prince George's County from the President's Council on Youth Opportunity.

$2,464,933 Department of the Army contract to Beltsville firm for construction and installation of x-ray machine subsystems and accessories.

$750,000 FWPCA grant for demonstration facility at the Piscataway Waste Treatment plant.

$103,515 Department of the Interior grant for construction of lake in Clinton Regional Park.

$295,400 contract to build Landover Hills branch of the Hyattsville Post Office.

$266,000 NASA grant to University of Maryland, College Park, for experimental studies in space.

$1,432,000 VA contract to Cheverly firm for x-ray equipment.

$214,567 GSA contract to Hyattsville firm for improvements to Central Heating Plant in Suitland.

$695,207 HUD Open Space Land grants for the acquisition and improvement of 22 park and recreation sites in Prince George's County.

$218,344 HUD grant for improvement of park and recreation areas in Seat Pleasant and Bowie.

$330,637 HUD grant for development of the Model Neighborhood area in Prince George's County.

$260,000 loan from HUD to Town of Fairmount Heights for storm drainage system and water and sewer facilities.

$26,979 research grant from the National Institute of Neural Diseases and Stroke to the University of Maryland.

$20,100 HEW Educational Opportunity grant to Prince George's Community College.

CHARLES COUNTY

$247,758 to Charles County under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act allotment for fiscal 1970.

$10,000 to Charles County Community College for HEW College Work-Study Program.

$407,496 Head Start grant to Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee to serve Charles, Calvert, and St. Mary's Counties.

$35,116 Federal Water Quality Administration grant to Charles County Community College for curriculum development.

$350,000 to Indian Head from the Farmers Home Administration for a rural community project.

$492,500 HUD grant for water and sewer facilities in the Waldorf Sanitary District and in St. Charles Communities.

$1,783 for remodeling of the Marbury Post Office.

$10,788 National Science Foundation grant to Charles County Community College to strengthen science program.

$40,000 to Charles County from the Farmers Home Administration to develop a comprehensive plan to serve 3,000 families.

$165,287 HEW grant to Charles, Prince George's and Anne Arundel Counties for a Family Planning Project.

$3,349,000 LEAA grant to the Maryland Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS

After months of research and preparation, Congressman Hogan introduced a piece of legislation known as the "National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act of 1970." The bill immediately received nationwide acclaim and recognition and was soon reintroduced in the House of Representatives with 14 bipartisan co-sponsors and was cosponsored in the U.S. Senate by Senators Edmund Muskie of Maine and J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware.

The bill would give families the ability to obtain protection from the financial disaster brought about by illness or accident where extraordinary medical care is needed. Presently, there is no protection for families dealt the staggering blow of extraordinarily high medical bills. This legislation would foster the creation of extended care insurance pools similar to those that have been successful in making flood insurance and riot insurance feasible.

HOT-LINE FOR YOUTH

If you know a teen-ager with a problem please ask him or her to call 864–7271.

This emergency phone number is staffed by trained aides who can help teen-agers think through problems or contact a specialist immediately.

HOGAN VOTES IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

Nearly 400 roll-call votes were taken in the House of Representatives during the 91st Congress. Congressman Hogan's attendance record for his first term in office is one of the highest on Capitol Hill. He scored a 95.9% attendance record on all roll-call votes.

Several of these 400 votes have been mentioned in the context of the subjects discussed in this newsletter. However, there are many other votes on issues as varied as military spending, law enforcement assistance, education, veterans' benefits, social security, etc., which cannot be included in this newsletter because of space limitations.

A complete listing of Congressman Hogan's votes on all the bills considered by the 91st Congress has been published in the Congressional Record of October 8, 1970. Reprints of this voting record are available from Congressman Hogan's office. Please send you request to: Congressman Larry Hogan, 1027 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

HOGAN BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW DURING 91ST CONGRESS

Public law, bill number, proposal:

P.L. 91–93, H.R. 9825: To refinance the Civil Service Retirement Fund, to include unused sick leave in length of service, and to compute annuities on high three years (co-author).

P.L. 91–106, H.R. 9846: To extend the time limit for temporary tags in the District of Columbia (included in D.C. Revenue Bill) (author).

P.L. 91–143, H.R. 1193: To authorize Federal contribution for Washington, D.C., area rapid transit system (co-author).

P.L. 91–231, H.R. 16844: To increase the pay of Federal employees and for other reasons (co-author).

P.L. 91–72, H.J. Res. 814: To authorize proclamation of 9/28–10/4/69 as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week" (co-sponsor).

P.L. 91–297, H.R. 17138: To increase salaries for D.C. policemen, fireman and teachers, with increase retroactive to July 1, 1969 (co-author).

P.L. 91–297, H.R. 16269: To authorize salary increase for D.C. Teachers (author of provision included in H.R. 17138).

P.L. 91-297, H.R. 16790: To authorize salary increase for D.C. policemen and firemen (author of pay scale and provisions included in H.R. 17138).

P.L. 91–268, H.R. 15033: To authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes (co-author).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 16196: District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedures Act (co-author).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 8868: To include the District of Columbia as a signatory to the Interstate Compact on Juveniles (co-author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 12854: To reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia (co-author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 12855: To increase the effectiveness of the District of Columbia Bail Agency (co-author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 12856: To expand and improve public defender services in the District of Columbia (co-author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 15339: To amend the D.C. Code to include imitation as well as real guns for premium punishment for armed crimes (author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 15340: To amend the D.C. Code to allow prior convictions to be introduced as evidence to impeach credibility of witnesses (author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 15341: To amend D.C. Code increasing the penalties for rape (author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 15342: To amend D.C. Code making it unlawful to resist arrest (author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 15343: To amend D.C. Code to increase the penalties for breaking into vending machines, parking meters, coin telephones, etc. (author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–358, H.R. 15350: To amend D.C. Code to provide sentences for separate offenses to run consecutively unless judge provides to the contrary (author) (contained in H.R. 16196).

P.L. 91–375, H.R. 17070: Postal Reform Act of 1970 (co-author).

P.L. 91–353, H.R. 8787: To preserve publication of newspapers in areas of economic distress (sponsor of bill identical to H.R. 279 enacted into law).

P.L. 91–385, H.R. 17061: To exempt VA and FHA loans from District of Columbia usury law (enacted into law as a rider to H.R. 17711) (author).

P.L. 91–405, H.R. 11216: To establish in the House the office of (nonvoting) Delegate from the District of Columbia (co-author) (contained in H.R. 18725 enacted into law).

P.L. 91–405, H.R. 14715: To establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia (co-author) (contained in H.R. 18725 enacted into law).

P.L. 91–405, H.R. 18725: To establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia (co-author).

P.L. 91–172, H.R. 50: To increase personal exemption from $600 to $1200 for income tax purposes (Tax Reform Act increased personal exemption in two steps) (author).

P.L. 91–172, H.R. 12057: To treat single taxpayers the same as heads of household (author) (Tax Reform Act authorized semi-head-of-household status to single persons over 35 years of age).

P.L. 91–418, H.R. 16968: To provide for the increase of the Government's contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants (co-author).

In addition to Congressman Larry Hogan's service on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the District of Columbia Committee, he was appointed to the Commission to Revise the Criminal Code of the District of Columbia and the Special Select Committee of the D.C. Committee. He has also served on three Senate-House Conference Committees to iron out differences between House and Senate versions of bills.

CIVIL AIR PATROL REMEMBERS OUR POW'S

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as commanding officer of the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol I would like to bring to the Members' attention a campaign currently being conducted by the nationwide CAP organization to focus public attention on the plight of Americans missing in action in Indochina and those being held as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong.

The House has made clear our strong interest in these men and our total commitment to remain active in this regard until they are returned home safely. An important part of this problem is keeping this vital issue before the American people, and the Civil Air Patrol is providing an important assist in this direction by distributing, at no expense to the Government, tens of thousands of bumper strips and small signs which read:

Civil Air Patrol urges you don't let them be forgotten: POW's—MIA's.

As the CAP memo on this said, these strips "are intended to provide a permanent and visible expression of CAP's concern for U.S. servicemen held as prisoners or missing in action in Southeast Asia."

This is a worthy project, consistent with the aims of the House; it has my support and I am sure the support of all my colleagues.

STRENGTHENING SOCIETY'S MORAL FIBER

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we are quick to criticize the "Age of Aquarius," the exploitative movie industry, businessmen after "the quick buck," and other targets of America's waning moral fiber.

We are prone to blame the other fellow for the moral decay we see all around us, too often forgetting that each petty dishonesty, each compromise with our consciences, contributes to the problem by weakening our individual lives and undermining society as a whole.

The Christian Science Monitor had a thoughtful editorial on the matter last month that I believe worthy of insertion in the RECORD:

REBUILDING MORAL FIBER

Surely is has occurred to many concerned individuals that if there were more simple honesty, more daily practice of the Golden Rule, more compassionate attention to modest justice among men, there would be less need for massive anticrime legislation, less need to attempt to legislate morality among mankind.

But how does one begin strengthening society's moral fiber? How shall the slow decay, which so many preachers and even politicians have observed, be reversed? To many this is a call for a more genuine practice of religion, or for the more earnest observance of humanistic virtues. But how is reform initiated? Where does it begin?

Ask youth today—indeed ask many an older person—and the answer will be: Not by preachment but by practice, by example-setting, by the active living of a moral life.

We are familiar, almost ad nauseam, with the young folk's complaint that the oldsters have made a botch of things. Those on the other side of the alleged age gap answer: "No such thing. We have actually done better than many previous generations."

Yet is it not frankly true that a sizable part of the undermining of moral fiber today is due to the transgressions, conscious or very nearly unconscious, of the adult generations? Not in such great matters of courage as fighting Hitler. But in the smaller, day-to-day practices of life, where it is "the little foxes, that spoil the vines."

One can easily list the petty dishonesties, the moral lapses, the modern indulgences, the compromises with conscience which, adding up, eat away at mankind's moral bastions:

The so-prevalent use of every kind of drug and tranquilizer by parents, a practice so closely watched by the kids. The petty cheating on income taxes and other obligations toward government and society. The gossip which destroys reputations and sours goodwill. The driving at 60 miles per hour in a 40-mile zone. The indulgent permissiveness which allows, even encourages, children to "go steady" at the age of 10 or 12. The missing of opportunities for an understanding dialogue with one's children or one's neighbors. The unwillingness to be "involved" when moral issues confront a community.

These are the small avoidances, the missed chances, that tear away at character and stability. But opportunities need not be forever lost. There is no time like the present to begin living the honest, courageous daily life. Strength comes to him who uses it. And the end result will be the resurgence of morality and, indeed, a happier, saner existence for the individual and for the community.

SMALL BUSINESS SET ASIDES BY TVA SUPPORTED

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and close friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, Hon. JOE L. EVINS, chairman of the Small Business Committee, has introduced a bill providing for steps to alleviate the Tennessee Valley Authority's coal shortage and to assist small businessmen in the coal industry. The set-aside requirement for small business by the TVA included in the bill is a brilliant idea which will be of great benefit not only to the small businessman, but to the country as a whole.

Chairman EVINS is to be commended for his lifetime dedication to the service of the small businessman. I have had the privilege and honor to serve with Chairman EVINS on the Small Business Committee for a number of years and can testify to his indefatigable drive to aid and assist the little man.

I admire and respect him for his goal of solving the problems and improving the role of small business in the Nation's economy. His leadership on the committee has been characterized by determination and strength. I think Chairman EVINS may best be described as a true champion of small business.

Chairman EVINS' tireless efforts on the Small Business Committee have been in addition to the heavy workload of two appropriations subcommittees, Public Works and Independent Offices and HUD. He is in every respect a dedicated and patriotic Representative who does a truly magnificent job in the performance of all the important duties that he has in the House of Representatives.

I have studied the bill introduced by Chairman EVINS and believe it to be worthy of the speediest and most earnest consideration by the House. I support the bill very strongly and urge my colleagues to take favorable action thereon.

WHY FEDERAL OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, when we return in November from the election recess, we will consider the Occupational Safety and Health Act, sponsored by our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS). In 1970, almost 200 years after the industrial revolution began, blue-collar workers—workers in the factories, workers in the fields—still are not afforded the necessary protection from the hazardous working conditions they encounter every day. These hazards are not only present in the steel mills or the automobile and glass factories where in Illinois, State factory air standards allow 10 times the amount of carbon dioxide considered harmful by outside air standards. Unsafe conditions can also be found in agriculture where every year deaths occur which are attributed to pesticide poisoning. Perhaps the saddest reality is that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has found that three out of four factory managers did not recognize the presence of any health hazards in their plants until they were pointed out to them.

An HEW Public Health Service survey shows that 340,000 workers daily are exposed to some occupational health hazard, while the Department of Labor reports that 14,000 deaths and over 2 million injuries a year can be attributed to industrial accidents. These are only a few of the facts of the low-class status we have pinned on the blue-collar workers of this country. We have disregarded these citizens by not guaranteeing them clean and safe working conditions while we work in air conditioned offices. Federal occupational safety and health standard laws are desperately needed for the protection of millions of Americans.

All of this has been documented many times over. However, the pungent and timely article by Mr. Jack Altman in the Chicago Free Press says it better and more specifically than any article I have ever seen on the subject.

I therefore urge all of my colleagues to give their attention to the article, "Industrial Murder," written by Jack Altman, and published in the Free Press. Its text follows:

INDUSTRIAL MURDER

(By Jack Altman)

Anybody could see that flimsy wooden walkway in the belt-line housing was going to cause trouble some day. Every now and again hot coke and sparks dropped off the belt and lay there smoldering. It wouldn't take much for the walkway to burn right through and the lighting up there was so bad you wouldn't know what was happening. In the old days the walkway was made of concrete, but in time the concrete wore out and was replaced by wood. The local union boss saw the danger and filed a grievance last year. The union wanted management to put concrete in again, but management said they couldn't locate the right kind of concrete. On May 31 of this year, on the night shift, a fire started on one of the walkways. It burned a gaping hole and Don Lynn, a 56-year-old boom operator, fell 25 feet to the ground. He severed his spinal column and died instantly.

More than four months later the wooden walkways have not been replaced and workers say the lighting is as bad as ever. This incident occurred at a furnace in Waukegan operated by Chevrolet to provide coke for its works in Saginaw, Mich.

How would you describe it? An accident? My dictionary defines that as "An event; especially an unforeseen contingency; a disaster." Well, it certainly was a disaster, but scarcely unforeseen. My dictionary defines "murder", on the other hand, as "The most heinous kind of criminal homicide; often applied to a death-sentence, killing of men in war, *or any action causing destruction of human life, which is regarded as morally wicked, whether legal or not.*"

Make up your own mind, but what happened to Don Lynn is happening to factory workers all over the country, thousands of them. Department of Labor statistics estimate deaths due to industrial accidents at 14,000 every year and injuries at over two million a year. But a department-commissioned report says the injury statistics are probably only a tenth of the reality. The report prepared by Jerome B. Gordon claims serious on-the-job injuries total 25 million a year. The discrepancy, says Gordon, is the result of "improperly run and underfunded federal government programs" and industry domination of setting safety standards.

Companies don't always tell and don't sometimes know what the cause of a worker's injury is. One major instance of this is in agriculture where poisonings and deaths from pesticides are seriously underestimated, Gordon claims.

An official at the state Department of Labor says Illinois stopped compiling separate regional statistics on industrial injuries and deaths in 1964. But even if state figures were available for metropolitan Chicago they would be subject to the same doubts raised by national figures. If you need statistics to convince you the situation is bad, HEW's Public Health Service did a factory safety survey of metropolitan Chicago which showed that 340,000 workers are every day "at risk to some occupational health hazard." There are over 14,000 significantly-sized plants in Chicago and 10,000 of them, says the survey, have health hazards. But for me the most interesting statistic is that three out of four of the managements surveyed "did not recognize any health hazards in their plants."

If Don Lynn's workmates in Waukegan have a laugh left in them, they'll find that hilarious. It's not that the incident was isolated. Talk to Baxter Bryant. As a quench-car operator it was his job to water down the hot coke from the ovens before it was moved out to the railroad cars. The water came from a cooling pipe 35 feet above the ground. The pipe was wet and slippery and in almost total darkness. Occasionally it got clogged and a man had to climb up on it and bang it clear with a sledgehammer. In 1966, John Grace, president of UAW local 1305, filed a grievance to have a catwalk installed with a guard-rail, a ladder leading to it and lights overhead. Management did nothing. A year later, September 19, 1967, Baxter Bryant, 59 at the time with a wife and four children to support, fell from that slippery pipe and fractured his skull. He underwent brain surgery which removed the part of the brain controlling his body balance. He has been totally disabled ever since, living on social security. Two days after his accident, Chevorlet installed the catwalk, the guard-rail, the ladder and the lights. A couple of weeks ago Baxter Bryant went back to the Appalachian home he left in West Virginia ten years before.

Look at International Harvester. Right now this company's Melrose Park plant is engaged in prolonged negotiations between labor and management. Not just over money, fringe benefits, pensions, retirement and the usual stuff, but over some vital plant safety measures that were part of the cause of a two-day walk-out last February. I know unions often use the safety measures as a bargaining counter in a quest for higher wages. They make expensive demands for new safety equipment and health programs which they then bargain away for a more promising management offer in wages. But it seems the situation with UAW Local 6 is a little different.

At the time of the February strike, says the Local's safety chairman Carl Carlson, "one of our major demands was that we refused to let the company continue with their lackadaisical approach to safety problems."

The union brought specific grievances about high noise-levels in the tractor-assembly and engine-testing departments, as well as complaints about air pollution from engine fumes and high concentrations of irritating ozone from a new high-heat welding process. Carlson says management offered a detailed Safety Awareness Program, to include weekly meetings for the workers to be able to present safety complaints without going through the cumbersome process of official union grievances.

That was February. Now, says Carlson, this whole program has deteriorated to the point where we just laugh at it. Safety meetings take place only every other week. Whenever we present a complaint, the company says: "You're right, you're absolutely right. We're going to do something about it." But when it comes to it, the people responsible have one thing in their minds: production. Production always wins out over safety.

I asked company officials if there was any basis to this charge. Insisting on anonymity, they told me: We're moving ahead on safety as fast as we can, but you have to realize the plant has been going through complete new installations. We're taking out the old rubber-tire equipment and bringing in all crawler-type tractors—don't go calling them "caterpillars," by the way. We've also had to introduce a major new tooling program for our new diesel engines. With all this we can't say exactly at the moment what the problems with noise-level and so on will be.

They were almost totally preoccupied with the joys of their new production-potential. It was lucky for safety to get a mention at all.

Union members are very conscious of the great gulf of understanding between themselves and management on the subject of working conditions. Jerry Siebold, number two man on Local 6's safety committee, commented: "In the offices, they're not exposed to noise-level, heat, smoke pollution and bad lighting." His UAW boss in Illinois, Robert Johnston, made the same point in a letter to Governor Richard Ogilvie. Noting that state factory air standards allowed ten times the amount of carbon dioxide considered harmful in outside air, Johnston wrote: "In terms of a total solution, air standards should be based on the ultimate installation of factory air systems that purify air rather than the present systems that pull in outside air, mix it with factory air and then expel it. Most executives and office workers now enjoy air conditioning and we seek this objective for factory workers."

It's funny. We've always taken for granted—working-class *and* middle class people—that factory workers have to live a dirtier, less pleasant life at work than those whose collars can be kept white. But why? Why take it for granted, when that dirt and unpleasantness translate themselves, according to a local public health survey, into six less years of life for the worker in a steel-foundry than can be expected for an office worker.

At International Harvester, again, these class distinctions take on a special flavor. Oscar Jones is an inspector in tractor-assem-

bly. There's a lot of noise there and so, in response to union demands—management never seems to take the initiative on these things—the company issued ear-plugs for the workers. But the plugs irritated Jones's ears. He was safety-conscious enough not to want to go without any ear protection at all, so he went to the company's safety department and asked if he could get the ear-muffs he had seen the salaried engineers wearing. The company said they couldn't provide Jones with a pair of ear-muffs but they'd be glad to give him the address of the place where they bought them for managerial personnel.

"You see," he was told, "the muffs cost $5 and the plugs are only 60 cents. If we give you muffs, everybody will want them."

Jones wasn't too worried about that and went out and bought his own muffs. But a few others asked for them, too, and about half a dozen, whose ear channels had to be examined by a doctor to ascertain that they were indeed prone to irritation when coming into contact with plugs, were provided with muffs. Which all goes to show that at International Harvester the ear channels of the average guy who earns his wages by the hour are different from the ear channels of a guy who is paid a salary.

This is the climate in which the labor-management negotiations are continuing. One of the main safety demands being made by Local 6 is for the right of the union to make its own on-the-spot noise and air pollution surveys, determine where the dangers are and have the company make detailed studies of the suspect areas. Safety chairman Carlson said that government and company surveys had shown noise readings way above acceptable levels, both from engines and tractor-assembly, with tractors running without proper mufflers or sound-absorbing material around the test areas.

When the union again felt management was causing unnecessary delays in pinpointing the problem areas, the members voted to buy a noise-measuring instrument of their own. Says Carlson: "We were told in no uncertain terms by the industrial relations manager that any man who opened up the instrument, even with company representatives present, would be fired on the spot. We've had that instrument a year now and it's not been used. We don't want this to be the cause of a walk-out—which is what would happen if any of us was fired for using the instrument. We prefer to make the issue part of our negotiations. We want the right to make an investigation and we don't care if it's with company equipment or union equipment."

The company doesn't seem to want to give in on this. Management told me: "We're not hiding anything from the unions. We just don't want them moseying around the shop, monitoring the noise. It's not part of the union job."

Local 6 also is asking for access to the results of all management safety surveys. Management replies that they've already handed over the smoke report, "but we don't yet know what we'll do with the noise survey."

But over and above these specific demands it is obvious that the main conflict is one of general outlook. In reply to union letters, Harvester's company doctor issued memoranda to the company and the union on what should be done to protect the workers against high noise levels. His recommendations included audiometric testing of new employees to ascertain their hearing ability and their capacity to take high noise levels. He also suggested periodic reexamination of those employees exposed to high noise. Faced with financing the tests from the plant budget, Melrose Park management told Local 6: "This involves a vast outlay of money. It's a tremendous problem. We've got people making a determination on which way we're to go." As Carlson explains, "They don't refuse to do it, but they always delay action by complaining about the expense."

To me, management insisted: "We're not primarily interested in costs."

One of the key safety disputes in the past couple of weeks has been over an old problem of fire-aisles. According to regulations of the company's Central Safety Committee, aisles in the plant have to be kept clear for ambulances and fire engines, ideally a space twice as wide as the vehicle. Local 6 says very few aisles are in fact kept entirely clear. At the end of September an ambulance trying to get to an injured man was blocked by construction workers installing a hoist. The man had to be carried by stretcher to the ambulance instead of the ambulance going to him.

When I asked management about fire-aisles being blocked, someone (there were always three present) said: "Listen, this is not a one-sided affair. You have to ask yourself: was it a management man who dropped something in the aisle or was it an hourly man?"

Fascinating. The company sees its responsibility entirely in terms of whether it was a "management man" or an "hourly man" (beautiful distinction) who made the mistake, not at all in terms of the overall accountability a company has for all the processes, good and bad, that go to make up its function of production. If management is going to play the schoolboy's game of fixing personal blame instead of accepting the responsibilities derived from the benefits of profit-making, factory safety is going to remain a dream.

I mentioned the ambulance incident. "Oh, yes," I was told. "There *have* been instances of construction people who necessarily had to have equipment in the aisles for our remodeling." (If it's for remodeling, it's of course necessary.) "Maybe we should have told the Plant Protection people that the aisle would be blocked so that they could have warned the ambulance to take an alternative rout. But we all make mistakes sometimes, don't we?"

The instances go on and on, with production invariably taking priority over safety. The workers themselves are not blameless. It is difficult to get them interested in their own safety needs. Many will not wear the proper safety equipment. Welders often prefer to hold protectors as shields in front of them instead of more safely wearing a mask fitting over the face. Stanley Johnson, head of the Illinois AFL–CIO, observes: "It's a peculiar thing. Rank and file are generally interested in progress but accidents are always something that the fellow in the plant thinks is not going to happen to *him*—until it does happen to him or to his buddy working alongside him. Then he gets all alarmed about worker's compensation and wonders why some of the safety precautions were not observed."

Workers are also reluctant to report problems of factory safety and health hazards affecting themselves, but there is sometimes a reason for this that is not of the man's own making. Dr. Bertram Carnow of the Tuberculosis Institute in Chicago has made many studies of factory workers' diseases and comments: "Some workers don't want it to be found that they have silicosis (lung disease frequent in foundries), hearing loss or some other disease because they're afraid that they'll lose their job. A man needs assurance that if he becomes ill due to his job conditions he will not be fired, but adequately compensated and put into a job where this hazard will not be present."

That insecurity that the worker feels is in large part due to the inadequate safety legislation protecting him at federal and state levels against company malpractice. Before Congress now are three different bills on occupational safety and health plus the Nixon Administration's own recommendations. In the House, Dominick Daniels, a New Jersey Democrat, has been pushing a bill that would empower the Department of Labor both to set and to enforce safety and health standards for industry. This would allow government to circumvent previous long drawn-out appeal and court procedures, with the power to punish and also close down violating companies where an inspector finds imminent lethal danger. The bill passed the House Labor and Welfare Committee in September with a large Democratic majority. It is now before the Rules Committee and will probably reach the House floor after the November elections.

Wisconsin Republican William Steiger, from Oshkosh, has proposed an alternative bill as a compromise between Daniels and the Nixon Administration. It would give the setting of standards to a five-member Presidential board for national safety and health standards, while leaving enforcement with the Labor Department. This may be introduced as an amendment to Daniels.

The third bill, in the Senate, is put forward by Senator H. A. Williams Jr., another New Jersey Democrat. His form of compromise is to leave both standard setting and enforcement with the Labor Department while accepting the idea put forward by the Nixon Administration and backed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce of an employers' appeals board.

A Labor Department official in Washington told me he felt the Steiger compromise, splitting standards setting and enforcement, had the best chance, but everything depended very much on whether union-backed Democrats were elected in November in sufficient numbers to make the AFL–CIO's wishes felt.

DeWitt Gilpin, top aide to Illinois UAW's Bob Johnston, boils it all down to some plain language. "What we're really trying to do," he says, "is to take a whack at the old industrial feudalism concept which still remains. What goes on inside once you pass that plant gate is governed by a different set of laws than apply in society at large. The companies set their own rules for discipline, working conditions, and despite all the vaunted power of the unions, that right to write their own laws and the sensitivity of politicians to let them do it has been basically unchanged for decades. The bill we want (Daniels) would breach that feudalism and reach beyond the plant gates and say to General Motors and Ford: 'You've got to run your plants this way as far as environment is concerned.' And they of course will fight that to the death."

One of the International Harvester management people who talked to me made clear what the current thinking is. "Any time," he said, "that you get government involved too deeply, you don't have a good thing. I would like to see standards established by industry for safety just like the automotive industry has done with its Society of Automotive Engineers."

It's as simple as that. We are to put the same trust in industry experts to say what is safe in the factory as we did in Detroit to tell us what was safe in an automobile. We had to wait for a Ralph Nader to tell us what was wrong there. By now we should have learned the lesson.

If you have any doubts, listen further to my Harvester management man. "If the unions are not happy," he said, "with the way safety standards are being met, there is always a final way union people have of forcing management to comply—the strike."

That's how desperate management has become in the face of possible government intervention in their previously protected domain. They are prepared to call down on their heads, like some beleaguered marine platoon in the Vietnamese jungle calling for American bombardment of their own position, the one piece of union fire-power they have fought so long and hard. Do they have to cut their nose right down to the bone before they'll give in to guaranteeing decent safety standards? That eternal fear of government intervention. If free enterprise is so strong, it should be able to safeguard the

welfare of its workers without worrying about government encroachment on its hallowed ground.

"We have all these government organs already," the Harvester man said. "NLRB, FEPC, OEO. We don't want any more government bureaucrats coming in and bothering us than we have already."

But if your labor relations, the fairness of your employment practices and your job-training programs were all in order, you wouldn't *have* those initialled men scurrying around your place. And if you run a safe factory, you won't have any more of them.

An Illinois Republican tries to look at it pragmatically. Alexander White, chairman of the Illinois Industrial Commission, is busy trying to get a tougher Illinois factory safety and health law to match the anticipated new Federal legislation—"we don't want to lose this particular responsibility to the Federal Government." His diagnosis of management's position is golden: "Their position is essentially that industrial safety is a good objective for *one* reason: 'We lose dollars through accidents.' "

That sounds so convincing on the surface. Here's a hardheaded Republican facing up to the prime motivation in his friends in company management: the dollar. Of course, if it were that simple, if the companies were that worried about losing dollars through accidents, then Chevrolet would have installed a concrete walkway at its Waukegan coke furnace and Don Lynn would still be alive. If the dollars of health hazards worried International Harvester more than the dollars of prevention, then they wouldn't be quibbling about the cost of audiometric testing for new employees facing high noise levels.

But in fact, in the short term, companies stand to lose less by letting their workers be injured and killed by inadequate safety precautions than by embarking on expensive safety programs in place of productivity expansion. In the long term—and how do you get profit-makers to think in the long term?—the physical insecurity and the accompanying festering ill-will of the workers will cost the companies dearly. Watch it.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, October 18, begins the observance of a very special week—National Business Women's Week.

I would like to pay tribute to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs and especially to the individual Business and Professional Women's Clubs in my congressional district.

I have spoken to meetings of BPW groups on many occasions and I have learned much about the good work these ladies do. Not only do they boost the ladies in the business world, but they offer many civic programs. Our communities benefit greatly from the contributions of our business and professional women.

In many towns BPW helps handicapped youngsters, offers scholarships to girls who seek careers, contributes to family services, sponsors children in camps, and supports such fine organizations as the Girl Scouts.

Nationwide there are some 180,000 members in 3,800 BPW clubs. The legislative, community, and cultural programs further the interests of all working women, whether BPW members or not.

These clubs have greatly elevated the standards for women in business and in the professions and have opened up new cultural and civic opportunities for women. On this occasion I salute the many outstanding women in my own area who have made contributions to our society through education and work.

IN SUPPORT OF OUR POLICE OFFICERS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the American people owe a debt of gratitude and appreciation to the police of this Nation for the contributions they are making in devoting their lives to the protection of our lives and property.

They are having to work, however, under a serious handicap as a result of the era of permissiveness; we are going through in what the criminal element has been led to believe he can get by with in disobeying the orders of the police and, in fact, can attack and abuse the police at will.

Unless the American people come out in full and vigorous support of our police, not only will the crime wave continue to rise but it will become impossible to recruit and retain enough police to provide minimum protection for our families.

Chief Michael J. Donio, of the Shively, Ky., police department, now serving as national president of the National Police Officers Association of America, has written an excellent article on the problems with which all of our police officers are confronted.

I call this article to the attention of the Members of Congress as well as the American people in order that we may have a better understanding of these problems of our police and to emphasize the necessity of finding ways to provide them more effective support:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By Chief Michael J. Donio)

One of the most dramatic and significant changes today in law enforcement is the complexity of mental attitudes. This is apparent in our police personnel from the newest rookie to the seasoned veteran. They all ask the same question: "Where do we go from here?"

How does the average lay citizen react to such a question? Does he know what the policeman is talking about? Does the average citizen know what to do about it if he does understand? Or if he does understand, does he pull back into his shell to avoid personal or political involvement? His is a shell of pseudo respectability.

Why does the policeman ask, "Where do we go from here?"

There are many reasons why his thinking has become confused. He has acquired a stigma, heaped upon him by violent reactionaries, unscrupulous editorialism and flagrant disrespect to the epitomy of his being. His cry for an answer is lost in the wilderness. A wilderness of planned design. Designed by the very core of infamous coalition between those dedicated to resisting the establishment and a communistic infiltration sowing their seeds of moral destruction.

When there is violence he reacts—an assumptive reaction of training and experience when the law is being broken. He feels he must react to maintain the trust and respect of the law itself. It is his pledged duty by oath. If he lies broken and bleeding in his efforts, the dissidents scream brutality and brand him with infamy—with the now classic words, "pig", "fuzz", "doghead", etc.

Do you wonder then that he asks "Where do we go from here?"

The very roots of our law structure are quaking.

Professor Arthur J. Wordell, one of the nation's most forthright academic lecturers and realists, said in a speech on November 17, 1969 to a bar association dinner in Des Moines, Iowa, quote: "If we continue to haggle and manipulate over and over the interpretations of enforceable laws, the police officer will very likely lay down his stick and walk away from the whole mess—and be justified in doing so. And—gentlemen, when that happens we have lost our birthright—yes, we will have lost our last bulwark—the last line of defense on the home line and local community control of lawlessness. When this happens there will be no hope." Unquote.

Overreaction, some critics say, is what has caused the policeman's image to wane into ruthless unequivocal dim perspective. Place yourself in his shoes—how broad is this term—overreaction? In the first place, it is purely an editorial word. A word of convenience that rings with gusty overtones and—implys poor judgment. An easy out for those who have not been smashed in the face with bricks, glass, human excrement, and fire bombs, and lost their lives from a skulking sniper. How do you temper this—with what kind of judgment? It must be very apparent that overreaction of those breaking the law—must be met with retaliation—then who reacts overly? Why was the policeman there in the first place—consider that!

Is there an answer to the question, "Where Do We Go From Here?"

Our government, in the center of the target, is the answer. The purveyors of collective thinking. Such thinking, a formulation of laws to govern the acts of man. A "political quagmire," you say?—"you don't teach old dogs new tricks?"—You see how easy it is to fall into the negative posture of a wagging finger?—

It is simply a matter of concern—If each of us is concerned enough—and diligent enough in our efforts, we can as Americans faced with challenges before—come out with shoulders squared and determined to shrug off the very effect that the dissidents so desire. First, let us get the policeman's neck from under the political boot of suppression. He must be recognized as a counterpart of our nation's endeavors to be a nation unequaled—as a land of freedom loving people—as a land of progress, and as a land of law abiding citizens.

The progress may be slow—but it must start from the top. We must put our law enforcement minions above petty political

controls and arrangements of personal convenience. We must reemphasize training in new techniques and concepts. Above all, we must endow our policemen with their fellow citizen's dedication and trust. It can be done. It takes practical action on our part—not lip service. We must stand up and be counted for what we represent—then, and only then, will we know where we are going. Others will follow—encouraged by the true significance of law enforcement and its ideals. Let's go forward together.

MR. AGNEW, YOU ARE WRONG ABOUT THE PRESS

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I have been quite disturbed by the continuing attacks by the Vice President on the Nation's press. He has implied that the news media are a sort of agent of the liberal conspiracy, has vociferously attacked the eastern papers as being unrepresentative of the true feelings of the people, and has constantly condemned the concentration of power among the news media as if such concentrations were anti-Republican and pro-liberal.

I wish to report to you today on the results of a survey I took this summer of American newspaper editorial opinion. I felt that the subject of diversity of newspaper editorial opinion was far too important to be talked about in vague generalities and on the basis of gut feelings and hunches. The people deserve to know what the newspapers are saying and whether or not it is what Mr. AGNEW says they are saying.

During this past summer my office sent questionnaires to 154 newspapers around the Nation. They were sent to all 125 papers with a circulation of over 100,000. In States where there are no papers with a circulation this size, questionnaires were sent to the largest papers in the State. Responses were received from 84 of the larger circulation newspapers and 14 of the smaller ones for a total response rate of 64 percent. I am quite confident that I got a truly representative sample of newspaper editorial opinion and I think this is confirmed by the geographic breakdown of responses.

The responses to the questions asking party affiliation of the owners and editors did not prove to be significant. A more accurate indication of the political party to which the newspaper traditionally leans is presidential endorsements. In November of 1969, Vice President AGNEW said the following in an address in Montgomery, Ala.:

> I do not seek to intimidate the press, the networks or anyone else from speaking out. But the time for naive belief in their neutrality is gone.

If "neutrality" means even balance between party support, my survey substantiated Mr. AGNEW's statement—on the whole the press is not neutral: It is on his side. I do not find this too discouraging as the Roper survey indicates that since 1963 television has taken over the lead from newspapers as most people's major source of news, especially about national candidates.

Endorsement patterns are overwhelmingly Republican. Republicans have received a majority of the endorsements since 1932 in every election except that of 1964. The Republican margin is usually 2 or 3 to 1 over the Democratic candidate. In terms of circulation, it is often higher.

In 1956, 76 percent of the papers responding supported the Republican candidate for President, 69 percent in 1960, 14 percent in 1964, and 68 percent in 1968. The regional breakdown is even more impressive. The "liberal eastern" press does not lag behind the rest of the country in its support of Republican presidential candidates and clearly led the rest of the Nation in Republican support in 1964. So we can say that when the Nixon-Agnew administration came into office in 1968 it had overwhelming support from the Nation's press. Considering the closeness of the popular vote, if editorial opinion has any influence at all, an even division of it would have resulted in a popular vote victory for Hubert Humphrey.

Six issues were listed on the questionnaire and the papers were asked to indicate their editorial opinion on each. They were:

ABM (initial passage of Phase I).
Carswell (Supreme Court nomination).
Cambodian Operation (initial reaction).
Cambodian Operation (after June 30).
Vice President Agnew's Statements on Dissenters.
McGovern-Hatfield Amendment.

Overall, consistently Republican papers were conservative on issues whereas Democratic newspapers were liberal. The papers which supported Humphrey were liberal—77 percent against the Cambodian operations and 67 percent against the confirmation of Carswell and AGNEW's statements. The papers supporting Nixon in 1968 were more mixed—63 percent for the Cambodian operations and only 26 percent in favor of the confirmation of Carswell and in support of AGNEW's statements.

The data on the editorial positions is very significant. First, on a national basis:

(1) 57% of the papers responding favored the building of an ABM system. This certainly reflects diversity of opinion.

(2) There was strong opposition to the Carswell nomination. The majority of the nation's papers did not, as the Vice President wishes to believe, support the nomination.

(3) There was a virtually even break on the Cambodian operations, again reflecting a healthy diversity of opinion.

(4) Almost two-thirds of the press came out against the Vice President's statements on dissenters. It would be easy for Mr. Agnew to generalize, as he often does, and say that this reflects the views of the biased liberal news media. However . . . .

(5) Three-quarters of the papers responding were opposed to the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment establishing a deadline for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam.

The data is interesting when viewed on a regional basis:

(1) The ABM system was supported in all regions except the midwest. Even there, there was only a very slight difference.

(2) All regions except the South opposed the Carswell nomination. However, if the Florida papers are removed from the sample, Carswell was opposed by a majority of the Southern newspapers.

(3) The Northeastern and Midwestern papers opposed the initial Cambodian move, the South split and the Western papers were strongly in favor. After June 30 some support was lost in the South.

(4) There was uniform unfavorable reaction across the nation to the Vice President's statements on dissenters.

(5) However, there was even stronger uniform opposition around the nation to the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment.

What conclusions can be gleamed from all this? First, greatest opposition to administration policies come from the Midwestern papers, not the Eastern ones. Perhaps equally surprising, the greatest support comes from the Western papers rather than the Southern. As a matter of fact, Southern newspaper responses were not at all different from responses from newspapers as a whole. The charge that Southern newspaper editorial opinion is buried under a deluge of radical liberal Eastern establishment media opinion just does not hold water.

So three points stand out: Carswell had little editorial support, even in the South; the eastern press is not the radical liberal monolith that the Vice President thinks it is, and any opposition that there is in the press to administration policies is not part of a liberal conspiracy. The administration, when it loses a majority of the large newspapers on an issue, loses by and large its basic supporters. Two-thirds of the Nation's papapers endorsed Nixon-Agnew in 1968 but 69 percent opposed Carswell, 65 percent were upset by the Vice President's statements on dissenters and only half the press supported the Cambodian operations.

I am not an easterner or part of the so-called liberal eastern establishment. I do feel that some of the eastern papers are among the best in the Nation and I object to them being maligned by a misinformed Vice President. Of all the issues I surveyed, the eastern papers, as a body, agreed editorially with the Nation as a whole. Where is this radical liberal monolith of which Mr. AGNEW speaks?

We have much to be thankful for though. The newspapers may be Republican oriented but they are not a slave to the party and its leaders' policies. They may not be neutral but they afford a platform for diversity of editorial position on questions of important national policy. Would the Vice President prefer a press that blindly followed the lead of whatever administration happened to be in power? The Vice President's view that the media should be made to represent the majority of Americans would change the traditional role of the press as a check on government and as a purveyor of both majority and minority points of view. A press which merely reinforced

popularly held viewpoints would contribute little to the development of the intelligent body politic which the Founding Fathers saw as the matrix of democracy.

The editorial survey follows:

BOB ECKHARDT'S NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL SURVEY

In July of 1970 questionnaires were sent to 154 newspapers around the nation. They were sent to all 125 papers with a circulation of over 100,000 and to a representative sample of smaller papers.

Responses were received from 84 of the larger circulation newspapers and 14 of the smaller ones for a total response rate of 64%.

The geographic breakdown of responses is as follows:

Northeast Region (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont): 17 replies of 35 questionnaires—49%.

Midwest Region (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin): 29 replies of 41 questionnaires—71%.

South Region (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia): 31 replies of 49 questionnaires—63%.

West Region (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming): 21 replies of 29 questionnaires—73%.

Only 42 respondees indicated the party affiliation of the newspaper's owner: 9 Democratic, 11 Republican and 22 independent.

Sixty returned questionnaires listed the editor's party affiliation: 14 Democratic, 18 Republican and 28 Independent.

A more accurate indication of the political party to which the newspaper traditionally leans is editorial presidential endorsements. As the results below show, except for 1964 endorsements have been overwhelmingly Republican.

ENDORSEMENT PATTERNS IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

[R, Republican; D, Democratic; NA, no answer]

Number	1956	1960	1964	1968
12	R	R	R	R
14	R	R	----------	R
28	R	R	D	R
7	R	R	D	D
14	D	D	D	D
4	R	D	D	R
4	R	D	D	D
1	D	D	D	R
1	NA	NA	NA	D
1	NA	NA	NA	R
1	NA	R	NA	NA
1	D	NA	D	D
1	NA	NA	D	R
1	NA	NA	D	NA
1	NA	R	R	R

In 1956, 76% of the papers responding supported the Republican candidate for President, 69% in 1960, 14% in 1964 and 68% in 1968.

This endorsement policy was further broken down by region:

PRESIDENTIAL ENDORSEMENT POLICY BY REGION

[D—Democratic, R—Republican]

	Northeast		Midwest		South		West	
	D	R	D	R	D	R	D	R
1956:								
Number	2	13	3	24	9	19	2	14
Percent	13.3	86.7	11	89	32	68	12.5	87.5
1960:								
Number	4	12	4	23	10	17	5	12
Percent	25	75	15	85	37	63	29.4	70.6
1964:								
Number	9	3	18	4	21	4	11	2
Percent	75	25	82	18	84	16	84.6	15.4
1968:								
Number	6	11	8	21	9	18	4	15
Percent	35.3	64.7	28	72	33	67	21.1	78.9

Six issues were listed and the papers were asked to indicate their editorial position on each. They were:

ABM (initial passage of Phase I).

Carswell (Supreme Court nomination).

Cambodian Operation (initial reaction).

Cambodian Operation (after June 30).

Vice President Agnew's statements on dissenters.

McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

A conservative editorial pattern was defined as being for the ABM, Carswell, the Cambodian operations, the Agnew statements and against the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment. A close correlation between straight Republican endorsements and the conservative editorial pattern exists. The same is true of a straight Democratic endorsement policy and the liberal editorial pattern. (The opposite of the conservative pattern)

Of the 12 newspapers answering the survey who exhibited straight Republican endorsement policy, 8 followed the conservative editorial patterns: 11 of the 14 straight Democratic papers followed the liberal pattern.

The data on the editorial positions follows:

	For		Against	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ABM (initial passage of phase I)	52	57	40	43
Carswell nomination	26	31	59	69
Cambodia (initial reaction)	47	51	45	49
Cambodia (stand after June 30)	41	49	43	51
Agnew's statements on dissenters	26	35	49	65
McGovern-Hatfield amendment	18	26	50	74

RESULTS BY REGION

[F, for; A, against]

	Northeast		Midwest		South		West	
	F	A	F	A	F	A	F	A
ABM:								
Number	10	8	13	14	15	13	14	5
Percent	55.5	44.5	48	52	54	46	73.7	26.3
Carswell:								
Number	4	11	5	22	15	13	3	13
Percent	26.7	73.3	19	81	54	46	18.75	81.25
Cambodia (initial reaction):								
Number	7	10	11	16	15	14	14	5
Percent	41.2	58.8	41	59	52	48	73.7	26.3
Cambodia (after June 30):								
Number	7	8	9	16	13	14	11	5
Percent	46.7	53.3	36	64	48	52	68.75	31.25
Agnew:								
Number	3	9	7	13	9	17	7	10
Percent	25	75	35	65	35	65	41.2	58.8
McGovern-Hatfield:								
Number	5	7	4	15	9	14	2	12
Percent	41.67	58.33	21	79	39	61	14.3	85.7

Looking at just two issues in depth, the Carswell nomination and Vice President Agnew's statements on dissention:

CARSWELL NOMINATION AND AGNEW'S STATEMENT ON DISSENTERS

[F—for, A—against, B—balanced editorials for and against]

Number	Position		Percent
	Carswell	Agnew	
18	F	F	18
40	A	A	41
5	F[1]	A	5
6	A	----------	6
4	A	F	4
2	----------	----------	2
9	A	B	9
5	----------	F	5
4	----------	A	4
4	F	B	4
1	----------	B	1

[1] 5 papers for Carswell and against Agnew are all Southern—1 each from Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Texas, and Tennessee.

AGNEW, CARSWELL, AND REPUBLICANS IN 1968

Number	Position		Percent
	Carswell	Agnew	
17	F	F	23
21	A	A	39
4	F	A	6
2	A	----------	2
4	A	F	6
1	----------	----------	2
4	A	B	6
4	----------	F	6
4	----------	A	6
4	F	B	6
1	----------	B	2

AGNEW, CARSWELL, AND DEMOCRATS IN 1968

Number	Position		Percent
	Carswell	Agnew	
1	F	F	4
18	A	A	67
1	F	A	4
2	A		7
4	A	B	15
1		F	4

RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES OF AIR CARRIERS THREATENED BY MERGERS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Congress must take action to protect the employees of air carriers involved in mergers.

The drop in airline business caused by the current recession is likely to bring pressure for many mergers within the airline industry. Present statutes do not protect employees from loss of jobs, loss of seniority, or loss of pension rights.

Congress has been careful to protect the employees of other regulated transportation industries. The Urban Mass Transportation Act and High Speed Rail Transportation Act are two recent examples of statutory language protecting employees. Section 405 of S. 3706, the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, has similar language.

H.R. 19661 is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It applies to air carriers much the same language as the statutes cited above. I urge other Members of the House to cosponsor this legislation and assist in gaining early passage of this important legislation. The text is as follows:

H.R. 19661

A bill to protect the rights of employees of air carriers involved in mergers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 408(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1378(b)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(b)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) It shall be a condition of any approval under this section that fair and equitable arrangements are made to protect the interests of employees affected by such approval. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired air carriers and priority of reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, an agreement pertaining to the protection of the interests of said employees may hereafter be entered into by any carrier or carriers by air and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its or their employees."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect as of October 5, 1970.

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE CONTINUES TO RISE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, despite the Nixon administration's roseate pronouncements about the unemployment crisis, the see-saw of his economic policies finds unemployment going up and all indicators of a healthy economy going down. The Wall Street Journal, a newspaper never known to be a spokesman for the Democratic Party or particularly strong in its criticism of this administration, carried an article on October 5, 1970, on the sorry state that we have arrived at as a result of the shortsighted leaderless economic policies of this administration.

I insert this article at this point in the RECORD.

RISE IN SEPTEMBER JOBLESS RATE TO 5.5% SHARPENS ELECTION ISSUE

WASHINGTON.—Any hopes the Nixon Administration had of blunting the unemployment issue before Election Day were dashed with the report that last month the jobless rate spurted to its highest level in nearly seven years.

At a seasonally adjusted 5.5% of the labor force, the unemployment rate was up 0.4 per centage point from August's 5.1%, matching the biggest jump in almost a decade, Labor Department figures showed. The September increase pushed the jobless rate to its highest level since Jan. 1964, when it was 5.6%.

Moreover, two leading labor-force indicators—the seasonally adjusted average workweek and weekly overtime of rank-and-file factory workers—declined sharply last month. About the only major bright spot in the department's report was that employment remained "essentially unchanged" in September.

Distressed Administration officials went to unusual lengths to try to soften the news of the sharp increase. But the Democrats and organized labor quickly pounced on the report as evidence that the GOP's economic "game plan" for fighting inflation isn't working. The September report from the department's Bureau of Labor Statistics is the last one on unemployment that the Government will issue before the Nov. 3 Congressional elections.

MANY "SHELL-SHOCKED"

"There were a lot of people in the Administration who were shell-shocked by this figure," one Government economist said of the 5.5% September rate. Generally, Administration economists had figured last month's jobless rate would edge up to 5.2% or, at the most, 5.3%.

In commenting on the bureau's report for last month, Harold Goldstein, Assistant Commissioner of Labor Statistics, told reporters "there is some overstatement of the (jobless) rate for September." The bureau noted that since its nationwide unemployment survey for last month was conducted earlier than usual, "the September figures may not have fully reflected the usual exit of youths from the labor market to begin the fall school term."

Mr. Goldstein added that the labor-force statistics, which are always gathered during the week in which the 12th of the month occurs, may have been affected by the inclusion of Labor Day in the September survey period. This could have tended to reduce the average workweek and weekly overtime figures, he said. But he noted that only workers who weren't paid for the holiday would have been reported as having reduced weekly hours.

After the bureau released its report Friday, Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, took the highly unusual step of calling a White House news briefing to contend that there wasn't any evidence of any "major deterioration in the economy" in the latest labor-force statistics.

While conceding that the jobless rate is likely to rise even higher than last month's 5.5%, Mr. McCracken predicted that the nation's economy will continue to grow at a "fairly moderate pace." He reiterated that the Administration expects the economy to return to "full employment"—which officials generally have equated with a 4% jobless rate—in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

"STATISTICAL ABERRATION"

The President's top economist focused most of his comments on the decline in the average workweek. "We have to assume what we see in the workweek is essentially a statistical aberation due to the impact of Labor Day in the (survey) week," he asserted.

But many administration officials privately dismissed the contention that the inclusion of Labor Day in the survey week adversely affected the results. Some of them feel that the 5.5% rate for last month is fairly accurate, but that the summer months' jobless figures—5% in July, 4.7% in June and 5% in May—had been on the low side. "Unemployment is probably around 5.5% now, but I just don't believe there was that much of a dramatic jump in September," said one.

His comment reflected renewed concern about the validity of the seasonal adjustment factors used by the bureau. In September 1969, the bureau originally reported a 0.5 percentage point increase in the jobless rate, but after the seasonal-adjustment formula went through its annual updating last February, the August-to-September increase was narrowed to 0.3 percentage point.

In an unusual move, a footnote commenting on the seasonal adjustment factor was tacked on to the bureau's latest report. It stated:

"When the seasonal factors are revised early in 1971 to take the recent data into account, the increase in the unemployment rate for September will probably be reduced, as it was last year."

It couldn't be determined just who in the Labor Department or Administration had decided that the footnote should be added to the report. In any case, it appeared to be part of the broad Administration effort to soften the news of the jump in the jobless rate last month.

POLITICAL DAMAGE SEEN

Despite the effort to explain the September increase in a way to best minimize the impact on the Congressional elections next month, many officials concede the 5.5% figure will be damaging politically.

"No matter how you cite it, it's just a bad number," said one top Administration economist sadly.

Democratic National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien declared that the September jobless rate is "fresh evidence, if any were needed, that the Nixon-Agnew economic game plan is in a shambles."

He added: "This sharp increase demonstrates beyond question that our economy is in serious trouble and that the Nixon Administration is without any effective answers." The Nov. 3 elections have "become a referendum on the economic policies of the Nixon Administration," the Democratic chairman asserted.

AFL–CIO President George Meany called the September jobless rate a "tragic statistic" and said "the Administration cannot duck responsibility" for it.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics said seasonally adjusted unemployment rose to 4,607,000 persons last month from 4,231,000 in August. Before adjustment, September unemployment was 4,292,000, up slightly from 4,220,000 the previous month. Joblessness normally falls "substantially" between August and September, the bureau noted.

Four-fifths of the 376,000 increase in seasonally adjusted unemployment occurred among workers between 16 and 24 years old, the bureau reported. Students in this age group would have been most affected by the earlier-than-usual survey week, Assistant Commissioner Goldstein observed.

The jobless rate for all adult men rose to 4% from August's 3.7%. While the rate for men between ages 20 and 24 jumped to 11% from 8.5%, the rate for males over 25 remained unchanged at 3%. Among married men, the unemployment rate edged up to 2.9% from 2.8%.

The bureau said the jobless rate for adult women rose to 5.1% last month from 4.8% in August. The rate for teen-agers moved up to 16.8% from 15.9%.

Among whites, the September unemployment rate increased to 5.1% from 4.8%, the bureau said, while the black rate advanced to 9% from 8.4%.

The rate for blue-collar workers jumped to 7.5% from August's 7%, while the white-collar rate edged up to 2.8% from 2.7%.

The number of persons who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or longer continued to rise in September, the bureau said. The seasonally adjusted total rose to 792,000, double the figure for September 1969 and the highest level since mid-1965, from 736,000 in August. The bureau noted that about two-thirds of the September increase in joblessness occurred among workers who either reentered the labor force or were looking for a job for the first time.

Quarterly statistics prepared by the bureau showed that the jobless rate stood at 5.2% in the third quarter, up from 4.8% in the second and 3.6% in the first. "Jobless rates for most groups of workers continued to increase in the third quarter but at a less rapid pace than earlier in the year," the bureau observed.

So far this year, unemployment has increased by more than 1.3 million—650,000 adult men, 395,000 adult women and 290,000 teenagers—the bureau reported. It said 80% of the increase occurred among full-time workers, most of them persons who had lost their last jobs.

CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE

The number of persons in the civilian labor force rose to an adjusted 83,031,000 last month from 82,676,000 in August. Total employment dropped slightly to an adjusted 78,424,000 from 78,445,000.

Nonfarm payroll employment also showed little change last month. The adjusted figure for September was 70,380,000, down slightly from 70,384,000 the previous month. This marked the first month since April that payroll employment hadn't shown a significant decline.

Manufacturing payrolls were unchanged last month at an adjusted 19,276,000 persons. The sharpest decline was posted in the construction category where payrolls shrank by 69,000 to 3,232,000 last month.

Whatever Labor Day's impact, the closely watched average worksheet for nonsupervisory manufacturing employes dropped to an adjusted 39.4 hours in September from 39.8 hours the previous month. Observers noted, however, that most factory workers normally get paid on holidays. This would mean that workweek statistics for factory employes probably weren't affected much by Labor Day occurring in the survey week.

Average weekly overtime of factory workers, the other leading indicator, slipped to an adjusted 2.7 hours last month from three hours in August.

Average hourly earnings of rank-and-file workers on private payrolls rose to $3.28 last month from $3.25 in August and $3.11 a year earlier. Their average weekly pay dropped to $121.36 from August's $122.20, but was still above the $117.87 of September 1969.

Among nonsupervisory factory workers, average hourly earnings last month were $3.43, up from $3.37 in August and $3.24 in September 1969. Their average weekly pay climbed to $136.17 from $134.13 the previous month and $132.84 a year earlier.

RESOLUTION ON THE PANAMA CANAL

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the 52d national convention of the American Legion, meeting in Portland, Oreg., approved an important resolution reaffirming its position of opposing any new treaties dealing with the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

I invite all Members of the Congress to read and heed the words that have herein been set down:

RESOLUTION No. 315

Subject: The Panama Canal.

Resolved, That the American Legion reaffirms its positions heretofore taken with regard to the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, and opposes any new Canal treaties that would abrogate the essential provisions of the 1903 Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama; and be it

Further resolved, That The American Legion urges the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress to adopt a Joint Resolution expressing it to be the sense of the Congress and the Nation that the Government of the United States shall maintain and protect its sovereign rights in the Panama Canal, and its jurisdiction over the Panama Canal, and that the United States shall in no way forfeit, cede or transfer any of these rights or jurisdiction to any other administration, government, or international organization; and be it

Further resolved, That The American Legion urges the Congress of the United States also to adopt legislation to provide for an increase in the capacity and for operational improvements of the existing Panama Canal in accord with the principles of the so-called "Terminal Lakes—Third Locks Plan."

VETERANS' NEWSLETTER

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD a report that I have sent out to the veterans of my State.

This report outlines the work that has been done by this Congress in regards to those who served our country:

VETERANS' NEWSLETTER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—As a veteran of the U.S. military service, we are pleased to advise you of major legislation affecting our nation's veterans. During the present session of the Congress I have continued to sponsor and work for the enactment of legislation which would benefit my fellow-veterans and their dependents, particularly those veterans who are returning from service in Vietnam.

PROPOSALS AWAITING ACTION

Among the proposals that I have introduced which are presently pending before Congress are bills that would:

Raise the World War I pension to $125 per month and provide for the payment of pensions without regard to the receipt of other retirement income, such as Social Security;

Recognize Mexican-border service as war service for pension purposes when there was, without continuity, a subsequent period of World War I service;

Extend wartime benefits to any veteran whose service involved armed conflict;

Increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans; and

Raise the rates and income limitations relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation.

THE HOUSE HAS DONE A GOOD JOB

The House of Representatives of this Congress has done some good work in regards to veterans' legislation.

But, unfortunately some of the measures passed by the House have been held up by the Senate Committee.

These measures include H.R. 372, which eliminates the annual income questionnaire for pensioners at the age of 72. This passed the House on October 6, 1970, and was given to the Senate on October 7, 1970.

The House also passed my bill, H.R. 15911, which makes certain that World War I veterans will not lose their pension because of Social Security increases. This bill passed the House on September 21, 1970 and was given to the Senate on September 22, 1970.

The House also passed H.R. 18253, which I co-authored, and which provides that the NSLI Trust Funds up to five billion dollars up to a five-year period may be used for an investment in GI home loans. This passed the House on July 20, 1970 and was given to the Senate on July 21, 1970.

BILLS SIGNED INTO LAW

My efforts in this area have not been without success, I am glad to report. President Nixon has signed into law a number of important veterans' measures that I supported during the 91st Congress. Among these laws are:

Public Law 91–32—Assure preservation of all disability compensation evaluation in effect for 20 or more years;

Public Law 91–96—Increases rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans;

Public Law 91–101—To amend title 38 of the U.S. Code in order to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans with service-connected disabilities;

Public Law 91–102—Provides that VA furnish medical services for nonservice-connected disability to any war veteran totally disabled from service-connected disability.

Public Law 91–178—To amend title 38, U.S. Code, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes;

Public Law 91–219—Increases the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowance paid to eligible veterans and persons under such chapters;

Public Law 91–241—Liberalizes conditions where Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recoupment from disability compensation otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans;

Public Law 91–262—To revise the definition of a "child" for purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, U.S. Code, to recognize the adopted child as a dependent from the date of the issuance of an interlocutory degree;

Public Law 91–291—To amend chapter 19 of title 38, U.S. Code, in order to increase from $10,000 to $15,000 the servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services; and

Public Law 91–376—To amend title 38, U.S. Code, to increase the compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

INDIANA VETERAN STATISTICS

With the enactment of P.L. 91–376, over 40,000 "Hoosier" veterans received approximately 11 percent increases totaling $4,334,000. With the signing into law P.L. 91–219 by President Nixon, 22,633 Indiana veterans received 35 percent increases in educational allowances.

WHAT "LOYALTY" IS ALL ABOUT

In closing I want to share with you an article that appeared in the VFW Magazine on Loyalty Day. ". . . the definition of loyalty is quite clear and simple. It becomes complicated only when someone tries to distort it with anti-American propaganda." The article then defines loyalty as "the individual's fidelity and tenacious adherence to government principal, custom and practice. It is the absence of any subversive thought or action." This simple passage captures the essence and spirit of what "loyalty is all about."

PRAISE FOR OUR MILITARY DOGS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the following correspondence from an Army scout dog handler in Vietnam in support of my bill, H.R. 19241, which provides for the humane disposition of military dogs. I wish to share the contents of this letter with you:

I am an Army scout dog handler in Vietnam. I noticed an article in the October 3rd issue of *Army Times* stating that you are sponsoring a bill for the return of military dogs upon completion of their usefulness to the Army.

I am writing this letter in hope that it may in some way aid you in convincing your colleagues that your bill has merit.

I picked up my dog in January, 1970 at Fort Benning, Georgia. He was 16 months old and had been in the military 2 months. We arrived in Vietnam early this past summer, after completing 20 weeks of training at Fort Benning and will be in Vietnam until next summer at which time I will have spent 19 months with my dog.

With any kind of luck American involvement in Vietnam should have scaled down to the point where the number of dogs used will be much smaller than at present. I do hope that when that time comes there is more waiting for my dog than a needle.

I am sure that you will run into those who question your concern for "only animals". Let me assure you that these "animals" are saving many lives every day. They are highly respected and a welcome sight to those who are doing the fighting over here. There are many men both here and back home who owe their lives directly to a dog. I am sure they would like it much more if they knew that these dogs were going to get a small reward, like their lives, for what they have done.

When one man is found directly responsible for saving the lives of a group of men he is praised and perhaps receives the Medal of Honor. Dogs are doing this every day and their reward is a needle.

I hope that your efforts prove successful. I will be following as closely as possible over here.

NIXON OFFERS SOLID PLAN FOR ENDING WAR

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, all Americans everywhere yearn to end the conflict in Vietnam and have our boys return home and must have found deeply encouraging President Nixon's new peace initiative in Southeast Asia. While it is obvious that our country wants peace, North Vietnamese intentions are less clear. A recent editorial from the State Journal in Lansing is a thoughtful analysis of the situation and, because of its vital concern to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to insert this commentary in the RECORD so that all the Members will have the opportunity of reading it:

NIXON OFFERS SOLID PLAN FOR ENDING WAR

President Nixon and the United States want peace in Indochina, and how soon it comes will depend upon how much North Vietnam and its allies desire to put an end to hostilities.

Those two points became extremely clear Wednesday night as the President announced a five-point proposal for bringing peace to Indochina.

The success of the firm but fair plan remains to be seen, but, if nothing else, the President has answered critics in this country and abroad who have claimed that he does not really want peace. And, he has issued an unmistakeable challenge to North Vietnam and its allies to prove that they share the United States' desire for peace.

We hope that the Communists do truly want peace and that meaningful negotiations, as suggested by the President, will begin and are successful.

Stating, "Our side is ready to stand still and cease firing without precondition," President Nixon offered these proposals:

Immediate negotiations for a stand-still cease-fire that would be internationally supervised throughout Indochina, as well as by the parties themselves.

An international conference to deal with the conflict in all three states of Indochina—South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia—with the Paris Peace Conference continuing until such an international conference is convened.

Negotiation of an agreed timetable for complete troop withdrawals as part of an over-all settlement.

Search by both sides for a political settlement that truly meets the aspirations of all South Vietnamese.

Immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war held by both sides.

Basically, the President's plan included three new points—the proposed cease-fire, the request for an international conference and a complete withdrawal rather than a gradual withdrawal.

The President stressed that the cease-fire would have to be internationally supervised and that neither side would be allowed to build up forces. He also stated that all kinds of fighting, including terrorist activities, would be included in all parts of Indochina. This, of course, is essential for the truce to be truly a cease-fire.

The request for an international conference, Nixon said, was based on the fact that, "This war in Indochina has been proved to be of one piece; it cannot be cured by treating one of its areas of outbreak." He noted that only Vietnam was being discussed in Paris.

In discussing the political settlement, the President noted that the "other side," by objecting to a few personalities, "wants to dismantle the organized non-Communist forces and insure the takeover by one party, and they demand the right to exclude whomever they wish from government." He wisely called this demand "patently unreasonable" and "totally unacceptable."

Nixon said, "We seek a political solution that reflects the will of the South Vietnamese people . . . which reflects the existing relationship of political forces." He stated that the United States would abide by the outcome of the political process agreed upon.

In short, the President offered the Communists a plan which seemingly would be difficult not to talk about . . . if they truly want a peaceful settlement.

As he pointed out, "Nobody has anything to gain by delay . . . only lives to lose."

The fact is obvious and painful, and now the fate of the President's plan for Indochina peace rests with North Vietnam and its allies. It seems President Nixon and the United States have done all they can to start the process for peace in Indochina.

EAST ORANGE, N.J., WINS KEEP AMERICA BEAUTIFUL CITY AWARD FOR 1970

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I inform my collegaues that the city of East Orange, N.J., has been selected to receive the 1970 Keep America Beautiful City Award.

East Orange was chosen from among 400 other applicants as the recipient of this high honor. The city's mayor, William S. Hart, Sr., is to receive the award on November 6 at the New York Biltmore Hotel.

East Orange qualified for this award because of its year-round litter prevention programs which help it to maintain a clean, beautiful city.

This signal honor was well merited, and I commend East Orange on its civic

pride and Mayor Hart on his successful campaign to maintain the city. East Orange, N.J., has set a fine example that other cities would do well to follow.

ENVIRONMENT—THE CHALLENGE OF THE 1970'S

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century ushered in the modern age—an age marked by genius, imagination, and discovery. Great scientific achievements and vast gains in technology have made us an industrialized society. As a people, we have committed ourselves to being the first, the best, and the most.

We are proud, and rightly so, of our achievements. We are a competitive nation and we revel in our success. We take pride in our achievements in space; we take price in the production of our industry; we take pride in our Nobel award winners; we take pride in the athletic prowess of our champions in international competition.

Through our competitive spirit, bountiful natural resources, intellectual minds, and hard-working labor, we have created a society unequaled in history.

But, over the years, in order to be the first or be the best, or to have the most, we have neglected one ingredient that we can no longer neglect, and that ingredient is our natural resources.

The fact is that our shrinking natural resources are at the bottom of the barrel. There are no replacements, no spare stocks to replenish our supplies.

Fortunately, there has been a growing awareness concerning the decay of our environment.

Such growing awareness displayed by the public is necessary and praiseworthy in the support of needed programs and for effective involvement on a personal level. This notable concern and support should be a reassurance to many of my colleagues who have struggled for years to enact major new legislation to clean up the environment. It has been convincingly demonstrated that the American people are squarely behind such efforts.

I recall a number of years ago, when I was in the California Legislature, our fight against polluters of our streams, rivers, and seashores. I was a member of the first legislative committee on pollution and we wrote some of the basic California antipollution legislation now on the books. However, I distinctly remember the general public's sentiment at that time. Air pollution or smog was considered by many as only a Los Angeles problem. Water pollution was felt to be the normal result of a large number of people and industry and there was not much you could do about it.

I am pleased with today's general awareness of the pollution problem. In the short 22 months that I have been a Member of Congress, I have served on the Public Works Committee and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. Most of the water pollution legislation is sent to this committee. We have been active and have worked hard in studying and proposing much significant legislation.

A few weeks after I took office, and following the oil leak at Santa Barbara and the flood disaster in California, I went to California with a special committee and observed firsthand the oil pollution in the Santa Barbara Channel. Shortly thereafter, I coauthored legislation which became the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 which established for the first time, liability of those responsible for oil spills. This act was basically a product of our public works subcommittee.

In addition to the Water Quality Improvement Act, Congress provided increased funding for the construction of waste treatment facilities. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 called for a steady rise over 5 years in Federal matching grants to States for sewage treatment facility construction—from $150 million in fiscal year 1967 to $450 million in 1968, $700 million in 1969, $1 billion in 1970, and $1.25 billion in 1971.

Only $567 million was appropriated during the first 3 years. Last year the administration requested $214 million, but Congress appropriated $800 million to clean up our Nation's waterways. Of this $800 million, the administration will have obligated only $515 million by June 30, 1970.

For fiscal year 1971, Congress appropriated $1 billion. Can the money be spent wisely? Do the States feel that they can use these funds to clean up their streams, lakes, rivers, and harbors? The answer is yes. As of February 28, 1970, pending applications for construction grants for waste treatment facilities totaled $1.7 billion. California alone has $57 million worth of applications that are awating approval and funding. Many say that even this amount is unrealistically low.

AIR POLLUTION

Air pollution continues to darken our cities' skies, and threaten our total environment with its poisonous chemical mixtures.

The primary contributor to this pollution is the automobile which accounts for nearly 80 percent of the air pollution in our cities. The automobile is responsible for dumping into the atmosphere each year more than 90 million tons of pollutants; this is twice as much as any other single contributor. If air pollution is to be curtailed, dangerous emissions from automobiles must be substantially reduced.

To combat the problem of vehicular air pollution the Federal Government is issuing emission control standards, but the present approach is inadequate for a number of reasons. Studies have shown that under existing controls automobile air pollution in the United States will more than double in the next 30 years. This is due to the projected increase in both the number of vehicles and the miles driven by each vehicle.

Only California has adopted emission standards which will stabilize air pollution and control the production of oxides of nitrogen. But, we want to not only stabilize air pollution, we want to eliminate it.

We have an immediate and pressing duty to protect the health of the American people by curbing dangerous vehicular air pollution. It is clear that present efforts to curb pollution by regulating new car emission levels are wholly unsatisfactory. Therefore, we must take immediate steps to encourage the development of low-emission vehicles.

In order to meet the challenge to our existence presented by air pollution, I have advocated vigorous action. I have coauthored the bill, H.R. 14534, which would require Federal procurement of low-emission vehicles, thus fostering development of nonpolluting vehicles. By offering legislatively guaranteed markets, a reasonable rate of initial production is possible. Such a proposal would make the nearly 400,000 vehicles now used by the Federal agencies a guaranteed market for low-emission vehicles. In 1968, the Federal Government spent $26 million for the purchase of about 16,000 passenger cars and $129 million for nearly 46,000 buses, ambulances, and trucks. Under the procurement plan limitations, the total additional yearly costs cannot exceed $34 million. This additional cost is a small price to pay for alleviating the dangers of air pollution and for preserving a life-sustaining environment.

In addition, I feel that we should put Detroit on notice that they must develop a low-emission vehicle. Last year, the California Senate passed a bill which would ban pollution causing engines in new motor vehicles after January 1, 1975. The bill died in the assembly. Similarly, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 17516, which is identical to the California bill.

When the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, H.R. 17225, was on the floor of the House of Representatives, I joined with a number of my colleagues to amend this act to provide even tougher standards. We attempted to add a provision similar to my bill, H.R. 17516, and we attempted to add a provision similar to the bill, H.R. 14534. In each instance, we were narrowly defeated.

However, when the Senate considered the Clean Air Act amendments, they were successful in adopting some measures which we unsuccessfully advocated in the House. The Senate bill requires that the automobile emit 90-percent less pollutants in 1975 than emitted by the 1970 model. In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be provided flexibility to act to abate emissions from new and existing aircraft, new and existing vessels and boats, new and existing diesel engines for railroads, and new existing trucks and buses and other commercial vehicles. This measure passed the Senate on September 22, 1970.

Presently, Members of the House and the Senate are meeting to hammer out the differences in the versions of the Clean Air Act amendments. Thus far, the conferees have agreed to accept the "clean car by 1975" provision as adopted by the Senate.

I concur in the clean air bill as adopted by the Senate and, as I said in my letter of September 29 urging all of the conferees to accept the Senate version, we must enact "stringent controls" now in order to breathe fresh air in the future.

The Senate-passed Clean Air Act amendments are aimed at dealing effectively with stationary sources as well as moving sources of pollution. The bill provides for the setting of national ambient air quality goals at levels necessary to protect public health and welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of air pollution.

In addition, the Senate bill establishes a Federal capability to evaluate the problems of environmental noise and requires legislative recommendations to the Congress. By authorizing the establishment of an office of noise abatement control, I feel that we can enhance our environment by reducing noise levels—especially around our airports.

Federal action to control air pollution has raised the question, "Should the Federal Government standards for air pollution be the ceiling or the floor?" I have felt that the States—if they desire to provide more adequate, stronger controls for their particular area than Federal standards—should have this right. The Clean Air Act of 1967 gave California the authority to adopt more stringent requirements for air pollution than were set by the Federal Government. I applauded this provision when enacted and I support the "State standards" provision of both the Senate and the House Clean Air Act amendments which continues the practice of allowing California to require standards more stringent than applicable Federal standards.

Preceeding congressional action on the Clean Air Act, I joined the county of Los Angeles in seeking an open trial regarding the conspiracy suit against the auto manufacturers. We contended that auto manufacturers conspired to limit research and the production of effective emission control devices. Our effort to bring the case to an open trial failed, but our action, I believe, awoke manufacturers to the concern.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

I am pleased that Congress has passed and sent to the President S. 3154, the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970. This bill will assist urban communities in developing transportation systems that will offer an alternative to the automobile. With the development of these alternatives, urban dwellers, representing 7 out of 10 Americans, will drive their automobiles less, thus relieving the congestion on the highways and reducing auto emissions.

MARINE SANCTUARIES

While the 91st Congress has enacted the most far-reaching air and water pollution legislation in history, I feel that much more can be done. We must enact legislation similar to my bill, H.R. 17528, the California Marine Sanctuary Act, which will prohibit further leasing for the extraction of oil and gas in those portions of the Outer Continental Shelf which are seaward of the areas California has designated as marine sanctuaries. Such legislation would have prevented the disaster which occurred at Santa Barbara in 1969.

OPEN SPACES

We must enact legislation which will provide more parks, playgrounds and open spaces for our urban citizens. We must insure that existing and future aircraft—such as the SST—will not decimate our environment with sonic booms, air and noise pollution. We must prohibit the usage of chemicals, such as DDT and phosphates, which are dumped into the seas and threatening the aquatic life. We must continue to press Government agencies to enforce existing legislation which prohibits the dumping of sewage, sludge, and waste into the sea. We must continue to seek solutions to the solid waste problem by establishing standards for disposable bottles and cans. We must develop methods of reusing some of the containers which we throw away.

These measures, if enacted, would be major steps in meeting the challenge to human life posed by the manmade causes of environmental decay. It appears there has been enough rhetoric on the subject of environmental quality. Congress is aware. The American people are aware. Now it is time for taking the necessary action and applying the means we have at our disposal. The people are looking to us for leadership. It is high time we acted upon those measures which would manifest that leadership.

ATTORNEY DAVID J. CONROY RECEIVES PROMOTION

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I announce that Attorney David J. Conroy, secretary, and resident counsel of the International Salt Co. in my district, has received a new and valued promotion with Akzona, Inc., of Asheville, N.C.

I have feelings of mixed emotions because, while I am delighted that Attorney Conroy—one of the ablest practitioners of law in the United States—has been promoted to this important position, I know also that we of the 10th Congressional District will miss him.

Dave Conroy and his wife, Lois, and their lovely family are the type of people who build a community, and in building that community, make this country a better place in which to live and to raise a family. Whether the call was for volunteers for a charitable drive, a new civic effort, new plans to enrich the cultural opportunities of our young, the need for a new school, indeed, any project that meant a better community and a better area—Dave and Lois Conroy always answered the call. They are the kind of people whose efforts add new sinews of strength to the fabric of society, and we of the 10th Congressional District wish Dave and Lois Conroy well in their new adventures.

PANAMA CANAL: PASSAGEWAY OR PERIL?

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, many people have expressed their concern over the future of the Panama Canal. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following article in regard to our sovereign rights in Panama which I believe will help to clarify some of the key Canal issues at this time.

The article follows:

PANAMA CANAL: PASSAGEWAY OR PERIL?

America's sovereign rights in the Panama Canal Zone are imperiled by three proposed treaties, being pushed hard by the leftists and liberals. The vital security of the U.S. demands that the treaties be rejected and that the U.S. maintain its present treaty based rights, for its own good, as well as the security of the Western Hemisphere and the best interests of Panama.

Construction of the Panama Canal (1904–14) has been called "one of the greatest works of man," undertaken as a "mandate for civilization in an area notorious as the pest hole of the world and as a land of endemic revolution, endless intrigue, and governmental instability." Today, our country's gross investment in the Panama Canal enterprise totals more than $6 billion. Obviously, "except for the grant by Panama of full sovereign powers over the Zone territory, our government would never have assumed the grave responsibilities involved in the construction of the Canal and its later operations, maintenance, sanitation, protection, and defense."

TREATIES OR TRICKS?

Our ultra liberal State Department negotiated three secret treaties with the government of Panama on June 26, 1967, without congressional knowledge. Here are brief descriptions of these destructive documents, which are still unsigned:

1. The first treaty would nullify the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, which guarantees American sovereignty in the Canal Zone, and turn over the Zone to Panama. This means that the United States would remain in the Zone, by virtue of treaty with the Panamanian government, rather than as a matter of sovereign right. *It means that the American Flag, under which three generations of Americans have worked to build and operate the Canal, would no longer fly over Canal Zone installations!*

The Panamanian government is totally incapable of handling its own affairs, as witness the Communist-led mobs which riot at will through the streets of Panama's cities. According to Rep. Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.), even a simple matter such as garbage collection is beyond the ability of the Panamanian authorities.

2. The second treaty would cripple the defense of the Canal, and make it a certain easy target for successful Communist sabotage. Certain specified areas would be authorized for use by American military forces, *but any military measures outside these small areas could be taken only with the consent of the government of Panama.*

American military authorities find this provision hopelessly inadequate for protection of the Canal, particularly since the Soviet base in Castro's Cuba is only a short distance away. If this treaty is ratified, vital supplies headed from the East Coast to American forces in Vietnam through the Canal could not be properly defended!

3. A third treaty gives the U.S. the right to build a sea-level canal through Panama. However, most authorities are agreed that a new canal is not needed. Even if one is to be built, it is inconceivable that it should be constructed where it will be susceptible to further Panamanian blackmail, since better sites are available in Colombia and Nicaragua.

Immediately after the Panama riots of 1964, the Kremlin issued a directive for all pro-Communists to get into the fight to take the Panama Canal, called "the jugular vein of hemispheric defense," away from the U.S. The present proposed treaties are the culmination of that Communist campaign. *The Senate can prevent this long-sought Communist victory, but it will do so only if an outraged public opinion forces defeat of the treaties.*

COMMITTEE FOR CONTINUED CONTROL

Mr. Flood, whose serious study of the interoceanic canal problem spans more than 15 years, recently told the Congress that the latest significant development on this question is the formation of the Committee for Continued U.S. Control of the Panama Canal, composed of "distinguished, knowledgeable, and realistic" members. He transmitted to all members of Congress copies of the committee's report, from which the following excerpts are taken (*Congressional Record*, June 16, pages 19886–19887):

The Panama Canal is a priceless asset of the United States, essential for interoceanic commerce and Hemispheric security. Clearly, the recent efforts to wrest its control from the United States trace back to the 1917 Communist Revolution and conform to long range Soviet policy of gaining domination over key water routes as in Cuba, which flanks the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, and as was accomplished in the case of the Suez Canal. The real issue as regards the Canal Zone and Canal sovereignty is not United States control *versus* Panamanian, but United States control *versus* Communist control. This is the subject that should be debated in the Congress, especially in the Senate.

Extensive debates in the Congress over the past decade have clarified and narrowed the key canal issues to the following:

(1) Retention by the United States of its undiluted and indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone territory and Canal, and

(2) The major modernization of the existing Panama Canal.

Unfortunately, these efforts have been complicated by the agitation of Panamanian extremists, aided and abetted by irresponsible elements in the United States which aim at ceding to Panama complete sovereignty over the Canal Zone and, eventually, the ownership of the existing Canal and any future canal in the Zone or in Panama that might be built by the United States to replace it.

As the result of canal operations during the crucial period of World War II, there was developed in the Panama Canal organization the first comprehensive proposal for the major operational improvement and increase of capacity of the Canal as derived from actual marine experience, known as the Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan. This conception includes provisions for the

(1) Elimination of the bottleneck Pedro Miguel Locks

(2) Consolidation of all Pacific Locks South of Miraflores

(3) Raising the Gatun Lake water level to its optimum height (about 92 feet)

(4) Construction of one set of larger locks

(5) Creation at the Pacific end of the Canal of a summit-level terminal lake anchorage for use as a Pacific reservoir to correspond with the layout at the Atlantic end, to permit uninterrupted operation of the Pacific locks during fog periods.

Competent experienced engineers have officially reported that "all engineering considerations which are associated with the plan are favorable to it." Moreover, such solution:

(1) Enables the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished

(2) Avoids the danger of disastrous slides

(3) Provides the best operational canal practicable of achievement with the certainty of success

(4) Preserves and increases the existing economy of Panama

(5) Avoids inevitable demands for damages that would be involved in a Canal Zone sea level project

(6) Averts the danger of a potential biological catastrophe with international repercussions that would be caused by removing the fresh water barrier between the Oceans

(7) Can be constructed at "comparatively low cost" without the necessity for negotiating a new canal treaty with Panama

All of these facts are paramount considerations from both U.S. national and international viewpoints and cannot be ignored, especially the diplomatic and treaty angles.

In contrast, the persistently advocated and strenuously propagandized Sea-Level Project at Panama, initially estimated in 1960 to cost $2,368,500,000, exclusive of indemnity to Panama, has long been a "hardy perennial," and according to former Governor of the Panama Canal Jay J. Morrow, it seems that no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such proposal within practicable limits of cost and time is demonstrated, there will always be someone to argue for it; and this, despite its engineering impracticability.

Congressman Flood concludes, "Let us save the Panama Canal and prevent our strategic position on the Isthmus from falling into Soviet hands by adopting the committee's recommended program." It is a timely warning.

THE TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE PAUL POWELL

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a giant of a man and a giant in Illinois politics, Paul Powell fell victim to a fatal heart attack last Saturday. His passing is a great personal loss to me.

A legend in his own time, Paul Powell's political career spanned nearly 40 years, starting with his election in 1930 as mayor of Vienna, Ill., his hometown, and culminating with his reelection in 1968 as secretary of state. During his illustrious and colorful career, he served in the Illinois State Legislature for 30 years where he was speaker of the house three times, once when the opposition Republican party was in the majority.

I was privileged to know Paul Powell throughout his career and I doubt that I will ever meet or know a more forceful or vigorous spokesman for the Democratic Party. In 1948 when many people were cocksure that the Democrats were going to be defeated Paul Powell hit the nail on the head by saying that he "could smell the meat a-cooking," alluding to the thousands of jobs that Republicans would lose. In 1960 when John Kennedy was on the campaign trail in southern Illinois, Paul Powell traveling with him, labeled him a winner long before anyone else.

Paul Powell was an astute politician who possessed a keen sense of feel and judgement; his abilities made him one of the most powerful political figures to come out of southern Illinois. There were few who could match his campaigning ability or his organizational talents. Paul Powell was the epitome of the political man who stood by his people and championed their causes.

I am deeply indebted to Paul Powell for his many acts of personal kindness and consideration over the years. I greatly valued our friendship and will always cherish the fond memories I have of our relationship.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET SUBMARINE STRENGTH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to ignore the Soviet Union's growing submarine strength. It is a cause for major concern to those who have the responsibility for the national security and defense of the United States.

It takes a long time to build a submarine. The new *Yankee* class of the Soviet Union has long-range missiles and nuclear power. These underseas arsenals of Communist power must be matched and exceeded by U.S. production and technology.

We should increase our submarine production, of Poseidon missile conversion as well as our emphasis on the Navy's new ULMS program.

In this connection, the column by David Lawrence in the Washington Star is interesting. The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 14, 1970]

THE GROWING SOVIET SUB THREAT

(By David Lawrence)

When is a "military base" not a "military base" but just a place at foreign ports where submarines can be refueled and pick up missiles and other supplies? The Soviet government in a formal statement has clarified its own policy in Cuba, and evidently feels it doesn't need a "base" in a military sense at all. It just has to have a friendly nation, with a port.

After asserting explicitly that it "has not built and is not building" a military base in Cuba, the Moscow government officially explains its position as follows:

"As for the use of the world ocean, the Soviet Union strictly adheres to operating principles and rules of contemporary international law. If Soviet ships and vessels enter ports of foreign states, including ports of the Republic of Cuba, on official visits and business calls, they do so with the permission of the governments of the states concerned. It is obvious that such calls are an inalienable right of sovereign states, universally recognized and confirmed by many centuries of international practice."

About all this means is that the Soviets say they are not building up a special base in Cuba, but have arranged to drop in at ports on the island to get necessary supplies and services for their submarines, which are obviously going to be stationed close to the United States for a long time.

It would not be surprising, however, if the Soviet Union raises the question of "military" bases established by one nation on the territory of another. Its statement says:

"It is well known that the Soviet Union, in general, condemns the building of military bases by some states on the territory of other states. More, the Soviet government has repeatedly made specific proposals at relevant U.N. agencies and the disarmament committee for the dismantling of foreign military bases on alien territories."

U.S. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird evidently has anticipated the possibility that this subject would be brought up. In a news conference a few days ago he pointed out that American bases in Europe were in existence when the United States and the Soviet Union began their strategic-arms-limitation talks. He added that if the Russians now were to build a submarine base in Cuba it would change the entire balance while the talks are in progress.

The Soviets want to make it clear that they are not "building" any military "base" in Cuba. But the fact remains that they are insisting they have a right to use any port on the island for supplies which can be stockpiled anywhere and delivered to given ports for use aboard Soviet submarines. No new "base" actually would have to be "constructed."

Laird has said that he has no evidence that the Polaris-type submarines of the Soviets—which, of course, use nuclear missiles—have thus far utilized any port in Cuba. He would, however, look upon the use by the Soviets of Cuban bases for Polaris-type submarines "as a very serious challenge" and one which doesn't follow the understandings that he believes were comprehended by both the United States and Russia in 1962 at the time of the Cuban missile crisis.

The Moscow government feels that building a new "base" would be the real issue, and says:

"The Soviet Union has not built and is not building a military base on Cuba and is not doing anything that would contradict the understanding reached between the governments of the U.S.S.R. and the United States in 1962."

So it seems probable that the whole question of military bases will be up for discussion in the talks about the limitation of strategic armaments. Since the Soviet argument is that any of its ships can enter ports of a nation which gives its permission, the United States can make the same point, for instance, about the use of "bases" in Spain, Italy and Greece—bases which have been established as a part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's program to defend Western Europe.

With the friendliness of the new regime in Chile toward Russia and the presence of a Communist government in Cuba, the assumption here is that the Soviets will be better able to maintain Polaris-type submarines in both the Atlantic and the Pacific as a threat to the United States.

AMATEUR RADIO OPERATOR

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called to the attention of the House the valuable services performed by the fraternity of amateur radio operators, "hams" as they are popularly known. As concrete evidence of the ability of these public servants to send communications over long distances with reliability and ease, I am inserting in the RECORD a message recently received at my office via amateur radio. The message originated in Connecticut, relayed through several stations to Jerry Horwitz, a ham in Silver Spring, Md., and then telephoned in to my office in Washington.

The message follows:

OCTOBER 8, 1970.

From: K1SXF, Bloomfield, Conn.

Your speech on floor of House on hams was excellent and much appreciated. 300 thousand hams thank you. This message is being sent by amateur radio.

GABRIEL F. GARGIFLO.

ELMWOOD, CONN.

HOLY TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 11, I had the distinct honor of attending the dedication ceremonies held to mark the new home of Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, in Union, N.J.

The pastor of Holy Trinity has prepared an inspiring prayer to mark the dedication. I include below for the edification of my colleagues the text of this prayer:

A PASTOR'S PRAYER FOR THE COMMUNITY OF THE FAITHFUL ON DEDICATION DAY

Thanks and praise to You, O God, for this day of achievement and joy. How dear to us is this House of Prayer, praise and thanksgiving. How close to our hearts is this community of memory and hope, reminding us of our help in ages past, our hope for years to come. We thank You for the privilege of raising arches and moulding stone to Your Honor and Glory, and for being able to enter fields of sacrifice and endeavor never entered before, and for being able to bear witness in a generation that would rather destroy than build up, for having been blessed with our alabaster jar of precious ointment to pour upon Your feet and to seek Your forgiveness for our failures of the years gone by.

We thank you for the faith of our fathers living still, the precious treasure of faithful witness we have received from the past, the most precious treasure we have to pass on to those who come after us. As we dedicate these buildings, help us to carry on the work of Your Gospel unsullied and undimmed that those who will remember this day years from now may fortify themselves with our example, even as we draw our inspiration from those who once worshipped and labored in this program with us and now are in the company of the Triumphant Church.

We thank you, Lord, for the full-heartedness of our leadership, the committees of planning and program, men, women and children who have slowly built their lives into these walls. What a cloud of witnesses are around us as we gather for today's dedication!

Keep us alert to the needs of people in all conditions of life, people who are burdened and their minds are not at peace. Let not this day's accomplishment loll us to sleep. May our cares pick up the cries of those in anguish and whose faith has withered and the problems of living have deadened their souls. Keep our congregation's conscience sensitized to the harrowing problems of society where priorities are confused, where Christ is forgotten and where the creature is worshipped above the Creator. In seeking to face the challenges of a planet bent on self-destruction, may we in our thanksgiving redirect our attention to the Source of all spiritual strength and gifts and effect a rededication to their proper use. Impel us to move where our community breathes and lives. As new unfolding opportunities of proclaiming Your Gospel in a growing neighborhood emerge, may we respond, engendering warmth and love in the lives of those who worship with us and who live around us. From strength to strength, let Your Spirit inspire us to be a potent influence, leading people to the feet of Him Who is our Shepherd, the Way, Truth and Life.

Now to this Savior and Lord, by the power at work within us, which is able to do more abundantly than we ask or think, at this Dedication and throughout our lives, be glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus to all generations forever. Amen.

WAGE GAP WIDENING

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in August I inserted in the RECORD an article by Richard Harwood entitled: "Male Poverty Slowly Fading But Women are Trapped." The article cites census statistics and concludes:

This problem transcends the problem of racial discrimination. The median money earnings of white women who worked full time in 1968 was $3,731; for Negro women the figure was $2,766.

For men of both races, the rewards of work were far greater. White men had median full time earnings of $7,447; the Negro median was $4,761.

What this means is that poor men in America have some hope of getting themselves and their children out of poverty if they stick to it long enough for the private economy to slowly draw them in.

But the poor woman trying to raise a family alone is hopelessly trapped. The private economy simply will not take her out of poverty.

Now we have an October 8 Wall Street Journal story which indicates that the gap betwen the wages of men and women is widening. The Chase Manhattan Bank—certainly not a nest of radicals—is the source of this information. As the Wall Street Journal points out, this confirmation of the gap betwen men's and women's wages "may steam up the 'Women's Lib' movement." Perhaps it will also steam up some of us.

The article follows:

GAP BETWEEN WAGES OF MEN AND WOMEN WIDENING, BANK FINDS

NEW YORK.—A Chase Manhattan Bank report indicating that the wage gap between men and women in the U.S. has widened in recent years may steam up the "Women's Lib" movement.

In its bimonthly economic newsletter, Chase says the median wage of women employed full time all year fell to 58% of the median male paycheck in 1968 from 64% in 1955. The bank attributes the decline to a persistent tendency to employ women in lower-level and lower-paying jobs than men and to the marked increase of women in the labor force. As more women go to work, competition for jobs open to them rises and wages

of those jobs tend to be depressed, the bank reasons.

Women will have to make greater breakthroughs in such male-dominated fields as engineering and medicine if they are to offset the effects of a growing surplus in fields such as teaching, the newsletter states. Chase says Federal Government figures show that for each three men with the potential to be engineers, there are two women with the same potential. As many women as men have aptitude for a variety of mechanical and repair jobs, the figures are said to show.

The bank notes it finds evidence among some employers of increasing willingness to hire women, because the average working-life expectancy of women exceeds that of men, and because women are less likely to jump from job to job and have better attendance records than men.

CONGRESSMAN MIZELL'S NEWSLETTER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present to my distinguished colleagues the results of a questionnaire I sent to every residence in my district.

I announced to this body several weeks ago that I would make a report of these findings in an effort to inform my colleagues of the sentiment and concern and opinion held by my constituents for the great issues of the day.

I believe their opinions are typical of those held by a majority of citizens throughout the country, and I am convinced that the strength and depth of their convictions on these issues prove that the American people are concerned for the welfare of their country as they have never been before.

The results of this questionnaire were included in a newsletter I sent to each constituent, as part of my continuing effort to bring Government closer to the people, so that Government can be more responsive and responsible.

I am including the text of this newsletter in the RECORD, in hopes that its content may assist my colleagues in discerning the interests of the people of my district.

The newsletter reads as follows:

DEAR FRIENDS: As we approach the end of the 91st Congress, I think it is appropriate for me now, as I have in the past, to report to you on some of the major actions taken during this past session.

These two years have been a most rewarding and gratifying experience for me in my freshman term as your representative. They have been filled with challenge and with achievement, both for you, my constituents, and for myself as well.

We live in the midst of rapid change. We hear the sounds of competing and clashing philosophies. We see the signs of progress. These are exciting times, to be sure.

Being in Congress during the past two years has given me a much greater scope of the problems and potentials America faces today. I think we have ample cause for optimism and for hope. Through the various levels of government and in the private lives of millions of American citizens, I see a growing concern and commitment to improve our society and strengthen our nation.

I have tried, through these newsletters and in various visits to every section of the Fifth District, to bring the processes of government closer to the people, to match the people's concern with government action where needed.

One such means of bringing the government to the people was the questionnaire we mailed to you several weeks ago. We have been busy compiling the results of that survey, and that is the main reason this newsletter is going out to you later than we had previously scheduled. The findings of the questionnaire are recorded elsewhere in the newsletter. I think you will find them interesting.

Finally, I want to thank you all for the trust and confidence you have placed in me during the past two years. Your support and interest in the actions of the Congress have been a constant source of encouragement for me. I deeply appreciate the opportunity I have had to serve you.

Cordially yours,

WILMER D. MIZELL.

Photographs used in the newsletter included one of myself on the steps of the Capitol with participants in a Highway Users Conference. A second photograph was a scene of my being inducted into the Winston-Salem Baseball Hall of Fame.

TEXTILE BILL

There are many issues of national and international concern in 1970, but none affects the lives of Fifth District residents more directly than the issue of textile import legislation now pending before the Congress.

This bill, the Trade Act of 1970, which I am co-sponsoring, would establish quotas on foreign imports, reverting such imports to the 1967–68 levels.

I am convinced that this legislation is vital to the continued success of our locally-based textile industries, which have become increasingly victimized by the rising influx of cheaply-made foreign imports, chiefly from Japan.

The worst-hit victims have been the textile workers themselves. As textile imports have startlingly increased, textile jobs in this country have decreased drastically. More than 8,500 jobs were lost in North Carolina alone in one 14-month period.

The Nixon Administration exhausted every avenue of negotiation in an effort to come to terms with the Japanese on this crucial and reverse this dangerous trend. But because of Japanese intransigence, Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans had no alternative but to ask for trade restrictions from the Congress.

The bill has now been reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee and will soon come to a vote on the House floor. I will continue to support this legislation, because I believe it is one of the most important priorities in the 91st Congress.

Its passage promises to bring a better quality of merchandise to the consumer's market, as well as giving a measure of protection to our domestic textile industry against a potential "flood market" of imported textiles.

CRIME LEGISLATION

The 91st Congress has passed two measures designed specifically to curb the rising crime rate in the nation. The first to be passed was a bill providing funds for the training and equipping of police officers throughout the country. The better our law enforcement officers are trained and equipped, the more effective their efforts to wage a comprehensive war on crime will be.

A unique feature of the legislation is the provision calling for block grants to municipalities directly from the federal government, without having the grants sifted through the state level.

The second piece of legislation passed by the Congress was the District of Columbia Crime Bill. This bill, though dealing exclusively with the District, could serve as a model for crime legislation on a national basis. The D.C. Crime Bill sparked some controversy because of the "no-knock" and "preventive detention" provisions written into the bill, but I strongly believe these clauses are not only constitutionally sound, but also vital to any intensive campaign to remove the criminal element from the nation's streets.

It is a violation of the rights of the law-abiding citizen to force him to live in fear of bodily harm while allowing a known criminal to roam the streets at will. The "no-knock" provision allows a police officer to enter a private dwelling without knocking, only if the officer is given a court warrant to do so, and only if there is probable cause that evidence of a crime may be destroyed or concealed before the officer's entry.

The "preventive detention" clause applies only to defendants with previous records of felonies, who are arrested again on charges of committing another felony. These are tough laws, but badly needed ones.

NONDISCRIMINATORY EDUCATION BILL

During the second session of the 91st Congress, I introduced a bill calling for a clearly defined policy for school desegregation to be established by the Congress. My bill calls for true freedom of choice and makes forced busing of school children illegal.

I regret to inform you that this bill seems hopelessly bottled up in the House Committee on Education and Labor, with little or no chance for passage in the 91st Congress.

In another effort to avert a crisis in some of our local school districts, I telegramed both President Nixon and Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, asking for a stay of the order to execute a plan calling for mass busing of school children in the Fifth District. These efforts, as you know, were unsuccessful too.

As a substitute effort, I have agreed to posing a "friend of the court" brief to be presented to the Supreme Court before it rules on the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school busing case. The brief is presented to instruct the court that it was the intent of the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that forced busing to overcome racial imbalance was prohibited in all cases.

Congress reasserted this position in the 91st Congress by passing an amendment to the education appropriation bill forbidding the use of federal funds for the cross-busing of school children solely for the purpose of achieving racial balance.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Here are the results, in percentages, of the questionnaire we mailed to you some time ago. The questions, and your opinions, are as follows:

(1) If a postal corporation is established, should it be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis? Yes: 91%. No: 9%.

(2) Do you believe the U.S. can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union? Yes: 24%. No. 76%.

(3) President Nixon has recommended strong anti-crime legislation. Do you favor:

(A) Allowing federal officers with a warrant issued by a federal court to enter private premises without knocking if drugs and other evidence of illegal narcotics traffic might otherwise be destroyed? Yes: 71%. No: 29%.

(B) Keeping a criminal defendant in "preventive detention" if his record indicates he might commit a serious crime if freed on bond while awaiting trial? Yes: 88%. No: 12%.

(4) Should balancing the federal budget to curb inflation be given priority over greater spending on government programs? Yes: 85%. No: 15%.

(5) Do you favor elimination of draft deferments for college students? Yes: 52%. No: 48%.

(6) In Vietnam, which one of the following four alternatives do you think will best serve our commitments and our national interest?

(A) Immediate and unconditional removal of all U.S. troops. 13%.

(B) Removal of U.S. troops by a definite deadline, regardless of any other consideration whatsoever. 14%.

(C) Gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops, depending on the ability of the South Vietnamese to assume the total defense of their country. 51%.

(D) Escalation of all military action to achieve a military victory. 22%.

(7) Do you favor an all-out federal attack on pollution, even if it means higher taxes? Yes: 66%. No: 34%.

(8) Are you satisfied with President Nixon's overall performance? Yes: 65%. No: 35%.

(9) Federal farm controls and subsidies should be:

(A) Phased out within five years: 54%.

(B) Continued as is: 20%.

(C) Made permanent, with the subsidies reduced: 26%.

(10) Do you agree with President Nixon's decision to neutralize the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia? Yes: 82%. No: 18%.

(11) Should the colleges expell any student who uses physical force as a means of persuasion? Yes: 95%. No: 5%.

(12) Please list the priorities which you feel the Congress should spend tax money on in our country. In order of frequency listed, they are: environment, crime, education, defense, poverty-welfare, social security, economy, urban affairs, transportation, scientific research, Vietnam, civil disorders, foreign affairs, agriculture, birth control, and drugs.

BURLEY TOBACCO BILL

This bill which I introduced, extending the right to lease and transfer acreage allotments to burley tobacco growers, recently passed a vote in the House of Representatives.

This bill will be a definite asset to the burley tobacco growers of our area, allowing them to lease or transfer acreage which they cannot economically farm by themselves, whether from lack of sufficient labor or equipment. It is a long-standing practice among other farmers, and it is time the same right was given burley tobacco growers.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Some most important legislation benefiting our senior citizens was passed in the second session of the 91st Congress by the House of Representatives. The roll call vote, 342–32, demonstrates the overwhelming support for this bill, the Social Security Amendments of 1970.

The measure is at this writing being considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and will require the Senate's affirmative vote before President Nixon signs it into law.

The House has approved a 5-percent raise for all Social Security beneficiaries and additional automatic cost-of-living raises, to allow our citizens on limited Social Security pensions to absorb future cost-of-living increases without suffering financially.

This bill also provides that a beneficiary can earn up to $2,000 without loss of benefits, and may receive a partial payment with earnings of up to $3,200.

The new legislation entitles a widow or widower to enjoy full benefits of primary insurance if first applied for at age 65 or older. It applies the same rules for men as now apply to women with regard to earnings up to the age of 62.

The amendments also eliminate reductions in spouse's benefits in certain cases, and provides improved disability benefits for the blind.

I have strongly supported these important and needed provisions designed to make more rewarding the retirement years of the fifth district's 56,800 Social Security beneficiaries as well as 25 million more senior citizens throughout our nation.

NATIONAL HISTORIC JEFFERSON BARRACKS—LANDMARK STATUS THE GOAL FOR THIS 120-YEAR-OLD POST

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see an article by Mary Duffe in the October issue of St. Louis Commerce, the publication of the chamber of commerce of Metropolitan St. Louis, and also a reprint thereof in the Mirror of Public Opinion of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, describing the history of Jefferson Barracks, the 120-year-old Army post, and the efforts that are being expended to have it receive national historic landmark status.

For more than 2 years, I have been working diligently to attract the interest of and provide information to the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, concerning Jefferson Barracks and its great historical background, to the end that the advisory board would recommend to the Secretary of the Interior its designation as a national historic landmark.

I am sure many of my colleagues have knowledge of this Army post, either through personal experiences or those of some of their loved ones. It is another of our historical areas which, in my opinion, should be preserved.

I am inserting in the RECORD the splendid article of Mary Duffe so that those who are interested in the great history of our country may have an opportunity to read it.

OLD ARMY POSTS JUST FADE AWAY

On a bluff high above the Mississippi River south of St. Louis, the rolling green meadows of Jefferson Barracks offer a pleasant vista. The former Army post, which once covered 1702 acres, is the verdant representation of a Carl Sandburg poem on war that contains the line, "I am the grass; I cover all."

With its quaint nineteenth-century red brick buildings contrasting with the new white gravestones of the Vietnam war dead in its National Cemetery, the Barracks' beauty in reality masks an anguished record of our settlement of the West, our wars of expansion, our quarrels with the Indians, and our enmeshment in other parts of the world.

The Barracks' cemetery has the dubious distinction of having one of the largest mass graves in the country—123 World War II atrocity victims who died in the Philippines. Also buried there are six Confederate soldiers shot in reprisal for six Union men summarily executed by guerrillas in outstate Missouri. Early graves hold victims of dueling battles and the plague.

Almost every Army man of note in the last century was stationed at the Barracks at one time in his career. Grant and Lee, of course, but also Sherman, Custer, Kearney, Leavenworth, Zachary Taylor; in more recent times, Pershing and Eisenhower spent some time at the post.

The Barracks originally was intended as a training center for infantrymen. But like at Fort Leonard Wood today, the enlisted men were sent out as rapidly as they came in. They hastened away to fend off uprising Fox Indians in Wisconsin, Seminoles in Florida, Sioux in the Dakotas, and Apaches in the Southwest. They foot-marched to the Mexican War and back again. They rode away to the Civil War, to the Spanish-American War, to the Mexican border, to World Wars I and II.

The finely kept graves in the National Cemetery, fourth largest Army burial ground in the nation, are reminders of the loss of young men in every generation. Dead from every war America has fought are interred there.

When Jefferson Barracks was established in 1826, the location was regarded as a more healthful site than old Fort Bellefontaine, north of St. Louis near the mouth of the Missouri River. It was from Bellefontaine that Lt. Zebulon Pike had set forth in 1804 on his famous expedition to the Southwest on which he discovered Pikes Peak. His little daughter is one of those re-interred in the National Cemetery at the Barracks. Another early grave is that of a soldier, Pvt. Richard Gentry, who had been present at Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown. His son, Gen. Gentry, was killed in a battle with the Seminoles in 1837 and also is buried there.

The Barracks burgeoned during the Civil War because of its strategic location on the border between North and South. In addition, a new hospital was authorized in 1861 and began at once to receive Union battle casualties and wounded Confederate prisoners as well. Fatal infections and deaths from such diseases as cholera, spinal meningitis and pneumonia took their toll, adding to the rows of graves in the cemetery.

A tent area for enlisted men came to be known as Pneumonia Gulch. The National Cemetery, an extension of the old post graveyard, was one of eight so designated by President Lincoln in 1863.

The post continued to serve the country as a military distribution center through World War I, and it again reached a peak during World War II when thousands of men were processed there. The end of hostilities marked the end of the Barracks' 120-year history as a military post. It was declared surplus in 1946 and since then has been whittled away until now only 135 acres of the original 1702 remain.

St. Louis County purchased some 450 acres, which include Sylvan Springs Park, west of the Barracks grounds. The Veterans Hospital has 170 acres, the National Cemetery 309. Private development has taken most of the rest.

Missouri Army and Air National Guard units use what remains of the old post for their activities. The grounds are open to picnickers and sight-seers who may visit restored buildings and museums.

There is an active Jefferson Barracks Landmarks Association, whose members are waging a campaign to have the area designated a national landmark. Its president, Tony Fusco, a riverboat pilot is also an enthusiastic historian of the Barracks and has written a number of booklets and articles about the post.

CLEVELAND'S NEW CITY COUNCIL PRESIDENT, ANTHONY J. GAROFOLI

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland City Council has just recently elected a new city council president, Anthony J. Garofoli.

I join with all residents of the greater Cleveland community in wishing Councilman Garofoli success in his new job of leading Cleveland and solving the problems which it faces.

I am very pleased to be able to report that Councilman Garofoli, representing the 19th Ward, is one of my constituents in the 22d District.

Throughout the Cleveland community, Council Garofoli is recognized as one of the community's finest young public officials and leaders.

Anthony Garofoli went to school at John Carroll University and then on to law school at Cleveland-Marshall. In 1965 he was elected as councilman from the 19th. He quickly made his mark as one of the most articulate and thoughtful men in the council's chamber. To quote from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 26:

Any politician, to be successful, must at least be shrewd and a master of the game. But when he is also noticeably more intelligent than his peers, it makes a difference.

Garofoli knows that now, while his leadership is at its most precarious, much of the respect he garners from his colleagues has to do with their knowing his mind is better.

The election of Councilman Garofoli to council president has been received with enthusiasm throughout the community. Indicative of this is the following editorial of September 15, 1970, from the Cleveland Press, entitled, "A New Chance for Cleveland":

A NEW CHANCE FOR CLEVELAND

A new era of statesmanship and cooperation in city government could begin as a result of last night's election of Anthony J. Garofoli as Cleveland Council president.

The conscientious and articulate Garofoli succeeds James V. Stanton, whose leadership of Council in the past couple of years has been marred by feuding with Mayor Stokes and other members of the city administration.

Garofoli, while differing sharply from the mayor on many major issues, has said he will meet with him this week and endeavor to develop an atmosphere of cooperation.

And Stokes' first remark to the new Council president was, "I look forward to working with you—working together with mutual respect for one another."

Both publicly expressed the right attitude. Cleveland's mountain of problems can be whittled down only if the mayor and Council work together.

There's nothing wrong, of course, with Council acting as a watchdog on city affairs—that's exactly what it ought to do. But there ought to be a joint and determined effort to solve the city's worst problems.

As Council's new leader, Garofoli has a great opportunity to do just that.

The new council president is particularly concerned about the severe financial problems which face Cleveland. In an interview in the Plain Dealer the councilman said:

The city does need money and that it has only regressive taxes available to it.

"Unfortunately, both kinds of taxation (income and real estate) seem to get the little guy most," he said.

Like Stokes, Garofoli sees the answer in tax reform on the federal and state levels.

"We should either have a broader tax base or get our fair share through some major reform from the federal government or the state. Until that happens, we're going to have to grapple with this problem."

Regardless of what happens to the proposed .8 of 1% income tax hike on the ballot Nov. 3, it appears certain Garofoli will move to pool a team of lobbyists from council and the administration to lobby in Columbus for reform.

Garofoli thinks a cooperative effort in this area might well help, especially if Democrat John Gilligan is elected governor. In the past, Garofoli said, the city has had only one man from the city law department representing Cleveland's interests at tax hearings in Columbus.

If this kind of cooperation comes to pass, it would be a major shift.

It is obvious from the above, that the new council president has some new, good ideas. He deserves the support of every other citizen in his new position of responsibility and challenge.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS EXPRESS THANKS FOR HOUSE ACTION PROVIDING FOR A NONVOTING DELEGATE IN THE HOUSE FOR D.C.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the president of the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia, Mrs. Philip G. Fortune, to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a note of thanks expressing their gratitude to the Members of the House of Representatives in passing H.R. 18725, a bill providing a nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia. I include the statement of the League of Women Voters in full below:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C.

To the Members of the House of Representatives:

The League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia is very grateful to the members of the House of Representatives for their patient concern regarding the bill providing for a non-voting delegate in the Congress for the District of Columbia.

The long session required to pass this legislation must have been trying to the great numbers of members who stayed through the dinner hour to pass this bill, and we are properly appreciative.

REPORT ON THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has been my annual custom to provide my constituents of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts with a yearend report on the Congress. I believe that my report, which reviews many of the major legislative issues, will be of interest to my colleagues.

The text of my report, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, reads as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSWOMAN MARGARET HECKLER REPORTS TO THE 10TH DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Americans must recover their confidence in democracy. This "End of Session" report on the 91st Congress is designed to describe my search as your Representative for the best means to bring about progress and responsive action to meet the domestic needs of our rapidly changing society.

In my recent Special Report to you on Viet Nam, I have stated my position on ending that devastating war, and called for an immediate cease fire.

OIL MUST BE ASSURED

Obviously a tremendous concern at this moment to my consituents and all of New England is whether we will have sufficient heating oil and fuel oil this winter. I do not believe we will ever have an assured supply of fuel oil until the nation abolishes the oil import quota system. I, for one, will continue to strongly urge the President to end this very restrictive quota system at once.

The government actions are necessary: 1) Imported oil must be brought in at once in quantities sufficient to avert a real crisis in New England this winter, and 2) The domestic oil industry must boost production of the fuels we need. I have given highest priority to insuring that these urgent goals are met. Our bi-partisan New England Congressional Delegation selected me to write the President asking for a meeting to provide final long range solutions to this annual crisis.

TEXTILES

I believe in free trade. Nations should work out voluntary agreements to resolve trade problems. However, when voluntary agreements fail to materialize, and unemployment threatens a sizable number of American jobs, government must act. I have introduced legislation designed to protect jobs in textile related industry, especially the garment trade, which is so important to Fall River. I will continue to exert every effort to protect this vital American industry.

SAVING OUR ENVIRONMENT

Combating pollution must be a primary concern of each and every one of us in the 70's. This problem deeply affects both the nation and our District. Consequently, I introduced legislation in Congress to have the President create a Council on Environmental Quality to direct a national battle against air and water pollution. I was pleased when the Council was established this year.

Pollution is especially burdensome in communities such as Swansea and Somerset whose citizens have long fought to protect their major recreational asset, Lee's River, from pollution caused by a power plant. I have strongly pressed the New England Electric System to end this pollution immediately.

Again, I have introduced legislation to make the installation of anti-pollution equipment feasible for small businesses by any or all of the following measures: tax rebates, direct subsidies and more rapid amortization of equipment.

In August, Fall River had a problem of contaminated water. I immediately contacted the appropriate federal agencies who successfully worked with the officials of Fall River to remove the contamination from the water.

I also fought and voted for the passage of the Emergency Community Facilities Act which doubled the authorized expenditure (from $500 million to $1 billion) for the construction of water and sewer projects.

INFLATION AND THE CONSUMER

Inflation and tight money have been devastating to consumers, especially the aged and those living on fixed incomes. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I introduced and worked for legislation to lower mortgage interest rates for middle and low income families and provide additional funds for home loans. The bill passed.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASED

Basic Social Security benefits were increased in this session by over 20 percent in one year. Those of us who have worked hard to bring about needed improvements in our

Social Security system have been gratified by our successes in this Congress. In addition to the benefits increase, we obtained an automatic cost-of-living clause in the House-passed bill. This bill also increased the earnings limitation on senior citizens and permitted the inclusion of retired teachers in the Medicare program.

There remains a great deal to be done to insure a more realistic Social Security program that will meet the needs of our senior citizens. I shall continue to work diligently for these reforms.

THE MYTH OF DICKEY-LINCOLN AND TAXES

An ever-increasing burden every American must carry today is taxes. One of the best ways of lightening this load is effective government spending. I have sought major budget cuts in nonessential funding such as the SST, and Dickey-Lincoln Dam so that we can meet essential human needs. I voted against the Dickey-Lincoln project, with the vast bi-partisan majority of New England Congressmen because it would have supplied one 6/10 of ONE PERCENT of the power needs of New England at a cost of between 500 to 800 million dollars. While increasing the burden on the taxpayer, Dickey-Lincoln would fail to supply cheaper electricity to Southern New England and destroy a vast wilderness reserve in Maine. At this time the Northfield mountain project here in Massachusetts is being constructed at 10 percent (89 million dollars) of the cost of Dickey-Lincoln, yet will supply TWENTY PERCENT more electric power.

ANTI-ABM

After extensive analysis, on June 11, 1970 (roll call 167), I opposed the ABM system because its highly dubious scientific reliability fails to justify an investment of at least 11 billion dollars.

CONSUMER NEEDS HELP

Because consumer protection requires more attention, I introduced legislation to create an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Branch. This will protect and represent consumers against improper business practices and harmful products. To protect the consumer's privacy, I fought for strong legislation to control mailing of unsolicited credit cards and obnoxious pornographic materials.

RAIL PASSENGERS SHALL NOT BE FORGOTTEN

In designing an overall transportation policy, we must maintain and increase railroad commuter service. In order to underscore my concern, I returned to the district several times to testify against the Penn Central's proposal to cut vital rail commuter trains. I shall continue to urge the development of a rail system that is responsive to the needs of the people dependent upon it. I have introduced legislation to this end.

DRUG ABUSE

While I was not satisfied with all of its provisions, I voted for the Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, because I felt that an immediate attack on the problem was essential. This act enhances law enforcement's ability to deal with drug pushers who threaten to injure or destroy thousands of young lives. It also provides for rehabilitation of the lives of those who are tragically addicted to drug use.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Since my first weeks in Congress, I have worked continually to reform the procedures of the House of Representatives, including abolishing the seniority system and secret teller voting. I believe such reform will make the Congress far more responsive to its constituents and to today's changing circumstances.

REFORMING THE SYSTEM

I have worked for reforms to strengthen our democracy and the rights of its citizens. Every citizen is entitled to vote and to be represented in the Congress, and each vote must have equal weight. Therefore, I introduced legislation to give representation in Congress to citizens of the District of Columbia, the constitutional amendment to end discrimination against women, and the voting rights act. I shall continue to work for passage of the constitutional amendment providing for direct election of the President and Vice President, which will establish once and for all the one-man, one-vote principle which is so crucial in a true democracy.

COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970 COMPREHENSIVE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTIVE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1970

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress today passed H.R. 18583, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. I supported the bill, reluctantly, because it represents a significant improvement of our national effort to combat the problem of drug abuse. Although this bill pretends to provide a national program to control and reduce drug abuse, many crucial aspects of the problem are ignored or inadequately treated and grave threats are made to our constitutional rights and liberties. Congress owes it to the people to produce a thoughtful, comprehensive program that will work, not a patchwork crazy-quilt passed in the rush before elections.

A program to meet the drug abuse problem in the United States must not be created in bits and snatches, with scissors and scotch tape. We are dabbling with a problem that is crying out for a massive assault. In New York City alone there are estimated to be over 100,000 narcotics addicts stealing $2½ billion a year in a never-ending search for funds to support their habits. Heroin took the lives of 582 people in New York in the first 8 months of 1970, and drug addiction of all kinds has become the leading cause of death in New York for those between the ages and 15 and 35. Drug abuse causes inestimable damage to individuals, families, our inner cities and outer suburbs, and the very fabric of society.

The three titles of H.R. 18583 propose to handle this problem by deterring drug abuse through better law enforcement and education; providing improved treatment and rehabilitation; encouraging research; and increasing control over imports and exports of dangerous drugs.

There are some worthwhile provisions in these titles: $135 million is authorized for treatment and rehabilitation programs. Most dangerous drugs are classified into five schedules which should be an effective means for improving the administration and regulation of the manufacture, distribution, and dispensing of these controlled substances. The bill eliminates mandatory penalties for drug abuse offenders, separates possession offenses from distribution offenses so that pushers can be punished more severely than users, and provides $1 million for a commission to conduct much needed research into the effects and handling of marihuana.

However, this drug abuse bill does not provide a balanced and comprehensive program to bring the epidemic of drug abuse under control. Its fragmented approach is at best a halfway measure masquerading as a full program on drug abuse. It overemphasizes the importance and effectiveness of law enforcement, gives inadequate attention to the need for treatment and rehabilitation programs, and ignores the crucial problem of international control of dangerous drugs.

This bill has been hailed by most of its supporters as primarily a law enforcement bill, updating and making more effective the statutes which bear on drug abuse. Yet, we have ample evidence that despite the best law enforcement we can muster, illegal drugs are available in every city in greater quantities than ever before. In 1968 over 162,000 persons were arrested for drug use violations, but the drug abuse problem is clearly worse today. In a recent survey of 200 college campuses 47 percent of the students sampled had smoked marihuana at least once. Do we want to apply even the reduced penalties under this bill to half of our college population? Indiscriminate enforcement of these laws can only increase disrespect for the law and alienate the young. I am not yet convinced that we have developed meaningful enforceable sanctions for the use, possession, and sale of narcotics that are realistically related to the offense involved.

The bill's provisions for treatment, education, and rehabilitation are clearly inadequate to the task we face. Funds should be provided in massive amounts for a wide variety of prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs, not only in the institutions specified in the bill but also in programs arising from community local initiatives, using the full range of medical, social welfare and other community resources available. The Narcotic Addiction Control Commission of New York reports that only 13,000 of New York's addicts are currently receiving treatment, leaving 87,000 "shooting up" in grimy corridors and back alleys.

The education programs authorized by the bill cannot merely point out the horrors of narcotics. The drug abuse problem is the manifestation of other problems of daily living. Teaching the young to deal with these problems will eliminate some of the present and future tendency to experiment with drugs. A carefully planned education program that presents the facts about drugs without increasing curiosity about them, without preaching, will go a long way to destroy the mystique that has built up around drugs and enticed the young to try them.

The most glaring failure of this bill is its total omission of any program to halt the flood of narcotics into this country. The third title purports to control imports and exports of dangerous drugs through a system of registration and notification of transactions. This puny effort ignores the necessity to stop the illegal importation of narcotics into this country at its source, in the opium poppy fields of other nations.

This can only be accomplished by establishing a new international consortium under the United Nations to control narcotics production and distribution. Such a multilateral body would:

Fund subsidies to poppy growers for crop diversification and cultivation of other cash crops.

Purchase poppy crops and supplies of opium for as long as necessary to keep such narcotics out of illicit channels of trade.

Embargo and suspend all trade with a nation which permits the uncontrolled or unregulated production or distribution of narcotics.

Exchange of United States and other nations' narcotics agents to assist and coordinate International cases affecting each country.

Assist in surveillance of narcotics law enforcement and the production and growth of poppies and so forth.

Insure close supervision of poppy cultivation and so forth.

Publicize those countries who are in default or at variance with international agreements.

Facilitate availability of U.S. aircraft and sensing devices to United Nations and to other signatory countries.

Encourage worldwide educational programs on the harmful effects of drugs, and so forth.

Support research programs to develop blocking drugs and narcotics substitutes.

Encourage stiffer penalties by signatory nations for pushers and traffickers.

Include psychotropic substances; that is, the barbiturates, amphetamines, and LSD under international control.

Such a program represents a realistic approach to reducing the menace of narcotics to manageable proportions. While promising to curtail drastically the supply of narcotics, these measures would provide the treatment and rehabilitation needed for those who are already addicts and discourage those who have not yet begun to abuse drugs. Only such a well-balanced, comprehensive approach covering all aspects of the problem promises any degree of success. I will continue to support programs which will fill in the holes left by the well intentioned but incomplete Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

SENSING THE NEWS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article dated October 11, 1970, from the "Sensing the News" column of the Southern States Industrial Council, written by Anthony Harrigan, executive vice president, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, pointing out that the U.N. has hardly lived up to the enthusiastic expectations of its advocates. The article follows:

SENSING THE NEWS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

In the glass palace on the East River officials of the United Nations are preparing to celebrate the organization's 25th birthday, October 14th-October 24th. No doubt there will be birthday cheers from liberal circles and the thinning ranks of one-world enthusiasts. For the most part, however, Americans are likely to pay little attention to the U.N. at 25. The organization long ago ceased to create much respect or confidence in the United States, though State Department officials continue to pay lip service to the U.N. concept.

In the late 1940's there was hope that the U.N. would represent a forum for free nations. From the start, however, the Soviets were obstructive. Then came the entry of new synthetic nations of Afro-Asia who turned the U.N. into a propaganda platform for the so-called Third World.

The U.N. war against Katanga in Central Africa was a major turning point in the organization's history. The U.N. intervention hurt the cause of civilization on the Dark Continent. In the later years, the Afro-Asian majority in the U.N., aided and abetted by the communist bloc, mounted massive propaganda campaigns against Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia—the bastions of anti-communist resistance in Africa. The propaganda proved futile, but even today the U.N. is trying to oust South Africa from the Southwest Territory mandated to it by the League of Nations at the end of World War I.

The U.N. Secretary General U Thant's pronounced bias against the Western powers, chiefly the U.S., has been a major factor in the erosion of American respect for the international organization. U Thant has not lost any opportunity to condemn the U.S. for its stand against communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

The Western nations are hopelessly outnumbered in the UN, which is expected to admit its 127th member state this month. The UN bureaucracy also is dead-set against the U.S. Even generally friendly observers of the UN sometimes express shock at the evident anti-western bias.

For example, CBS correspondent Richard C. Hottelet, writing in the New Leader magazine, said:

"The recent UN World Youth Assembly was a fiasco." He noted that "the well disciplined communist bloc took the well-meaning, disorganized and distressingly uninterested or stupid participants from other countries to the cleaners . . . One of the Youth Assembly final documents' conclusions and recommendations read like the front page of Pravda."

Ironically, the biggest failure of the UN is in peacemaking. None of the major conflicts of the post World War II era have been resolved by UN action. Indeed the UN has been responsible for strife not only in Katanga but in the Middle East. U Thant's removal of a UN contingent from the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba triggered the Egyptian attack in 1966.

Moreover, a stock-taking of the UN at 25 must include the organization's failure to help the Hungarians overrun by the Russians in 1956, or the Czechs reconquered by Moscow in 1968. Indeed the dominant forces in the UN have displayed shocking unconcern for the Germans in West Berlin, the Chinese on Taiwan, and the South Vietnamese under attack of Hanoi. At the time of the Nigerian War, when more than a million Ibo tribesmen were slaughtered by federal Nigerian forces, the UN failed to voice strong condemnation.

Morally, therefore, the UN has a sorry record. Its administrative leaders are basically hostile to the Western World and endlessly apologetic with respect to the Eastern Bloc countries in the Third World. Thus the UN cannot be viewed as an instrument for advancing freedom or preventing the march of aggressors.

AIR POLLUTION EFFORTS IN ILLINOIS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray C. Dickerson, director of the Illinois Department of Business and Economic Development, has written an excellent article on what is being done to control air pollution in our State.

The Illinois General Assembly's enactment this year of an environmental protection act has given Illinois the Nation's first comprehensive and unified program for pollution control. However, Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie has noted that "pollution and the environment are really problems bigger than government." Fortunately, in Illinois our utilities and manufacturing industries, as detailed by Mr. Dickerson, are making great strides toward achieving an environment as free from harmful pollutants as modern science and technology can make it.

Mr. Dickerson's article, which follows, appeared in a recent issue of his department's newsletter:

A LOOK AT AIR POLLUTION CONTROL EFFORTS

(By Ray C. Dickerson)

As both Director of the Department of Business and Economic Development and chairman of the Natural Resource Development Board, I feel that the time has come for me to render some comments on the present state of Illinois' environment and what is being done to eliminate the air pollution over which everyone is so concerned. I make these comments not with the intent of irritating what is already an inflamed issue, or confusing the public with more facts and statistics, but rather to clear the air, so to speak, of some basic misconceptions about pollution and provide a more logical approach for solving our problems.

First, I think it should be noted that pollution is not something new, or even something that has grown out of the industrial revolution. Pollution pre-dates man himself in the form of natural pollution. For example, over large fir forests there is a continuous bluish haze produced by terpenes—volatile hydrocarbons emitted by the trees themselves. In fact, the first recorded human victim of air pollution was Pliny the Elder who died in 79 A.D. as the result of an overdose of sulphur oxides produced by the erupting Mt. Vesuvius.

Secondly, I would like to point out the actual sources of air pollution in our present environment. While most people think that the dangers of air pollution lie in the dark, billowing clouds that pour from some of our industrial smokestacks, it is a fact that 90 per cent of all air pollution consists of largely invisible gases. More than half of America's air contamination, for example, consists of colorless, odorless carbon monoxide, most of it issuing from the exhaust pipes of cars, trucks, and buses. The second most common gas pollutant is sulphur oxides produced by homes, power plant and factory combustion of fuels containing large percentages of sulphur. More than one-tenth of the pollutants are hydrocarbons resulting from the un-

burned or only partially burned portion of automotive fuel. Combustion also produces significant quantities of carbon dioxide, ozone and nitrogen oxide. The remaining ten percent of air pollution is made up mostly of fly ash, dust, metal particles and other visible contaminants.

To put these figures in proper perspective it should be noted that the Public Health Service has determined that 60.6 percent of all air pollution results from our various forms of transportation, 16.2 percent comes from industrial combustion, 14.1 percent from the generation of electricity, 5.6 percent from space heating and 3.5 percent from general refuse disposal.

Thirdly, it should be noted that most of the industries and utility companies being held responsible by the public for supposedly creating our pollution conditions have established a commendable record of doing something about the situation. The following is an example of the significant contributions made by many firms to establish a better environmental quality.

General Motors reports that they have now developed controls for the four sources of emissions from the automobile—crankcase, exhaust, fuel tank and carburetor—and for the three types of pollutants now identified with automotive air pollution—carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides. They also state that the latest pollution control systems are now in use on 1970 models in California, and will go nationwide in 1971. General Motors goes on to say in their research report that the control of both hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide has already turned the corner. The nationwide peak on automotive emissions of those two pollutants has been passed, and the total daily output is declining steadily. This is because the reductions per car are more than enough to offset the growing car population.

Another interesting point made in the report of the General Motors Research Laboratories was that a great deal of the progress to be made in emission control now depends on the development of a lead-free gasoline by the oil industry. Such a development would be especially beneficial, in that it would allow the development and use of the catalytic converter which converts emissions into harmless substances by chemical action. In this regard, it was recently announced by Standard Oil of Indiana that a lead-free gasoline is now available for general consumption. The announcement by Standard included the remark that use of the new lead-free fuel in conjunction with a catalytic converter could result in the production of a 99 percent emission free automobile.

Other American automotive and oil producing companies are developing products along the same line, and already there are 49 service stations in the city of Chicago that are selling the new lead-free fuel.

Therefore, it is apparent that the transportation industry, which through its products is the largest producer of air pollution, is very definitely on the road to improving our environment, and at a relatively rapid rate.

Next, I would like to point out that Illinois industries responsible for pouring pollutants into our air are also taking significant steps to eliminate environmental hazards.

According to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, nearly 300 industrial firms from throughout Illinois, excluding Chicago, have invested approximately $200 million on air pollution abatement facilities during the past two years. This cooperation by the state's industrial community is acknowledged in the introduction to the booklet, "Commitments for Clean Air," published by the Illinois Pollution Control Board which states that, "the listings of the industries and municipalities in this publication stand as concrete evidence of the cooperation this Board has received from the industrial segment of this State. It is a cross section of large and small industry who have realized their obligation to abate air pollution and have translated this obligation into a definite response." Likewise, a report by the City of Chicago's Environmental Control Department shows that 87 industrial firms in that city have recently begun pollution control programs.

Therefore, I think it is obvious that industry, upon which the public has placed primary responsibility for our present air pollution, is indeed doing something about the situation. They are taking significant action at a relatively rapid rate.

Fourth, it should be made clear that the power companies are also taking definite and timely action to eliminate their harmful emissions.

Presently, Commonwealth Edison, Illinois Power Company, and Central Illinois Public Service Company, three of the State's largest utilities are participating in a seven million dollar research project to develop an advanced air pollution control system for power plants. The goal of the program is to develop a commercial system to eliminate 99 percent of the solid pollutants and 90 per cent of the gaseous sulphur oxides from the exhaust of power plant boilers.

These companies are also taking steps to shut down older inefficient and costly to operate plants as rapidly as possible, and replacing them with newer plants that are equipped with devices to capture particular matter. An example of this effort to eliminate emissions, can be seen in Central Illinois Public Service Company (CIPS) which is now carrying out a five-year sixteen million dollar program to install electrostatic precipitators at all four of its electric generating stations.

While many people argue that most of the pollution caused by power generating plants could be eliminated by switching to natural gas or some other fuel source, few realize that to do so would be to put an enormous number of coal miners out of work. This can be seen in the fact that CIPS alone consumes nearly 3 million tons of Illinois coal each year. Another statistic shows that the nation's electric utilities today burn more than half of the coal consumed in the United States. So if electric utilities were to shut down all coal operations, it would logically follow that about half the coal miners and processors across the country would suddenly be out of work, and most likely added to our burgeoning relief roles.

Another source of power for the generation of electricity that has been attacked to some degree by factions of the antipollution movement, is nuclear energy. Those who attack it on the basis of air contamination, apparently feel that the radioactivity given off by a nuclear power reactor is a direct threat to their well-being. I would like to quote an observation by Clarence E. Larson, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. He has pointed out that a person living every minute at the site boundary of one of our nuclear power plants, drinking the discharged water and breathing the air, and eating the fish from the same water would have to remain there for more than 200 years to get the same radiation exposure effect as will result from a single chest X-ray.

In summarizing, I hope I have made it clear that industry itself is not synonymous with air pollution. It is only part of a problem which has been created through man's ignorance of the nature of his environment. It is our society as a whole, not any one particular segment of it, that has contaminated our air. And if the general public would change their attitudes and actions as rapidly and as drastically as American industry has changed theirs, the threat which now exists could be removed.

For such changes to take place, it will be necessary for all of us to become much more educated in the field of ecology, to become willing to alter our life-style to some degree, and to begin assuming responsibility for the conditions which now exist, rather than looking for scapegoats like the industrial community and governmental bodies.

Our state legislature on the request of Governor Ogilvie and with the counsel of Illinois industry has recently enacted the Environmental Protection Act which will give our State a solid set of standards by which industry and government will be able to deal more efficiently with pollution problems. They have acted in response to the desires of the people.

But as Governor Ogilvie said, when announcing his recent environmental protection legislation, "Pollution and the environment are really problems bigger than government. And the solutions and cures must extend beyond the government and its efforts . . . The pollution problem in the last analysis is a people problem. It will only be met when every individual realizes that he is part of the problem, and will have to be part of the solution. Individual concern and individual action are the ultimate keys that will prevent this affluent society from becoming an effluent society—one drowning in its own trash and waste."

In essence the answer boils down to this: Are you willing to give up some of your conveniences, and pay more money in order to have a relatively clean environment? When we can all say 'yes' to that question, we will be able to effectively counter pollution.

What we want, and what we can afford are the two major questions that are unanswered. But they can and will be answered if we can begin to take an orderly and constructive approach toward the problem of air pollution.

NIXONOMICS IN ACTION—INFLATION AND RECESSION AT THE SAME TIME

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of President Nixon's second year in office, let us examine the "success" of his economic policies.

After a decade of unprecedented growth, the U.S. economy has been shaken by the conflicting pressures of inflation and recession. In the past 21 months we have witnessed:

First. The largest increase in unemployment in over a decade, from 3.3 percent in December 1968, to 5.5 percent last month;

Second. Steady increases in the cost of living, including skyrocketing food prices and medical costs;

Third. A steady decline in production;

Fourth. A significant drop in corporate profits; and

Fifth. A sharp increase in interest rates, which are now at their highest level in 100 years.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the sorry economic record of the Nixon administration; a throwback to the Eisenhower-Nixon recession years. The only thing more pathetic than the record itself is

the administration's attempt to defend it. For instance:

The administration claims that there is no recession. The fact is that the National Bureau of Economic Research—the undisputed expert on business cycles—has stated that the years 1969–70 qualify as a period of recession, the first since the Eisenhower-Nixon recession of 1959–60.

The administration claims that it has brought inflation under control. The fact is that inflation has increased since the Nixon administration took office. The Consumer Price Index rose 5.4 per cent during 1969, the highest one-year gain since 1952. In the first 18 months of the Nixon administration it rose 9 per cent, compared to 6 per cent in the previous 18 months.

The administration claims that economic conditions are improving. The FACT is that the economy has made only minimal gains in recent months and has hardly begun to recover from its sharp losses since December, 1968.

The administration claims that current unemployment increases are only temporary. The FACT is that unemployment is still increasing. A six per cent unemployment rate is estimated for the beginning of 1971, with even greater unemployment a possibility later in the year.

The administration claims that inflation is a result of democratic spending. The FACT is that Congress has cut over $7 billion from the President's budget requests for the last two years. Also, it was Congress, not the President, who imposed a spending ceiling on the federal budget in 1969.

The administration claims that it is fighting inflation by cutting federal spending. The FACT is that the President has cut the budgets for vitally needed domestic programs while ignoring expenditures for the unproven ABM system and other wasteful and unnecessary programs.

The time has come for the Nixon administration to admit to its mistakes, Mr. Speaker. The economy is in trouble. The American people need performance, not promises; results, not rhetoric; action, not excuses. Congress has given the administration the necessary tools to control inflation, lower interest rates, and stabilize the overall economy. It is high time the administration utilized these tools for the benefit of all Americans.

Judging by past administration performance, however, Congress will remain the leader in the fight for economic stability through 1972.

GLAD TO HAVE THEM ABOARD

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, if the issue were not so vital and crucial to every citizen, the spectacle of certain liberal public figures belatedly posing as law-and-order supporters would be reason for ribcracking laughter. But, because present conditions warrant anything but levity, I am sure my colleagues in the House and Senate who for years have emphasized the self-evident need for a continuing fair but firm law-enforcement system at all governmental levels will welcome all the help they can get on the issue. Unfortunately, the tools of research, observation, and the review of recent history did not suffice for some to get the message. Unfortunately, it required a drastic increase in the killing of policemen, a plague of bombings, and other means of outright violence to drive home to some what every thoughtful citizen has always taken for granted—a well-ordered society presupposes an adequate means of law execution. In recent years the evidence has been piling up, but some have been too busy crying "police brutality" or pushing police review boards or apologizing for lenient judges and parole boards to note and confront the increase in crime.

There were those back in September 1963, who could have cared less that a band of radicals rioted in the caucus room of the House of Representatives during a hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In commending the local police for their restraint in the face of contemptuous and offensive conduct, I noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time:

It is no secret that one of the stratagems of the Communists in the country is to discredit the FBI, internal security laws and the police whenever it can be done. Unfortunately, they are joined by a great number of civil liberties groups who are silent when gallant police officers are shot in the line of duty, such as Sgt. Peter Voto and Gary Tedesco, at Lodi, N.J., on August 27, 1963, but cry "police brutality" if the policemen use necessary means to defend themselves.

Responsible law enforcement sources have consistently tried to bring to public attention the obstacles they face in guarding the Nation's citizens. The October 13, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carried a lengthy and provocative address by FBI Special Agent Dwight J. Dalbey which I thought should be given wider dissemination. The theme of Mr. Dalbey's address was that the law enforcement is in trouble with the law, not because of law violations but due to public apathy, confusing, and restricting Supreme Court decisions, defective rationalizations, and other factors.

It was evident in the 1960's that the issue of law and order would have to be confronted eventually as a major issue. Items that I thought merited mention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during those years included the slanderous campaign against Lieutenant Gilligan, the New York policeman; the report of a Cleveland grand jury on the 1966 Cleveland riots; a speech by Jack Webb of the "Dragnet" television series entitled "What Is a Cop?"; FBI Director Hoover's statement on riots and disturbances; juvenile crime, subversive elements in riots; excerpts from a report of the Conference of State Chief Justices; subsidized riots; reappraisal of civil disobedience; criticism of Kerner Commission riot report; the role of the FBI in civil disorders.

In 1968 the pattern of lawlessness continued. Other developments in the law and order area which I thought worthy of noting included a House Committee on Un-American Activities report concerning guerrilla warfare advocates in the United States; Governor Reagan's comments on law enforcement; Miami's epidemic of law and order; Director Hoover speaking on violence in American society; violence caused by agitation and design; Operation Shakedown—riots; American campuses and violence; federally financed radicals; various statements by Director Hoover on SDS and the New Left.

It would belabor the point to continue listing the remaining items which I thought merited attention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the 1960's. Suffice it is to say that the above listing of items, all gleaned from public source material, indicated the lawless and violent trend which has today become a problem of the highest priority.

One further item which interested me and which appears in the July 1, 1968, issue of the RECORD, concerned the petition campaign by the Fraternal Order of Police and its President, John J. Harrington, protesting recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court on the issue of crime and law enforcement. The drive encouraged law enforcement officers and other citizens to put themselves on record in their opposition to certain Court decisions by repetitioning Congress for a redress of grievances.

Today I had the opportunity to hear Mr. Harrington testify before the House Internal Security Committee which is conducting hearings on the Black Panther Party. Mr. Harrington again singled out Supreme Court decisions as a major factor in hindering law enforcement:

The Court decisions which surround and protect the criminal with a veritable maze of technicalities, must be reversed. They not only make it much harder to convict the accused, they encourage many to become law breakers in the belief that crime does pay.

Our liberal friends in the communications media were not unmentioned in his testimony:

I am wondering, in the wake of the violence and disorders, which have swept the college campuses and the streets, what these liberal newspapers, and the TV chains, extremely prosperous most of them, are thinking now. Insofar, as I can see, their views have not changed.

Hearings in recent years by Senator MCCLELLAN'S Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Internal Security Committee and its predecessor, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, along with an avalanche of items from the press should have alerted responsible officials and citizens to the severe nature of the crime problem. It is time to close ranks on this issue, and to those whose awakening has been long in coming I can only say "Welcome aboard."

I insert at this point in the RECORD the statement by President John J. Harrington, national president of the Fraternal Order of Police and my October 7 issue of Washington Report which deals with this very important issue:

TESTIMONY OF JOHN J. HARRINGTON

I am John J. Harrington, of Philadelphia, National President of the Fraternal Order of Police, the oldest and largest of national police organizations. We have approximately 120,000 members, with more than 900 lodges in over 40 states. Our membership is composed of active police officers. Most of them are patrolmen but our membership includes many high police officials.

Speaking for the Fraternal Order of Police, I wish to express my profound appreciation of the fact that Representative Ichord, chairman of the House Internal Security Committee, has introduced HR 19543 and HR 19544 which provide severe penalties for groups and persons who use interstate commerce for the purpose of slaying, wounding, or feloniously attacking police and firemen. We fully approve these measures and think that, if enacted they will go far towards ending the guerilla warfare which is being waged against police and society in this country every day. The police, the pigs, they are called by Black Panthers and other militants, are singled out because their function is to enforce the law and to protect the law abiding citizens and their property. If they can demoralize the police and prevent them and the firemen from carrying out their duties, they will have gone a long way towards their ultimate objective of destroying our system.

Meanwhile, the Panthers and other militants, including some primarily white groups like the Weathermen and some factions of the Students for a Democratic Society, are carrying out vigorous propaganda campaigns which charge the police with brutality, fascism and genocide aimed at the Panthers.

The Weathermen, incidentally, claim credit for recent bombings which have done a lot of damage. Amazingly enough, many prominent persons, including moderate Negro leaders, have been taken in by these charges against police. After two Black Panthers were killed in a raid by police on Panther headquarters in Chicago last December, Panther spokesmen claimed that the police were engaged in a campaign of genocide against Panther members.

A party was given by Leonard Bernstein, famous as an orchestra director, at his home to raise money for the Panthers. This party was attended and the cause approved by Otto Preminger, noted motion picture director, and other celebrities. Arthur Goldberg, now running for the governorship of New York, said he would help with a committee to inquire into the circumstances of the shootout in Chicago. His statements indicated, in my judgment, the most tender solicitude for the civil rights of the Panthers. If he has any concern for the policemen who are being killed by militants almost every day, I have failed to read about it.

For Leonard Bernstein, I must say that he later repudiated the Panthers. If Goldberg did so, I haven't heard about it, nor have the moderate Negro leaders to my knowledge. I want to point out to them that the slaying of black policemen and black firemen is a part of the Panther objectives. All are "pigs" in the BPP version.

The Department of Justice got into the act in Chicago. It immediately empaneled a special Federal Grand jury to inquire into the affair. This Grand Jury has since issued a report highly critical of police conduct in the shootout. Another Grand Jury was empaneled and I would not be surprised if indictments against the officers involved in the raid follow.

I am not familiar with the details of the Chicago encounter. I do know that the Panthers systematically assemble weapons and munitions to be used against the police. In Chicago, the police had a search warrant to look for weapons and munitions and the papers reported that weapons and munitions were found.

What are the police of this country to do? Approximately 20 policemen have been killed without provocation this year. Not long ago, in my own city of Philadelphia, a gunman walked into a guardhouse and killed a long time friend of mine, Sergeant Frank VonColln, who was sitting at his desk unarmed. He was a fine man and a fine officer. Six other policemen were wounded at about the same time. Since that time, a Cleveland policeman was murdered and another wounded. One also was shot down in cold blood not long ago by an assassin in Atlantic City. Every day, Black Panther spokesmen, and other militants urge that policemen be murdered.

Let me read you what the national publication of the BBP, "The Black Panther," had to say of the slaying of the Cleveland policeman in its issue of October 3rd.

"Joseph P. Tracz, Jr., 27, one of the Cleveland's Police Departments Tactical Squad's pigs was known to have an outstanding record for getting lumpens (Panthers) felony charges. His pig partner, Frederick Fulton, 29, 18026, was known to have a contract on his head, put there by the lumpen in the area."

There follows a quote listing a point in the Black Panther platform, which says that all Black people should arm themselves for self defense to resist racist police oppression and brutality.

The article in the Black Panther continues:

"At 2:00 AM, Fulton and Tracz forced a gold Buick 225 over to the curb on E. 106th and Saint Claire Avenues, Fulton ran over to the driver's side and was greeted by a barrage of bullets. He was hit in the mouth, chest and groin. (He is now in the intensive care division of some hospital.)

"Tracz jumped out with his gun in his hand and ran up on the passenger side where he was greeted by a second barrage of bullets, the lumpen (in the correct manner) knocked the pig down, took his gun and fired into the pig, bang, bang, dead pig!

"The lumpen escaped unharmed."

"This and other revolutionary acts will continue to happen until community control of police is implemented throughout racist, facist Babylon."

There is more to the article but it parallels what I have already quoted. The Panthers murder one police officer in cold blood and shoot down another and boast about it openly.

J. Edgar Hoover has stated unequivocally that the Black Panthers are violating the law and yet when I wrote the Attorney General about the matter, I got a mild reply from somebody down the line, saying that an investigation was being held. This is disgusting to myself and most other police officers. Here we have an Administration, supposedly dedicated to the bringing about of law and order. But no recommendations to put a stop to the nation-wide conspiracy aimed at the police by the Black Panthers and others like them have come from the White House and the Department of Justice. The Department, however, rushes out the minute that the Panthers raise the cry of violation of civil rights and genocide in Chicago. I thank God that we have men in Congress like Representative Ichord and others who see the implications and consequences if the Panthers are allowed to carry out their murderous and revolutionary program.

This committee has a hard task. It is the habit of liberal papers like the Washington Post, the New York Times and the St. Louis Post Dispatch to assail this body as useless and engaging in farcical activities. These papers, and others like them, and many of the great TV chains have always sneered at efforts to control, by law, such outfits as the Communist Party. The Supreme Court has agreed with them.

I am wondering, in the wake of the violence and disorders, which have swept the college campuses and the streets, what these liberal newspapers, and the TV chains, extremely prosperous most of them, are thinking now. Insofar, as I can see, their views have not changed. The TV chains list to the left and so do many of our influential newspapers. The Washington Post and the New York Times, for example, call constantly for an end to the conditions which cause crime, poverty, ignorance and discrimination. I oppose all these conditions but, in view of our actual situation today, this advice amounts to prattle. It is like calling for the immediate acceptance, the country over, of the Golden Rule. I wish some of the liberal spokesmen would explain to me why, during other times when the country was a good deal poorer than it is now and there was more discrimination, there was much less crime.

The reality is that efficient police forces and swift and objective court action against the criminal must be employed if the rise in crime is to be curbed. The Court decisions which surround and protect the criminal with a veritable maze of technicalities, must be reversed. They not only make it much harder to convict the accused, they encourage many to become law breakers in the belief that crime does pay.

There is a place and a most important one for the House Internal Security Committee. The Ichord bills provide life imprisonment or death for anyone who kills a policeman or fireman by traveling in interstate commerce or using the facilities of interstate commerce. They provide a term of imprisonment of up to ten years for a felonious assault upon a policeman or fireman, if interstate commerce is involved.

If such a law is enacted, it will, in my opinion, put the Black Panthers and other extremist groups out of business and they should be put out of business. If the people who govern this country, can't stop a guerrilla warfare aimed at overthrowing their society, we are lost. The alternative is a dictatorial government. The people aren't going to put up indefinitely with a situation where they are not safe in the streets, their homes or in their places of business.

Speaking for the Fraternal Order of Police, and many other policemen, I feel, I can say that the average law enforcement officer is fed up. His pay is poor and the conditions under which he works become harder all the time. One comfort is that he feels he has the backing of the public, if only this backing could be organized and made more effective. I see, however, that many former liberal politicians, who used to pat the indulgent students—verbally, of course—on the head and were always yelling about the Bill of Rights everytime somebody talked about law and order, have changed their tune. They are finding virtue in effective law enforcement and are shying away from student excesses and from sympathetic statements for such as the Panthers. I hope that, if they are elected, their conversion turns out to be genuine.

I worked as a partner with Commissioner Rizzo of Philadelphia when I was on active duty on the Philadelphia force for almost 30 years. I am proud to say that I am his personal friend and that I back and the FOP backs strongly his policy of strict but fair law enforcement. When he began this policy, he was strongly criticized by liberal elements and some moderate black spokesmen but with time, his support has grown. He is one of the most popular men in our city and crime in Philadelphia is less, I think, than in any big town in the country.

The FOP favors a fair and strict law enforcement policy, a Rizzo policy and will pass for it all over the country.

Meanwhile, we feel that public support of the police is greater now than at any time in the recent past. Unfortunately, this support is not as well organized as it might be. But we believe that the legislation Mr. Ichord has introduced and similar legislation in the Senate and House are a recognition of the public attitude. We will strongly support the Ichord bills and other measures aimed at the Panthers and other revolutionary and extremist groups. Again, I thank the Chairman and members of the Committee.

POLICE KILLERS MUST BE STOPPED

(By JOHN M. ASHBROOK)

When the four Kent State students died earlier this year, the Ohio National Guardsmen were labeled murderers by many, and there was mourning throughout the land over the death of these students. When members of the revolutionary Black Panther Party are the losers in a shoot out with police acting properly within the scope of their duties, the liberal news media lament the loss of the anarchists and scream "repression." But who mourns for the slain policemen?

During the 10-year period 1960–69, there were 561 law enforcement officers feloniously murdered in the line of duty.

In 1969, there were 35,202 assaults on police officers, 11,949 resulting in injury. Eighty-six police officers, a 34 percent increase over 1968, were killed. More than 100 policemen have been wounded in unprovoked attacks during the first eight months of this year, more than a dozen of them fatally, and the incidence of bombing police cars, sniping at patrolmen and luring them into traps is sharply increasing.

The seriousness of the mounting casualties in police ranks around the country as Black Panthers and other extremists wage terrorist war against public order and authority cannot be overstated. The unmistakable planning and ferocity of these attacks presage a long-range campaign of guerrilla warfare with all signs pointing to further escalation to come. We have already seen how verbal assaults on policemen as "pigs" moved to rock and bottle throwing and then to assaults with pistols, snipers' rifles and fire-bombs.

Verbal assaults have been tolerated under the First Amendment guarantee of free speech. Most of us recall the early school years' chant of "Sticks and stones may break my bones but names will never hurt me." But tolerance of overt violence is a far different story indeed.

Unfortunately, too many Americans were indifferent when organized groups of people burned draft board records, destroyed computerized data in corporate offices or broke police station windows. These acts were generally dismissed as nothing more than legitimate protest or pranks. Time and again the liberal apologists would proclaim that this activity was protected by the First Amendment. Over a long period of time, they have cultivated a permissiveness that allows each individual to decide for himself which laws are "just" rather than yield to the law of the land. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, those who proclaim the right to violate the law as a "constitutional right" and call law and order "repression" or "fascism" fan the fires which lead to tragedy.

So it was that the burning of draft records led inevitably to burning down the draft board and the attacks on corporate offices and police stations escalated from allegedly "tolerable" protests to fanatical bombings. Tolerating the "permissible protests"—with almost inevitable certainty—leads to escalation and the frightening guerrilla warfare taking place in many of our major cities.

Those who are still willing to dismiss the sniper killings of police and other reprehensible acts of terrorism as being the work of a numerically insignificant radical minority will find that consolation short lived. The demonstrated vulnerability of an open society to the tactics of terror should dispel the illusion of weakness in numerical inferiority. Here are just a few examples of the devastation that can be wrought by an "insignificant radical minority": In Chicago four policemen have been slain from ambush since mid-June; in Omaha one policeman was killed and seven wounded in a bomb explosion; in Minneapolis a policeman was killed in his squad car; and in Philadelphia a police officer was brutally shot five times sitting at his desk and three other policemen were wounded during the same weekend.

Our society must move with firmness and determination to protect itself against such atrocities. The policeman feels abandoned by the society which asks so much of him. He is often reviled by the very people he is supposed to protect. It has reached the point where he has good reason to fear for his life, as his fellow citizens fear for theirs. Those who volunteer for service in the law-keeping forces deserve and must be given the full support of those they protect. Action is also needed to safeguard firemen, who also have been repeatedly attacked in the performance of their duties.

The ease with which today's highly mobile criminals—and of course they are that for murder is always murder no matter what the objectives—can flee from the scene of their crimes calls for legislation to permit Federal assistance to local law enforcement agencies when necessary to apprehend those who deliberately single out law enforcement officials and firemen for their vicious attacks.

I have in the past introduced legislation to make it a Federal crime carrying stiff penalties to interfere with the activities of policemen, firemen, and other law enforcement officers. I have also introduced legislation calling for stricter bomb laws. Last week I joined in sponsoring another strong bill aimed at providing prompt Federal investigatory assistance when a policeman or fireman has been assaulted or murdered. The State could rely on the Federal Government's resources and facilities in apprehending the suspects, yet would remain free to try them for the offense.

By whatever name you call it—a revolution, a guerrilla war, a terrorist uprising—this violence which is menacing the whole fabric of our society must be curbed. Halting the dreadful unprovoked attacks on our law enforcement officials and restoring community confidence and support in their invaluable work is a common-sense step in that direction.

CAPTIVE NATIONS MORE CAPTIVE TODAY, SAYS HORTON

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this past July we again marked Captive Nations Week. In 1959, Congress passed a resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. The President was requested to issue the proclamation each year until all the captive nations of the world achieve freedom and independence.

In this 11th year since the proclamation, we have to react with sadness at the deteriorating plight of so many nations who are still under the oppressive thumb of the U.S.S.R.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I feel we in Congress can offer encouragement to the millions of freedom-loving people who endure the domination of communism, and to their relatives here in the United States. The fear, the strangulation, the anguish would be almost impossible to bear, if these people did not know that there are those in the free world who are working for their rights of self-determination.

Despite their sufferings, there is an undercurrent of hope and a strong will to succeed. I commend the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Albania, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, the people of all other subjugated nations and their countrymen living in the free world for maintaining their spirit of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the captive nations are a reminder to the entire world of the tragic injustices to our fellow men in Eastern Europe. All of us should reaffirm our belief in the rights of all men to be free. By so doing, we are attesting the dignity of man, and his ability to determine his own fate.

These things need to be said, the free spirit of the captive nations, dominated by communism is deserving of praise and encouragement. But we must not stop there. If we do, we will be lamenting the plight of captive nations for years and decades to come.

What we must do is probe the details of the oppressive situation these people face. We must take every possible opportunity to call public attention to the injustices that these millions of human beings are forced to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of what I am talking about, I have done a great deal of work and study into the problems besetting the people of Hungary While these problems do not begin to tell the whole story of the captive peoples, they will serve to point out in vivid detail, the seriousness of the situation behind the Iron Curtain in 1970.

At this point, I am including in the RECORD the text of a recent address I made to a group in my district, as well as a study which I asked the Library of Congress to undertake concerning a recent change of policy in Hungary regarding passports, and an exchange of correspondence regarding a possible change in American policy which would directly affect the people of Hungary.

Following is the text of my recent remarks at the 50th anniversary gathering of the Rochester Hungarian-American Community to discuss the consequence of the Trianon Treaty of 1920 for the peoples of Central Europe:

First of all, I want you to know that I was deeply honored when my dear friend Louis Lote asked me to serve as your main speaker tonight. I do not want to take too much of your time, but I do want to make several important points about the concern which we all share for the situation in Eastern Europe.

You don't realize how significant it is that you, American citizens with families and problems of your own, have come here to talk about the consequences and the tragedies that have resulted from the signing of a treaty in Europe 50 years ago which most Americans today in 1970 never even heard of. Of course, it is not unusual for members of an immigrated nationality to continue to be concerned about their homeland, or to meet together to share their thoughts and their worries. This is not what is so significant. What is significant is that you, as Americans, are devoting time and energy to a problem which, but for your own determination and initiative, might be all but forgotten in this new world. At a time when almost all discussion of public

issues centers around the Southeast Asian war, around protesters, around racial division and dissent and other high-profile problems of our own people, it is very, very heartening to know that not everyone has allowed the deep-rooted historical problems of the peoples of Eastern Europe to be swept under the rug and forgotten.

The Trianon Treaty was a tragic mistake which created a new order in Eastern Europe, out of which the only certain result was to be disorder, disunity and oppression. It was the seed, which once planted, bore certain pain and death for millions who suffered under Hitler and Stalin, a seed which when nurtured by more mistakes which followed, split up nations and peoples and families which could today be living in peace and tranquility and freedom instead.

In 1970, the Trianon Treaty is something more than a seed of human mistake which bore tragedy. It is a lesson of history, teaching us that when the precious moments arrive when men at peace tables in the aftermath of war may set about reordering embattled nations for a new life and a new era, there are factors which cannot and must not be tossed aside for political expediency.

Those who recarved Europe after World War I, disregarded the lasting factors of nationhood, common language, natural boundaries and disregarded prior lessons of history in redrawing the map.

Will we allow the lesson of Trianon to go unheeded the next time there is an opportunity to establish a more peaceful and permanent order in Europe and other regions of the world? When the time comes for peaceful and permanent settlement of problems in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia, will we allow political expediency to sow the seeds for future wars by dividing nations and peoples?

Only if people like yourselves will not allow the world to forget these lessons of history can we hope for a better world in the future.

The pain and suffering forged by this treaty and by subsequent events are still very much in evidence in the present nation of Hungary. Not only are the Hungarian families and villages which were thrust into hostile foreign regimes suffering as oppressed minorities, the Hungarians who are remaining in what is today called Hungary are not much better off. There is one current example which has received very little attention in the press and news media that I want to point out to you.

Earlier this Spring, the communist regime in Budapest announced a new law which, on its face, would for the first time entitle every citizen of Hungary to a passport for foreign travel. Some publicity was given to this new law, hailing it as a great sign of liberalization of Hungarian communism. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I was skeptical about some of these reports, and I asked the Library of Congress to obtain a copy of the full text of this law and to fully research its impact and its consequences. The result was startling. First of all, the issuance of passports is subjected to the capricious and arbitrary regulation of several Hungarian government agencies. The grounds for passport denial are so broad as to make any "new statutory right" to a passport laughable.

Most serious about this new law is that it has been devised as a tool to discriminate against those in Hungary who have relatives abroad who either left without official permission or who are engaging in activities which the Budapest regime deems harmful to its interests or unlawful.

In other words, the new law seeks to put a damper on Hungarian antiCommunist organizations abroad by singling out relatives of the members of these groups for passport denial.

Thus, any 1956 refugee who belongs to the Freedom-Fighters Federation, any who belong to organizations which regularly or even occasionally criticize the Budapest regime, may find that back-handed sanctions are applied through discriminatory treatment of relatives back home, under this new passport rule.

Mr. Speaker, I should like permission to enter this Library of Congress study into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I intend to send it to our Secretary of State, and to those in the United Nations concerned with international human rights. For, there is no question that this so-called liberalization is really an attempt to cripple political activity in free nations like the United States and Western European countries where Hungarians reside. I do not think oppression of this sort should escape world attention, and I certainly do not think it should pass for "liberalization" in the world press.

The full text of the background study on this new regulation follows:

NEW PASSPORT REGULATIONS IN THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

The Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic issued an edict on passports on March 3, 1970.[1] This regulation was widely heralded in the Hungarian as well as in the foreign press as a new milestone in the direction of the "liberalization" of the hitherto harsh measures of communist rule, and toward compliance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The probable reason for this claim is the first half of Section 3(1) of the Edict which provides that "every Hungarian citizen has the right to a passport and to travel abroad. . . ." However, the whole picture may be seen in a different light if the entire paragraph is read and the provisions that follow are also taken into consideration, together with the regulations included in the implementing decrees which were issued on the same day by the Government[2] and by the Minister of the Interior.[3]

Sections 3 and 4 of the Edict read as follows:

SEC. 3. (1) Every Hungarian citizen has the right to obtain a passport and to travel abroad provided he complies with the requirements set forth in the statutory provisions.

(2) A passport shall not be issued to a person whose travel or stay abroad might impair or jeopardize the state or economic interests of the Hungarian People's Republic, or other important public interests.

(3) The passport shall be revoked if the issuing authority obtains knowledge about the circumstances defined in paragraph (2).

SEC. 4. The Government, in the interest of the state, may restrict the issuance of passports within certain limits, and may establish excluding reasons beyond those defined in paragraph (2) of Section 3.

The Edict defines the several types of passports which may be issued. These are: diplomatic passports, service passports for foreign service personnel, service passports, service passports for sailors, private passports, group passports, emigration passports, consular passports, border crossing certificates, and repatriation certificates.

The Edict is very short; it only lays down the basic principles and includes authorizations for the Government to implement these principles. Apparently the drafters of the statute were very anxious to give the Government the power to restrict the issuance of passports because, in addition to the authorization in Section 4, another, similar authorization is also included in Section 8, which reads:

SEC. 8. The Government shall take care of the implementation of the present Edict and, at the same time, it shall be authorized to establish by decree the rules of issuance and use of passports, as well as the causes for the exclusion of the issuance of passports.

The Government, by virtue of the authorizations included in the afore said sections of the Edict, issued its Decree which regulates in detail the rules for issuing or refusing to issue a passport, and other conditions of travel abroad by Hungarian citizens.

The first section of the Decree relegates the right to issue passports to the Minister of the Interior with the exception of diplomatic passports and service passports for foreign service personnel which are issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The same section sets the validity of a passport at five years, which may be extended or renewed. The territorial validity of a passport extends to the states or continents indicated therein.

Probably the most important provision of the Decree is paragraph (1) of Section 1 which provides that:

A passport shall entitle [its holder] to travel abroad only with an exit permit.

This inconspicuous provision extends the hitherto frequently used practice that prevented even the owners of valid passports from leaving the country, causing in many instances great expense and irreparable damage. It also makes the passoprt a worthless document, because the statutory provisions regulate only the conditions for the issuance of a passport, but no statute has been published which would regulate the issuance of the exit permit, without which the passport is useless. Apparently the issuance of an exit permit remains within the discretionary power of the police, which may issue or deny it in accordance with secret internal directives.

This practice in the past caused many would be travelers, who had already obtained their passports, to obtain the foreign visas for their intended temporary or permanent stay abroad at great expense and to make all travel arrangements only to have the exit permit denied without any justification.

Service passports may only be issued upon the authorization of the heads of national agencies to officials of these agencies who travel on official agency business if it involves state, social, or economic interests. Service passports may, furthermore, be issued to judges and prosecutors, heads and division chiefs of county and district councils, employees and higher-ranking officers of social and mass organizations, students who received a state scholarship for more than one year, persons who carry out international agreements, Hungarian employees of international organizations and of Hungarian communications media and transportation agencies, and to the spouses and minor children of the aforesaid persons in case of assignments of long duration.

Private passports may be issued to persons who travel for the purpose of official (economic, sports, cultural, etc.) assignments and are not entitled to service passports. Furthermore, private passports may also be issued to visitors if their travel expenses are paid by the persons inviting them, to tourists, and to persons who want to travel for educational purposes, are looking for employment, or seek medical treatment.

---

[1] Edict No. 4 of 1970 of the Presidium of the People's Republic; published in *Magyar közlöny*, No. 13, p. 91 (March 3, 1970).

[2] Decree No. 4/1970 (III.3.) of the Hungarian Revolutionary Worker-Peasant Government on Passports. *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[3] Decree No. 2/1970 (III.3.) B. M. of the Minister of the Interior on the Implementation of Decree No. 4/1970 (III.3.) Korm, on Passports. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

According to the general provisions of the Decree, every request for a passport must be accompanied by the opinion of the employer if the applicant is a worker or employee; in case of a self-employed applicant the opinion is given by the professional organization, and in case of students, by the educational institution. This opinion must be taken into consideration in the adjudication of the request by the issuing authority.

This requirement alone practically nullifies the right to travel abroad as declared in Section 3 of the Edict, because it gives employers (government agencies or government enterprises), or government-dominated professional organizations a discretionary veto power over any request for a passport.

Section 3 of the Decree deals with the statutory reasons for denial of a request for a passport. This Section reads as follows:

SEC. 3. (1) A passport shall not be issued to a person:

(a) whose stay abroad might injure or imperil the internal or external security of the Hungarian Peoples Republic;

(b) who wants to travel to an organization or person engaged in a hostile activity against a socialist state;

(c) against whom criminal proceedings are in progress, or who is under the effect of a criminal sentence;

(d) who is under police surveillance, or under the effect of a banishment [from a certain part of the country];

(e) who wants to travel to a person who is staying abroad illegally, or whose parent, child, spouse (common law spouse), brother or sister is staying abroad illegally;

(f) the required financial means of whose stay abroad are not assured.

(2) The reasons for inclusion described in par. (1), point e) shall not be taken into consideration if the punishability of the crime committed by the illegal stay abroad, or the possibility of the execution of the punishment imposed therefor has ceased.

The reason for exclusion enumerated in the above section of the Decree are—in most cases—clear violations not only of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also of the principle set forth in Section 3 of the Edict.

There is no statutory definition found in my statute as to who, or what behavior may "injure or imperil" the security of the Hungarian People's Republic. Therefore, it must be assumed that the determination is left to the discretionary decision of the issuing authority, the Minister of the Interior and his subordinates, the police authorities. On the basis of this provision alone a passport may be denied to anyone who is merely suspected of being a critic of the Government or the Communist Party, and consequently, travel abroad is only assured to the subservient followers of the regime.

The second condition is also repugnant, because it is again left to the discretionary power of the police to determine what foreign organization or which foreign person is engaged in an activity which is, again in their determination, "hostile to any socalist state." The wide range of possibilities cannot even be foreseen, and the consequences of this provision may even be more serious and dangerous to the citizens of Hungary who travel abroad and later may be accused of violating this provision because they met a person who, according to the Hungarian police, is engaged in such a "hostile activity."

At this point it should also be considered how the Hungarian Criminal Code [4] defines certain crimes against the state:

SEC. 127. Whoever commits an act liable to incite others to hatred directed against

(a) the Hungarian nation,

(b) the Hungarian People's Republic, its political system, any fundamental institution of the political system, the Constitution of the Hungarian People's Republic, or any of its fundamental principles,

(c) international relations of alliances or friendship or other international relations aiming at cooperation of the Hungarian People's Republic,

(d) against any people, nationality, denomination, or race, as well as on account of their socialist conviction, against certain groups of people, . . .

is punishable for the crime of incitement.

Section 129 of the Code defines treason as follows:

A Hungarian citizen who makes contact, forms an alliance, or cooperates with a foreign government or a foreign organization or with its agent in order to violate the independence, territorial integrity, political, economic, defense, or other important interest of the Hungarian People's Republic. . . .

Espionage is defined in Section 131 of the Criminal Code which reads in part:

SEC. 131. (1) Whoever offers himself for intelligence work for a foreign government, foreign organization, or for its agent, or undertakes such work, shall be punished. . . .

(2) Whoever acquires, collects, or delivers data which can be used to the prejudice of the Hungarian People's Republic with the purpose of having such data passed on to a foreign government, foreign organization, or to its agent, shall be punished. . . .

In one section the Criminal Code protects the interests of the other socialist states by providing that:

SEC. 133. Whoever commits a crime defined in this chapter to the prejudice of another socialist state shall be punished with the punishment provided for that crime.

The nationality law of the Hungarian People's Republic [5] provided that Hungarian citizenship may only be lost by dismissal upon request, or denationalization by the Hungarian Government. The law acknowledges the possibility of dual nationality, and regards all former Hungarian citizens who were not dismissed or deprived of their Hungarian citizenship by the Hungarian Government as Hungarian nationals even if they renounced their nationality and acquired another citizenship.

As a consequence of the above-cited legal provisions, any former Hungarian citizen may still commit the crime of treason, not to speak of incitement or espionage, which can also be committed by persons who never were Hungarian citizens.

To illustrate the effect of provision 3 (1) b) of the Decree on passports, in connection with the above-cited criminal provisions, any librarian who collects reference material on Hungary or any other socialist state may be regarded as one who is committing espionage. Similarly, any American citizen who supports the American Government's policy in South East Asia may be regarded as engaging in a hostile activity against a socialist state. Consequently, any Hungarian who wants to meet such people may be denied a passport.

The reason for exclusion defined in the first half of point c) which provides that a passport shall not be issued to a person against whom criminal proceedings are in progress is reasonable and usual. The second part of the same point is, however, very vague because the question of who is under the effect of a criminal sentence, and for how long, especially after serving the imposed punishment, is not defined in any statute.

The provision of point d) is not unusual, only the measures of police surveillance and banishment are unusual in a free society.

The reason for the exclusion defined in point e) of Section 3 (1) is to punish innocent relatives of persons who committed an act which is known as crime only in communist-ruled countries. It is quite difficult to determine when a person is staying abroad illegally. The second paragraph of the same section of the Decree provides that the excluding provision may not be applicable if the punishability of the crime committed by staying abroad illegally has ceased. Some newspaper reports concluded from this provision that the exclusion is not applicable to those whose relatives left Hungary prior to March 22, 1963, because on that day a general amnesty [6] went into effect which applied to persons who left Hungary without permission. The problem, however, is not so simple.

First of all the term "staying abroad illegally" is uncertain and heretofore unknown in Hungarian legal terminology. The Criminal Code distinguishes two different "crimes" which may result in "illegal stay abroad." Section 203 of the Code provides that the crime of unauthorized crossing of the frontier is committed by a person who: "crosses the national boundary without permission, or with a travel pass obtained by misleading the authorities, or in another unauthorized manner."

The other pertinent provision of the Criminal Code is Section 205 which deals with the crime of refusal to return home which is committed by anyone who: "left the country with permission and does not return to its territory despite an official summons to do so, or otherwise makes known his intention to stay abroad permanently."

The language of the Decree does not make clear which of the acts above performed by relatives abroad is responsible for the denial of a passport to the applicant, or may it be assumed that it will be applied to all persons whose relatives committed either of the two acts?

However, the 1963 amnesty is applicable only to persons who "left the country without permission" and not to those who "refused to return." Furthermore, the amnesty did not apply to persons who committed the crimes of treason or espionage. It was shown above how widely these crimes may be construed, therefore, it is quite uncertain whether the amnesty was applicable to any person who escaped from Hungary. Consequently, a passport may be denied to any Hungarian citizen who has a relative abroad, regardless of when the latter left Hungary, because the police authorities may decide that these relatives are abroad illegally.

It should be mentioned that on March 25, 1970, the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic proclaimed another amnesty.[7] This applies, among others, to persons who were convicted *in absentia* for the unauthorized crossing of the frontier and for refusal to return. No criminal proceedings may be instituted against those who announce their intention to return to Hungary to any Hungarian diplomatic mission, and actually return before the end of the year 1970, provided they did not commit any other crime. It is unclear from the reports whether the latter condition also applies to persons who have already been convicted.

This amnesty decision makes a very interesting distinction in the application of the passport decree. Relatives of persons who were convicted *in absentia*, regardless of whether the latter refuse to return to Hungary, may obtain a passport because the possibility of executing the punishment has ceased. However, the relatives of those who have not been convicted yet of the same act will be denied a passport because the amnesty to them is only applicable if they have

[4] Law No. V of 1961 on the Criminal Code of the Hungarian People's Republic.

[5] Law No. V of 1957 on Hungarian Citizenship.

[6] Edict No. 4 of 1961 on the General Amnesty.

[7] The official text of this statute is not yet available in the collection of the Library of Congress. Parts of the present report pertaining to this amnesty are based on a report published in the Hungarian biweekly publication *Magyar hirek*, v. 23, No. 7 (April 4, 1970). p. 2.

declared their intention to return and will do so prior to 1971.

The final reason for exclusion gives the Government another weapon to restrict the travel of citizens, because, according to Section 19 of the Decree, the Minister of Finances is authorized to determine the amount and the distribution of foreign currency available for travel abroad.

The issuance of a passport may be denied temporarily (for up to five years) to a person who made untrue statements in his application for a passport, who abused his passport by prolonging an earlier stay without permission, or by traveling to a country other than that to which the exit permit authorized him to go, or by taking unauthorized employment abroad. Similar consequences are imposed on a person who has lost his passport, or whose passport was detroyed through his own fault; who behaved abroad in a manner injurious to the interest of the country, or whose behavior was unworthy of a Hungarian citizen; or who committed a minor violation of the customs or foreign exchange regulations.

The Decree imposes a territorial restriction on foreign travel by providing that Hungarian citizens may only travel more than once a year to countries with which Hungary has concluded a bilateral agreement to this effect. Such countries are the socialist (communist) states, and Finland. To any other country visitor passports or permits may only be given once every two years, and tourist passports or permits only once every three years.

The length of the stay abroad is also curtailed by the Government, which provides in Section 10 of the Decree that:

The stay abroad in European states may in general be permitted for up to thirty days, and in states overseas, in general up to ninety days.

The limitations on the frequency and duration of travel obviously apply only to visitors and tourists and not to those who travel on official assignments with private passports.

Emigration is also restricted by the Decree which provides that:

"For a permanent stay abroad a passport may be issued to a person who is over 55 years of age and wants to depart for the purpose of living with his [or her] parent, child, or spouse, provided that he is not liable in Hungary for support, financial or public debts."

The Minister of the Interior may grant exceptions in justified cases.

This restriction means that citizens of Hungary who are under 55 years of age are unable to change their permanent place of living. Those who are over 55 years, but do not have close relatives abroad, may not emigrate either.

Provisions dealing with consular passports, border-crossing certificates, and repatriation certificates, as well as the procedural requirements, are of minor importance and are not dealt with in the present report.

The restrictions imposed by the Government on the issuance of passports and permitting travel abroad sharply contradict the general principle of free travel set forth in the Edict of the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic, not to speak of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, this fine and detailed study was prepared by Dr. William Solyom-Fekete, senior legal specialist in the European Law Division of the Law Library, Library of Congress. The whole captive nations' community owes Dr. Solyom-Fekete its deepest gratitude for this effort.

Despite this continuing evidence of totalitarian tactics and control by the Hungarian Communists over individual liberties, there was a disturbing report recently in the New York Times which said that the new U.S. Ambassador to Hungary had mentioned or recommended that we negotiate the return of the crown of St. Stephen. To Hungarians it is a symbol of legitimate constitutional government. The United States has had possession of this 1,000-year-old symbol since World War II. We have not returned it because it would mean to the Hungarian people that the free people of America have annointed the Communist regime with an aura of acceptability and legitimacy. It would mean that we had abandoned any hope or effort to win freedom for Hungary, or to win meaningful concessions in the area of human rights from Kadar's government.

I checked this startling report with our State Department. They replied, fortunately, that they had no "plans" to negotiate the return of the St. Stephen crown, but they did say that they did not rule out the possibility of returning the crown if it would serve the real purpose of promoting better relations between our two Governments.

In my humble opinion, this would be the wrong reason for returning the precious crown. It is not the relationship between our Government which is important, it is the relationship between the Hungarian regime and its people which must determine the legitimacy or nonlegitimacy of that Government, which must determine its right to wear proudly and boast proudly its possession of the crown of St. Stephen.

You may agree with me that to date, Kadar's rule, like Communist rule in the other captive nations, has fallen far below that standard of freedom and dignity for his people which the crown should signify. Thus until and unless the plight of the people of Hungary changes for the better, I do not believe we should consider bringing the crown even a mile closer to Budapest than it is now.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we must look beyond the sincere but general praises of the free spirit of captive people. We must look to the details of international events and policies, including our own foreign policy, which will, in the long run, determine how long these nations will remain captive.

The issues which I have thus related are vitally important to the people of one captive nation, Hungary. I could spend equal time discussing the detailed plight, of other captive peoples. Let us not be satisfied to glorify and then forget these people. We must remain vigilant of their plight.

The reduction in human freedom in many Communist countries is having its effect on American citizens. Recently, an Amerian, visiting East Germany, was sentenced to 7 years in prison for stating that the stability of the East German regime depended on the presence of Soviet troops in that country. His sentence is one of the most oppressive in modern times.

One of my own constituents, a graduate student, is in his third month of incarceration in a Czech prison.

Other Americans are held prisoners elsewhere in the Communist world. They have, in effect, been woven into the web of totalitarianism rule which Eastern Europeans have now been living with for more than 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that our President has extended highly successful personal diplomacy into the countries of Eastern Europe—notably Rumania and Yugoslavia—I support what the President is doing diplomatically in these countries in the hope that its result will be more freedom for the citizens of these nations and less dependence of these countries and their governments on the military intervention of the Soviet Union.

On the eve of the 14th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution I urge that American citizens not allow the present era of negotiation to obliterate the facts of human suffering and oppression which are daily fare in the captive nations.

FEDERAL RESERVE APPOINTMENTS TO TRUTH-IN-LENDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have often remarked here in the House on the outstanding performance of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in carrying out its responsibilities under the Federal Truth-in-Lending Act—title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968. The Board's assignment under that act is a very broad and difficult one, in an area of activity in which this agency had never before been required to assume jurisdiction.

The members of the Federal Reserve Board have mixed feelings whenever I comment on the fine job they have done in a consumer field, because the last thing the Board wants is any further responsibilities as a consumer agency. Nevertheless, their work in the preparation and issuance of regulation Z, to implement the Truth-in-Lending Act, deserves great praise. When businessmen complain, as they sometimes do, about the added paperwork this act may have imposed on them, I point out to them that the regulation was drafted by an agency which is as conscious as any in Government of the needs of legitimate business, and that when the Board imposes a requirement which Congress left up to the Federal Reserve's discretion, it is imposed only because the Board considers it essential to close loopholes or prevent schemes for circumventing the statute.

DR. HOLTON REAPPOINTED CHAIRMAN

Part of the explanation for the Board's conscientious approach to its responsibilities under the Truth-in-Lending Act lies in the fact that the Truth-in-Lending Act called for establishment of an advisory committee representing consumers, lenders, and sellers of merchandise on credit, to assist the Board in developing policies and issuing regulations under the act. The Board yesterday reconstituted this advisory committee by reappointing 10 of the 20 members of the

original committee for terms of 1 year each, and appointing 10 new members for 2-year terms, so that the advisory committee will hereafter have a rotating membership. Henceforth, no member will serve continuously for more than 2 years, and can be reappointed only after being off the committee at least a year.

The advisory committee, from the time of its formation 2 years ago, following passage of the act, has been headed by Dr. Richard H. Holton, dean of the school of business administration, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. Dr. Holton has now been reappointed by the board of governors as chairman of the committee for another year.

OTHER REAPPOINTMENTS

Also reappointed for 1-year terms ending next June 30 are Mr. James M. Barry, managing director of the Texas Credit Union League, Dallas, Tex.; Mr. O. C. Carmichael, Jr., chairman of the board of Associates Investment Co., South Bend, Ind.; Mr. John E. Eidam, former president, Omaha Bank for Cooperatives, Omaha, Nebr.; Mr. William F. James, president, Bill James Chevrolet Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Mr. Robert J. Klein, economics editor, Consumers Union of the U.S., Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y.; Mr. William F. Melville, Jr., senior vice president, Maryland National Bank, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Doris E. Saunders, staff associate for public information and neighborhood relations, office of the chancellor, Chicago Circle Campus, University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, Charleston, W. Va.; and Miss Barbara A. Zimmelman, consultant, Urban and Economic Development, Houston, Tex.

NEW MEMBERS OF TRUTH IN LENDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The following new members were named to the committee for 2-year terms ending June 30, 1972:

Mr. H. D. Allen, assistant credit sales manager, Rich's Department Store, Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. Edwin B. Brooks, Jr., president, Security Federal Savings & Loan Association, Richmond, Va.; Miss Barbara A. Curan, senior research attorney, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Louis F. Del Duca, director of admissions and professor of law, Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pa.; Mrs. Lynnett Taylor, executive director, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Robert R. Masterton, president, Maine Savings Bank, Portland, Maine; Mrs. Faith K. Prior, extension specialist, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.; Mr. Robert W. Pullen, administrative vice president, Colby College, Waterville, Maine; Mr. Peter R. Thompson, president, Mid-Continent Properties, Inc., Piqua, Ohio; and Mr. Harry R. Valas, vice president, Valas Corporation, Denver, Colo.

OTHER MEMBERS OF ORIGINAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, the changes made by the Federal Reserve in the membership of the Truth in Lending Advisory Committee were based, as I said, on the expressed desire by the Board to limit membership hereafter to 2-year terms. But instead of replacing the entire committee at one time, and have an entirely new committee unfamiliar with previous actions and recommendations, the changeover was accomplished by replacing one-half of the committee at this time with the intention of replacing the remaining 10 members of the original committee next year.

Hence, I feel it is proper at this time, in placing in the RECORD the membership of the new committee, to express my appreciation as sponsor of the legislation which became the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 to the 10 members of the original committee whose terms have now ended for the hard work and good work they did in helping to make truth in lending an effective law for the education of consumers in the costs of using credit.

They are:

Mr. Clark W. Blackburn, general director, Family Service Association of America, New York, N.Y.; Mr. W. H. Bowman, credit sales manager, Davison-Paxon Co., Atlanta, Ga.; Mr. Dick Christman, Dick Christman, Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.; Dr. Jean A. Crockett, department of finance, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.; Mr. George H. Dixon, president, First National Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.; Prof. David I. Fand, department of economics, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.; Mr. Richard G. Gilbert, president, Citizens Savings Association, Canton, Ohio; Mr. Irving S. Michelman, executive vice president; Budget Finance Plan, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mr. T. G. While, consultant, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio; and Prof. William F. Willier, department of law, Boston College Law School, Brighton, Mass.

TAYLOR, MICH., TO VOTE ON RECREATIONAL PROGRAM; FEDERAL GRANT AT STAKE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report on plans by local officials in my home city of Taylor, Mich., to launch a $5,000,000 recreation program with the help of a $325,000 open space land grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Voters in Taylor will be asked at the November 3 election to approve a $5 million bond issue. Unless voters give their approval, the $325,000 Federal grant will be lost, and the program will be dropped.

As a resident and voter in Taylor, I plan to vote in favor of the bond issue, for I believe that adequate recreational facilities are a vital part of any community's overall planning.

Taylor is one of the fastest growing communities in the Detroit metropolitan area, and land for parks and recreation purposes is fast disappearing. This may well be the city's last opportunity to acquire adequate sites for this purpose.

If the bond issue is approved, Taylor officials plan to purchase 40 park sites, including an 82-acre tract that will be developed as a community center. Included among the plans are two swimming pools and two artificial ice-skating rinks.

I am very proud and pleased that the Taylor city administration has demonstrated its foresight in giving voters an opportunity to provide funds for a well-rounded recreational system. Too many communities fail to recognize this need until most available land has been used.

I am pleased, also, to see my hometown taking advantage of the open space land program, one of the many programs approved by this Congress to help local communities solve their problems. It represents another example of how enlightened cooperation between Federal and local agencies can help progressive communities plan for the future, and put Federal tax dollars to work on local projects to benefit local residents.

The Taylor recreation plans were developed by a dedicated and capable group of city officials which include Richard J. Trolley, mayor; Roy L. Ford, clerk; Louis M. Theil, treasurer, and Roy Davis, Troy Harville, Richard Marshall, Mitchell Moran, Robert A. Rapley, Robert Robinson and Harold W. Siebert, councilmen.

Other members of the city administration are Parker Salowich, recreation director; William Siemasz, assessor; Robert Kurtz, constable, and Anthony Nicita and William J. Sutherland, municipal judges.

To this outstanding group of public servants, I offer my congratulations for a fine job of community planning, and my sincere hope that Taylor voters will join me and them on November 3 in approving the bond issue and making this wonderful recreation program possible.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert DeHart, president of De Anza College in my congressional district recently spoke at a conference held at Pajaro Dunes, Calif.

Believing Dr. DeHart's comments will be of interest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am submitting his address for inclusion in today's proceedings:

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

"Change With A Purpose Should Be A Commitment Of This College: Continuous development and evaluation should permeate our activities. Institutional criticism should be sought and considered as an ongoing means of improving. Imaginative and creative approaches to the many problems facing higher education in the years ahead should be encouraged."—DeHart's 1969 Opening Address.

I don't know how valuable you find my opening of the school year speeches (this is my fourth now), but I do know they are good for me. I hold all of you in such high regard, and in wanting you to feel the same about me, I am highly motivated to really get myself together on what I consider the most important topic for an academic year. And, within the demands imposed on a presi-

dent's time, I do prepare carefully and give it my best shot.

My first year I spoke to you about the characteristics that I hoped De Anza College would achieve as we grew and developed. The most important characteristic, I emphasized, would be a "sense of community" where the relationships that developed between people—trustees, faculty, students, and administrators—and their interaction with each other, are what would ultimately determine the quality of our college. My next year's speech picked up in greater detail on this necessity for establishing these good relationships—especially between administration and faculty—and I developed the underlying assumptions, along with consequent organizational structures for Theory X and Theory Y organizations. You will remember that I opted for moving our college toward a Theory Y organization—although how far to go I didn't know, and still don't (I am convinced, however, that a good organizational structure is harder to achieve than to write a speech about.) Since a primary requirement for the proper functioning of Theory Y is the identification of an individual's goals with the institution's goals, I spent most of last year's speech developing what I thought our college goals ought to be along with my rationale for them.

You may remember that I didn't really call them institutional goals, but rather guiding principles because I thought "goal" had a finality about it that we know we seldom achieve in education. One of those guiding principles I called *Change With A Purpose Should Be A Commitment Of This College* and I went on to say that imaginative and creative approaches to the many problems facing us in the years ahead should be encouraged. In fact, institutional criticism should be sought rather than suppressed for how else would we have an ongoing means of improving?

THE CRUCIAL ROLE OF CHANGE

It is to this concept of change—change in our college, our society, our values, and in our young people that I want to expand on today. Now I don't want to give you the impression that change is something I invented last week. Our Foothill District has from its inception been known nationwide for its willingness to experiment and change when conditions indicated. But I believe as we move into the 70's we are moving into a new era where change, and our ability to adapt to it, must become a central focus for individuals and social institutions alike. And if this be true, education must play a crucial role in not only providing a model for change but in aiding the individual and his society to make appropriate accommodations.

Before I get into my analysis of the problems we will face as we attempt to change, I would like to state a disclaimer or two. At times I may sound like an alarmist, a pessimist, a radical, or a great believer in the ideas of the young. I don't believe I am any of these things to any great degree—in fact I may be just the opposite. But without overstating—or understanding—the case, I do want you to know how important I feel this subject is to all of us. So often we talk about change in such an abstract and intellectualized way that the impact of the implications are often lost, and I don't want that to happen. And we all know, too, that it is basically people that must change—it is their changing that creates the changes in our institutions.

One additional advantage I feel we have this year is the immediate feedback I can get from you because we are able to be here at Pajaro Dunes for the next two days where you can set me straight—if you think it is worth doing. I do welcome all of your nonviolent reactions to my remarks.

THE ACCELERATING VELOCITY OF HISTORY

Higher education is experiencing an extreme crisis of confidence. It is a crisis with many sources, but none is more important, I think, than the incessant and irreversible increase in the rate of social change.

Henry Adams was the first American historian to note the overriding significance of the ever accelerating velocity of history. "The world did not (just) double or treble its movement between 1800 and 1900," he wrote in 1909, "but, measured by any standard known to science—by horsepower, calories, volts, mass in any shape—the tension and vibration and so-called progression of society were fully a thousand times greater in 1900 than in 1800." Hurried on by the cumulative momentum of science and technology, the tension and vibration of society in 1970 are incalculably greater then they were when Adams wrote. Nor, pending some radical change in human values or capabilities, can we expect the rate of change to slow down at all in the foreseeable future.

This increase in the velocity of history dominates all aspects of contemporary life. First of all, it is responsible for the unprecedented instability of the world in which we live. Science and technology alter our world more in a decade than it used to alter in centuries. This has meant the disappearance of familiar landmarks and guideposts that stabilized life for earlier generations. It has even meant that our children, knowing how different their own lives will be, can no longer look to parents as models and authorities. Change is always scary; unchartered, uncontrolled change can be deeply demoralizing. It is no wonder that we moderns so frequently feel disoriented and off balance: unsure of our ideas and institutions unsure of our relations to others, to society and to history; unsure of our own purpose and identity.

The accelerating velocity of history has, of course, a multitude of effects. Improved methods of medical care and nutrition have produced the population crisis; and the growth and redistribution of population have produced the urban crisis. The feverish increase in the gross national product first consumes precious natural resources and then discharges filth and poison into water and air; hence the ecological crisis. Nor can one omit the extraordinary moral revolution which makes our contemporary society reject as intolerable conditions of poverty, discrimination and oppression that mankind had endured for centuries.

All these factors, as they have risen in intensity and desperation, are placing increasing strain on inherited ideas, institutions, and values. The old ways by which we reared, educated, employed, and governed our people seem to make less and less sense. How to keep a social system from becoming obsolete is a crucial problem, that citizens—and especially educators—must consider very intently today.

The basic task, as I see it, is to control and humanize the forces of change in order to prevent them from tearing us apart. The present turmoil I do not see as a proof of decay in America, or due to the immorality of generations that have preceded us, but as a price for all the benefits that have accrued to mankind, or "progress" as we so often describe it. The cutting edge of science and technology has sliced through ancient verities and accustomed institutions; it has raised up new questions, new elites, new insistences, new confrontations. As the progress has gained momentum, the immediate result has been social and moral confusion, frustration, fear, violence. Yet the turmoil, the confusion, even the violence may well be the birth pangs of a new epoch for us in higher education. If we can develop the intelligence, the will, and the leadership to absorb, to digest, and to control the consequences of accelerated change, we *can* avoid the fate of internal demoralization and disintegration.

READINESS FOR CHANGE

Obviously by now you know that I think it is possible for us to meet the challenge of "change with a purpose." But social institutions, like our college, do not change unless they have a readiness for change. This readiness grows out of some of the tensions I have alluded to already and I believe they can build up to destructive explosions, or equally destructive erosion—or they can be channeled into *creativity*. I want to get more specific about these tensions, and their creative potential, at this point because our ability to recognize and analyze them will hopefully keep us working on causes rather than symptoms.

The First Creative Tension: The incompatibility of structure and goals.

Are we properly organized to meet the challenge of change—even to changing the goals themselves? Let me briefly point out some examples of incompatibilities of even our present structure with our goals:

Our goal is to help each student develop as an individual integrated man—our internal structure fosters each instructor doing his own thing.

Our goal is universal opportunity for *comprehensive* higher education—our structure still places very heavy emphasis on the elitist university model designed to winnow out all who can't meet AB, MA, or PhD specifications.

Our goal is to be student centered—but enrollments reaching 5,000, 10,000 (De Anza this year including day and evening), 20,000 which moves us from organization, to bureaucracy, and finally to regimentation (do not fold, spindle, or mutilate).

Our goal is open communication—but structure encourages the old hierarchial pyramid with its Theory X emphasis that tends to isolate the Board and top administration just as it tends to make insignificant the individual instructor and demean the student.

Our goal is to encourage identification of personal goals with institutional goals—but our structure does not provide for little universes in which faculty and students can find that identity. We have not planned well for these little universes, or clusters, and it is not difficult to see why an instructor's primary identification is, by default, with his discipline—and usually to the exclusion of the primary goals of the institution.

Our goal is to provide empathetic, professionally trained, experienced counselors to assist a highly heterogeneous student population—but our structure (for certainly our counselors don't like it) encourages a retreat to a counseling fort well secured by closed-door cubicles, by long range appointment schedules, and a front line of defending clerks.

Our goal is to move toward autonomy where as many as possible who are affected by decisions will have a voice in making those decisions—but the pressures of population, the money crunch, and the increasing demand for "efficiency" (and no one knows how to define that in higher education) move us toward a structure emphasizing centralization, large campuses in multicampus districts, control by state-level coordinating councils and state boards of governors.

I hope these few examples convince you that the way we organize will to a major extent determine not only whether we reach predetermined goals but actually will dictate those goals. I spent a great deal of time two years ago going through an analysis of Theory X and Theory Y types of organizations. You will remember that I believed that the central principle of organization of Theory X leads naturally to an emphasis on the tactics of control—to procedures and techniques of telling people what to do, for determining whether they are doing it, and

for administering rewards and punishments. Theory Y's emphasis on identification of personal goals with institutional goals along with self control will hopefully lead to open communications, mutual trust, mutual support, and management of conflict rather than suppression of it. I believed then, and I still do, that a Theory Y organization will better help us achieve our goals. There has been, and continues to be, a great deal of creative tension caused by our attempts to structure ourselves more toward Theory Y. In our discussion groups later today and tomorrow, we should thoroughly discuss this tension: Are we organized to achieve our goals and to cope with the changes that seem imminent in the 70's? Is our Senate organized to effectively help us set and achieve our goals? Are we organized to work most effectively with our sister college and the District staff?

The Second Creative Tension: The incompatibility of "politicizing" the college with academic freedom.

American higher education, and especially the community college, owes its very existence to its ability to serve society. We Americans, as a people are active rather than contemplative. When we have identified a social evil, our inclination is to do something about it, not to reflect on its significance for the human condition. Higher education is a great repository for the expert knowledge and advice needed to identify and solve these vexing problems. And I think it only just that we serve the society in which we reside for are we not, after all, parasitic upon our community? The social bookkeeping may be a trifle obscure, but somewhere, somehow, administrators, instructors, and students are living off the productive labor of the working classes. Surely it is reasonable that the recipients of this benefaction should return a part of its value to its community in the form of an educated citizenry and cooperation in socially useful enterprises.

The issue arises when we attempt to determine what form that cooperation will take: do we become an *instrument* of social change, much like a political party, or do we continue in our traditional role of academic freedom where we operate as social critics?

During our conference each of you will all have an opportunity to speak to this subject in your seminars but I will take this opportunity to state my position. As an institution—and even when we as individuals are in a position of *representing* our institution—we should not choose sides in the battles waged between doctrine and doctrine, dogma and dogma, in the marketplace of ideas. We can serve as an impartial referee in the contest, ensuring a place in the debate to every position and every party. As a part of the administration, I know it is one of my responsibilities to protect those within the college from assaults by outside critics. But at the same time I believe I must guarantee that freedom of debate reigns within. From this freedom in the marketplace of ideas, I believe the greatest possible advance in truth and wisdom will flow.

American higher education today, despite its defense contracts and ROTC programs, its businessman trustees, its establishment presidents, is the only major institutional center of opposition to the values and policies that have led to so many of our social problems. And it is through higher education, if anywhere, that new and deeper attacks on the evils of American society will be mounted. But, in my opinion, if we seriously endanger our role of social critic and our freedom to inquire by establishing party lines, we endanger our entire society's ability to change through other than violent means.

One only has to look at my mail during a period of conflict involving some aspect of community standards to know how strongly people feel as "owners" of our college. And if we are to successfully defend academic freedom, objective and honest dialogue, and freedom of speech in the formulation of the *changing* of social values and goals, then trustees, faculty, students, and administration had better be standing together on this vital issue.

The Third Creative Tension: The incompatibility of older generation values and life style with younger generation values and life style.

The values which people incorporate into their psyches, consciously or unconsciously, develop out of the context of thir lives. During the age of belief, when *religion* was the dominant, living, force within Western Civilization, people found meaning and significance in devoting their lives to the greater glory of God, to the priesthood, to religious scholarship, to nunneries and monasteries, to the simple piety of peasant labor, to works of religious art, to the building of magnificent cathedrals, and, I must add, to the Inquisition. During the age of empire, when *conquest* was the central thrust within Western Civilization, the prevailing values were romantic: adventure, widening horizons, military valor, big risks for big rewards were all highly prized and men became soldiers, explorers, colonizers, developers, booty-seekers of every description. During the age of capitalism, when *money* could buy power and reputation and security and all the creature comforts, people thought that motivation and making money were synonymous terms: work was the reason for man's living, and opportunity was defined as the chance (usually through education) or grabbing the brass ring.

Bennis characterizes the culture that has developed from our present day values as ". . . authoritarian, puritanical, punitive, fundamentalist. When forced to choose it tends to give preference to property over personal rights, technological requirements over human needs, competition over cooperation, concentration over distribution, producer over consumer, means over ends, secrecy over openness, social forms over personal expression, striving over gratification, loyalty over truth." Mankind, nature, this planet, the future have been viewed as eternal.

But that culture is changing. Even the generation in power, growing up with unquestioned faith that the world and man would go on forever, now know in their minds, if not in their guts, that life itself is in jeopardy. The generation coming to power, the youth being taught and counseled, have grown up emotionally aware that the *now* may be all there is; that the *now* may end with a hydrogen bomb and/or in a prolonged and pitiful whimper as our ecology gets more and more out of balance.

In looking ahead through the remainder of this century, the pervasive values that are emerging are based on survival—not personal survival that has shaped man for so many centuries—but survival of humanity, survival of the democratic and humanistic verities, survival of civilization, survival of the spaceship Earth. I hardly think I need to take the time to establish in any detail the perils that face us. Just consider:

The perils of physical survival: War: nuclear, chemical, biological; Pollution: 3.4 billion to 7 billion by 2000 A.D.; Ecology: need a Bay Area resident look farther?

The perils to survival of the social order: Economic Revolution: cybernation producing abundance to replace scarcity; Black and Third World revolution: Are we *really* prepared to redress past injustices; Generation Gap: not just a single but often a double generation gap; Credibility Gap: loss of national condence and national purpose; Alienation; Threat of Facism: American style.

I am not trying to alarm you with this dismal list of perils to our survival, and I realize that some of my personal bias may have crept into my interpretation; but there can be little disagreement that this is essentially the context out of which are developing the values and the life styles of the generation coming to power. I see in my own sons value patterns different from my own developing in response to these perils: an existential, live for the moment, *now* orientation; a deep identification with the beauty of the physical world; a devaluation of materialism; a devaluation—even irreverence—toward nationalism and the American Way of Life; a turn away from security; a questioning of the protestant-capitalistic ethic of work; and I could go on and on.

These emerging value patterns are not just notions lightly held. They become manifest in discernible, nameable life styles: There is the hippie life style, the street people life style, the utopian commune life style, the political activist life style, the militant Black life style, the dedicated revolutionary life style, the dedication to human services life style, the youth internationalist life style, the research sciences life style; there are the super-squares and the Crazies and all the variations of life styles between these extremes.

Again during discussion groups you will have an opportunity to exchange ideas with your colleagues about this developing tension—and I hope you will freely critique my analysis. I don't believe I'm overstating the case, and I certainly hope I'm not understating it. We, who are supposed to be the experts in our society who best know our youth, desperately need to understand them if we are to lead them and to have some influence on the future through them. Margaret Mead sums it up succinctly when she states that it is the youth who are at home in the *now*. She writes: "Effective, rapid, evolutionary change, in which no one is guillotined or forced into exile, depends on the cooperation of a large number of those in power with the dispossessed who are seeking power." Not many of the older generation are listening to Margaret Mead's analysis of youth's time orientation and the revolution in values which follows from it. As I listen to my older friends in the community who do not have the opportunity to associate with the young to the same degree that we do, I get to thinking there is a war going on between us and the young. These fine young men and women I know so well turn out to be the enemy. We at De Anza College must not come to that. We must continue to seek opportunities to associate with our students—and this usually means planned student activities *outside* the classroom. The tension developing between the generations *can* be a positive influence in shaping our future society.

ARE WE READY TO MEET THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE?

There are other tensions at work in our society to produce change, but these three—the incompatibility of structure and goals, the incompatibility of politicing the college with academic freedom, and the incompatibility of older generation values and life style with younger generation values and life style—are the three most crucial to be resolved for us in the immediate future. And I believe we are thoroughly capable of adapting to fundamental change, if only we have the will. It is a pity that so many institutions have to be scared into change by outbreaks of anarchy. It is a pity we cannot more willingly take advantage of the fluidity of our times, the availability of resources, the vitality and engagement of our students, and the bewilderment of a society in the throes of great change. It is a pity we cannot show intellectual initiative rather than panic and rigidity at a time when the need is so great and the possibilities are so abundant. If the college cannot demonstrate how freedom and order may be adjusted in a fairly select com-

munity, then what are the prospects for the community? When a college presents the spectacle of faculty vs. administration, of students opposing both, and of all confronting the Trustees, the community is sadly disappointed. The community quite understandably feels let down. It does not seem too much to ask that the college understand and interpret the values of the young as a top priority.

But individual campuses are making progress and certainly De Anza is one of them. Our society is changing and our institutions of higher education are changing both with and sometimes ahead of society. To those who have waited so long, it must often seem that the progress is agonizingly slow. To those who are so eager, it must seem that the terribly complex issues ought somehow to have simple answers. Gardner comments on the modern belief that man's institutions can somehow accomplish any goal he seeks, and on the bitterness that wells up when these beliefs are disappointed—". . . the rage of people who expected too much in the first place and got too little in the end." He says:

"How can we make people understand that if they expect all good things instantly, they will destroy everything? How do we tell them that they must keep unrelenting pressure on their social institutions to accomplish beneficial change but must not, in a fit or rage, destroy those institutions?

"Dissent . . . is an element of dynamism in our system. It is good that men should expect much of their institutions, good that their aspirations for improvement of this society should be ardent.

"But those elements of dynamism must have their stabilizing counterparts . . . One is a tough-minded recognition that the fight for a better world is a long one, a recognition that retains high hopes but immunizes against childish collapse or destructive rage in the face of disappointment."

I hope that all of us—students, faculty, administration, trustees, and our supporting public—can retain the essential high hopes and the tough-minded endurance to see the fight through to a new day for all of our citizens.

SOME ESSENTIALS

I certainly don't have pat answers for how we can meet the challenges of "change with a purpose," but if we can retain a reasonable degree of freedom to explore ideas, to define goals, to wrestle with problems of student unrest and campus turmoil, and to experiment on the curriculum, then we *will* find answers. I can only suggest some significant changes that look to be essential to me:

(1) recognition and establishment of the teacher-student relationship as the most influential factor in the learning process;

(2) modification of our curriculum in order to relate it more to the spiritual, psychological and esthetic needs of all students;

(3) improved cross-fertilization of ideas and knowledge among the professionals within the various specialties:

(4) involvement of the academic world in community service, not militant activism and confrontation, but rather in a *constructive* involvement to effect those ideals which will produce a society more idealistically motivated and less prone to produce anxiety, hopelessness, pessimism, alienation and deviant behavior;

(5) continuous and relevant self-evaluation within all areas of our educational program;

(6) exploration, through innovative curricular structure and new models for internal organization, of ways to improve the educational process, despite the fact that to experiment is to hazard the embarrassment of failure;

(7) continuous defense of academic freedom that will permit the exposure of the flaws in the value system of Western Civilization which lead to the pursuit of goals incompatible to the psychological and physiological well being of man.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE 1970'S

I know that the Kerrs, Reissmans, Gardners, Heilbroners, and many others have pointed up much better than I have been able to do here today the issues, the tensions, and the challenges that lie ahead in the 70's. Many people, and educators are prominent among them, feel pessimistic about the next decade and there is plenty in our world to cause that feeling. But I am not pessimistic about our future; I feel much like Emerson when he said, "This time like all times is a very good one if one but knows what to do with it." And "what to do with it" is why we are here together at Pajaro Dunes.

Planned "change with a purpose" requires energetic and dedicated advocates. Not everyone will choose to be an advocate, but I believe all should be willing to honor those who try. The plain and simple fact is that planned change will not happen unless there is a wide commitment to it. My earnest hope is that an environment has been created at our De Anza College that will not only permit but encourage the changes I see ahead for us in the 70's if we are to live up to our promise—and our promises.

At a recent conference I heard Clark Kerr evaluate his tenure of office as president of the University of California by stating that he left his position as he came to it, "Fired with enthusiam!" Well, I certainly came to my job as first president of our De Anza College fired with enthusiasm and I have felt on more than one occasion that I will be leaving that way. But however I leave, it will be still believing this: Institutions which are for teaching must honor and respect teachers; institutions which are for *all* people must honor and respect its minorities; and above all, institutions which are for the young must honor and respect the young. I know the potential that exists in this very room, in our staff, in our minorities, and in our students if we can but find the means for releasing it. We can find that means if we will continue to work together—to combine pragmatism and idealism with compassion in seeking the changes that are upon us.

PROGRESS ON CHARTIERS CREEK FLOOD CONTROL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter I am sending to citizens of my district to alert them to the excellent progress which is being made for flood control of Chartiers Creek in our area:

OCTOBER 14, 1970.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS ON CHARTIERS FLOOD CONTROL

It is a real pleasure to write to you people who are on my personal list and those particularly interested, to let you know that we are making real progress on the Chartiers Creek Flood Control Program, which means so much to every community around Chartiers Valley. My friend Cong. Tom Morgan of Washington Co. and I for Allegheny Co., have cooperated well on over-all support for Chartiers construction for both counties. Flood control is an absolute necessity for us to keep and develop our fine industries and increase the number of jobs, as Chartiers Valley is one of our finest industrial and manufacturing valleys in the United States.

I have been working hard in Washington for our new grant of $5,700,000 in Federal funds for the current Fiscal Year for continuing work on the Chartiers Valley Flood Control project. This is the full amount requested by U.S. Army Engineers and myself as your Congressman under my original resolution to authorize the work for the Chartiers Valley Flood Control. In the past four years we have obtained grants of $4.6 million Federal funds.

This continues to be a hard fight in these times of budget cutting, so I am writing to share with you my gratitude for the fine support I have received as your Congressman from local officials, Legislators, Chambers of Commerce, Flood Control Authority, labor unions, civic and Church groups. It is only by such excellent team work across party, boro and township lines that we are able to announce this fine success.

The local U.S. District Engineers handling construction, have on 13 October confirmed to me to announce the progress and plans for prompt construction of the major part of Chartiers Valley Flood Control:

(1) Unit One—3.1 miles in the Thornburg, Crafton and East Carnegie areas *is being completed* in October 1970.

(2) Construction on Unit Two—2.8 miles from East Carnegie, through Carnegie to Collier Township, now under contract, will be continued with real progress now being made.

(3) Construction of Unit Three—2.8 miles in the Glendale, Heidelberg, Woodville area will begin in December 1970, and is scheduled for prompt action by U.S. Engineers.

With my grateful appreciation to our local U.S. Army Engineers organization, and to every concerned citizen, local official, organization and Church for their civic and patriotic interest.

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

P.S.—We have also been able to get this year the first grant of $30,000, the full amount that with U.S. Engineers we worked for, to proceed with Saw Mill Run and West End flood control program study for construction.—JIM.

AMERICA'S ALLIANCE WITH THAILAND

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the most expensive, yet unaudited alliances the United States has is that with Thailand. Well over $2 billion of American assistance, in various forms, has been provided the military regime in Bangkok since the end of the Second World War. Until recently, however, there has been little awareness of what has happened to that money.

In an exceptionally well-researched paper on this subject, Miss Frances Zwenig of the Student Advisory Committee on International Affairs located here in Washington has discussed the whole question of America's relationship with Thailand. I wholeheartedly recommend that my colleagues familiarize themselves with what Miss Zwenig has written.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this paper be inserted in the RECORD.

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

THAILAND: OUR TROUBLED ALLY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Over the past 20 years the United States has quietly spent more than $2 billion in military and economic aid in Thailand.[1] Thailand exemplifies United States involvement in the absence of publicly defined foreign policy commitments, an involvement that begins on an innocently small scale and proceeds by sheer bureaucratic inertia into situations demanding unexpected and unappraised U.S. obligations. What commenced as a 75-man advisory group and $10 million in 1950 now embroils policymakers in an internal debate over the presence of 42,000 U.S. troops on eight bases and U.S. responsibilities for the Thai economy when the troops are withdrawn.[2]

Given a public aroused about Vietnam, it is difficult to make decisions about Thailand without the context of a specific foreign policy. Now that we are so involved there, U.S. policymakers are finally asking the fundamental question: Is Thailand vital to the United States in the 1970's?

A responsible scrutiny of U.S.-Thai relations must include the following:

1. Evaluation and public admission of the old and by now shaky premises of U.S. aid to Thailand.

2. A realistic definition of present U.S. policy toward Thailand and the rest of Southeast Asia.

3. A troop withdrawal if no justification is offered for their continued presence in Thailand.

4. A publicly debated appraisal of further U.S. military aid to Thailand.

WHAT IS THE U.S. RELATIONSHIP WITH THAILAND?

U.S.-Thai relations since 1950 have been based on the premise that Thailand is vital to U.S. interests. Politicians and diplomats alike have voiced concern about "the land of smiles," four-fifths the size of Texas, with a population of 35 million, located in the heart of the Southeast Asian ricebowl. Edwin Stanton, Ambassador to Thailand in the late 1940's and early 1950's, wrote in 1954. "If Thailand's freedom and independence can be preserved, the heart and much of the body of Southeast Asia will have been saved."[3] In May 1961, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson asserted in Bangkok: "Nothing is more important to the United States than the integrity of your country."[4] Four agreements comprise a legalistic basic for this U.S. concern about Thailand; they came in response to the perceived Communist threats in 1950, 1954, 1962, and 1964–5.

The Thais demurely accepted U.S. attention and generosity with the understanding that the arrangements entered into were of a "delicate" nature better kept unpublicized. Until a year ago there were very few Thai disclaimers of American aid and there were polite, periodic reassurances of support for the U.S. position in Southeast Asia.

Now that the delicate arrangement has been unsettled by U.S. domestic discontent with the Vietnam War, a change of administrations and priorities, and the expansion of the war into neighboring Cambodia, Thai political leaders openly express doubts about continued dependence on the United States. The Thai hesitation about sending troops into Cambodia reveals that they no longer regard the U.S. as a reliable ally. As with Vietnam, the Thais demand that the U.S. cover the cost of fighting in Cambodia.[5] Well aware of Japanese non-involvement and the U.S. position on eventual withdrawal from Southeast Asia, the Thais know they cannot be solely responsible for the collective security role.

The uncertainty generated by the present American confusion over priorities has severely shaken the Thai political scene. The Thais by necessity listen closely as the United States agonizes about its future global role. American hawks and doves alike ponder the "what will happen if the U.S. withdraws?" question and prepare to beat their breasts whatever the outcome. They evince a common unwillingness to admit that major powers sacrifice the lesser powers on a national interest basis despite all the protestations. Smaller nations like Thailand have to face reality. Dialogues with the Russians and Chinese are continuing now as they have in the past, with results in the form of Russian-Thai trade agreements and cultural exchanges.

In the sweeping review of past foreign policy undertaken by the Nixon administration, Thailand comes in for examination. U.S. officialdom poses this question for itself. Is Thailand still vital to U.S. interests. Whatever answer the National Security Council decides upon is so very susceptible to the tradition of continuity in foreign policy that little change is anticipated. President Nixon's Guam Doctrine suggests that the basic commitment to Thailand remains the same. The only distinction between the past and projected U.S. involvement in Thailand is that the Thais will definitely have the primary responsibility for defense, i.e., fighting, and the U.S., the secondary responsibility, i.e., the supply of arms, money, and advisers.

If it does turn out that Thailand is no longer considered "vital," the policymakers will have to make adjustments for a backlog of twenty years of rhetoric. The Thais, however, may decide that they prefer to look elsewhere and may find it advantageous to join the ranks of the nonaligned.

WHY IS THE UNITED STATES INTERESTED IN THAILAND?

Leonard Unger, the present U.S. ambassador in Bangkok, testified before the Symington subcommittee in November, 1969, and enumerated four reasons "why the United States is interested in maintaining close cooperative relations with Thailand and in contributing to the capacity of that country to preserve its independence."[6]

No. 1. *Thailand's strategic location.* It is a crossroads, an international air center, and a buffer state.

No. 2. *Thailand's part in the containment of mainland China.* We are interested in encouraging a "world order in which independence by an outside aggressor's force."[7]

No. 3. Thailand's immediate relevance to the Vietnam conflict "as well as the conduct of a wide range of additional activities important to us, including some which also have a direct relation to our own security,"[8] a VOA transmitter, communications and transport facilities and "things of a security nature."[9]

No. 4. Thailand's potential leadership role in the "development of a concrete program of regional cooperation in Southeat Asia and perhaps a larger Asian sphere."[10]

Analysis of Ambassador Unger's points indicates some insufficiencies in the rationale he presented:

No. 1. As Senator Fulbright remarked in the Symington hearings, every place is a "crossroads." It is questionable to label Thailand a buffer state when the U.S. has no real commitments to defend Burma or Malaysia.

No. 2. So far the Chinese threat to Thailand has amounted to (a) training of 2300 Thais and Meo's since 1954 (b) a limited provision of arms (c) propaganda and (d) a road built in northern Laos connecting southern China and northern Thailand.[11] No massing of troops in southern China to threaten an overland invasion has occurred. It is difficult to conceive of China's invading Laos and Thailand given her present relations with the Soviet Union and Nationalist China. The road built by some 6,000 Chinese was commissioned in 1950 and begun in 1960 at the request of Suovanna Phouma, the present premier of Laos.

No. 3. As soon as the war in Vietnam ends, the U.S. troops will leave Thailand unless Unger's "things of a security nature" means that the U.S. sees Thailand's bases as part of the containment perimeter of the Soviet Union and China. Thailand's own attitude toward the "Vietnam conflict" is interesting. Beginning in the 1930's Vietnamese refugees (including Ho Chi Minh from 1928–30) poured into northeastern Thailand. Angry at the French for the seizure of Laos and the expansion of Cambodia, the Thais received an estimated 50,000 to 70,000 Vietnamese fleeing from the colonial French regime. By the end of 1961, at Thai insistance some 28,000 were repatriated to North Vietnam. Due to the traditional ethnic hostilities between the Thais and the Vietnamese, the remaining 40,000 Vietnamese do not wield any major political influence.

No. 4. The lack of success in any previous cooperative efforts in the region does not lessen the Ambassador's optimism. Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew maintains "The eventual fate of South and Southeast Asia is dependent more upon resultant policy decisions of America, China and Russia (put in alphabetical order and not their respective order of influence), than in the decisions of the dozen or more governments in the region."[12]

WHAT IS THE LEGALISTIC BASIS FOR U.S.-THAI RELATIONS?

I. Military assistance program

In 1950 under Public Law 329 of the 81st Congress, the U.S. gave Thailand aid through the Economic and Technical Cooperation Agreement and Military Assistance Treaty to upset the "dynamic timetable"[13] of the Communists fresh from their success in mainland China. Phibun, the Prime Minister of Thailand, readily concurred with the American anaylsis of the threat posed by the Communists in Thailand in 1950. Phibun was the same individual who had signed a military alliance with the Japanese and had served as the wartime Prime Minister. The acceptance of U.S. military and economic assistance enhanced Phibun's own political position. Thai politicians took note that invoking Communism not only elicited forgiveness from the Americans but also their money. President Truman approved a grant of $10 million in military aid for Thailand. Over the next year the Thais received enough arms to outfit ten army batallions. The air force gained fighter planes and the navy, vessels. A 75-man U.S. Military Assistance Group (MAAG) arrived to train a 45,000 man army.

III. SEATO treaty

The next stage in the U.S. commitment to Thailand came with the conclusion of the 1954 Geneva Conference which partitioned Vietnam. The U.S. ironically inherited the French colonial empire and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles sought to protect the legacy with the eight member Southeast Asian Treaty Organization. Thailand, the only Manila Pact member on the mainland, was designated as SEATO headquarters. Burma and India, declared neutrals, refused to join. Japan and Indonesia, two major Asian powers, are not members. Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam were excluded. The other members of the almost defunct agreement are the Philippines, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, France and the United States.

At the opening SEATO Cuncil meeting from February 23–25, 1955, Mr. Dulles tied U.S. foreign policy to countries such as Thailand.

Footnotes at end of article.

"United States foreign policy, in its basic aspects, has always rested on two propositions. The first is that we want our own people to enjoy, in peace the blessings of liberty. The second is that we cannot assure the liberty for ourselves unless others also have it. Freedom cannot thrive in an environment that is hostile to freedom." [14]

In 1954 the U.S. expanded the MAAG mission to 400. Military assistance jumped to $29.7 million. Work began on Friendship Highway, a 300-mile road connecting Bangkok to the Lao-Thai border.

III. Thanat-Rusk agreement

In March, 1961, Secretary of State Dean Rusk paraphrased Mr. Dulles at the seventh SEATO Council conference: "We cannot imagine the survival of our own free institutions if areas of the world distant from our own shores are to be subjugated by force or penetration." [15] Bolstered by such assurances but alarmed by the deteriorating situation in Laos, Thai Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman came to Washington in March, 1962. One week of negotiation between Thanat and Rusk produced an amendment to the SEATO treaty: the obligation to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes . . . does not depend upon the prior agreement of all other parties to the treaty, since this treaty obligation is individual as well as collective." [16]

SEATO's bilateralization was confirmed with the dispatch of "about 10,000 U.S. ground [combat forces] and air force personnel to Thailand" [17] even though token forces were sent by Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand (in connection with an already-scheduled SEATO military exercise). The Kennedy Administration later removed the troops when Laos no longer seemed to pose a threat to Thailand. Secretary of State William P. Rogers reaffirmed the Thanat-Rusk agreement in the spring of 1969.

IV. Joint planning

Before, during, and after the Gulf of Tonkin incident and the U.S. commitment to the full-scale defense of South Vietnam, joint military planning was instituted and Thailand became even dearer to the U.S. policymakers, and the United States became even dearer to Thailand. Construction of air bases began early in 1965 and by the end of 1965, there were 25,000 Air Force personnel in the country. The United States bought the land for the bases, equipped them for the Vietnam War, but the bases are Thai. There is no status-of-forces agreement with Thailand, unlike South Vietnam and South Korea.

A military contingency plan was drawn up in 1965 between the U.S. military and the Thais in Bangkok. The text of the agreement provided that American troops would help the Thai Army oppose Communist forces in Laos before any such troops could cross the Thai border. the U.S. military, reacting to public discussions of the plan, contends that the plan is but one of many and that anticipating such situations and providing for such contingencies is required of them. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird says that he does not agree with the plan and that he would come to Congress before it was implemented. The U.S. Senate passed the first Cooper-Church amendment in December, 1969, preventing American troops from being committed to combat in Thailand or Laos without prior Congressional approval.

IS THAILAND ANOTHER VIETNAM?

The four arrangements delineated above form the cornerstones of U.S.-Thai relations. Although most of the 42,000 U.S. troops are in Thailand in Vietnam-related activities, there is a real possibility that they may be called on to defend the bases in case of attacks on the base at Udorn in northeastern Thailand—one in 1968 and one timed to coincide with President Nixon's visit to Bangkok in 1969. This small incidence of insurgency activity seems attributable to a policy decision by the insurgent leadership.

Since 1950 the main thrust of U.S. economic and military aid has been to bolster the Thai counterinsurgency effort.[18] The United States and Thai policy is that military security must precede all other endeavors. Every U.S. agency in Thailand, except the Peace Corps, reflects the common Thai and U.S. dependence on military solutions to the complexity of problems. For example, since 1957 AID has helped train the Thai police, with particular emphasis on the Provincial Police and the Border Patrol. AID has assisted in the buildup of the Air Support Division of the Thai National Police Department by providing aircraft, advisory service in operations, and maintenance and support for the training of Thai personnel needed to fly and maintain the aircraft. Recently the Defense Department had to cut down the supply of helicopters because the police were taking to the air and abdicating their control of the roads.

Most of U.S. AID money has gone into the Accelerated Rural Development Program begun in 1964 by the Thai government in six provinces of the Northeast.[19] ARD places emphasis on road-building: the latest project is the circular road connecting Udorn, Nakon, Phanom, and Ubon, the sites of three air bases. AID officials point to the roads as evidence of the Thai government concern with northeastern Thailand. Critics point to the military transport objectives of the "circular highway" and its predecessor, the Friendship Highway.

The United States has problems exercising control over the military equipment it has provided to the Thai armed forces. U.S. arms have proved to be as useful in local power struggles as in combatting insurgents. Department of Defense officials decry the fact that the top-rate First Army remains around Bangkok amid persistent threats of coups and blackmail through shows of force—rather than going upcountry. Another very dangerous misuse of U.S. equipment is the napalming of hilltribe settlements in the North. In addition to the officially denied napalming the government does not extend citizenship rights to the hilltribesmen and forbids them to grow opium, their chief means of livelihood.

Up to now, the ethnic homogeneity of the Thais combined with a loyalty to the King and the country and a GNP per capita of $157 (a 25% increase since 1957) have effected stability. Thailand faces real problems if the insurgents exploit the troop presence in the Northeast, if the Thai government continues its present policy toward the northern hilltribes, if the military maintains its political predominance. Thailand is not a Vietnam, but there are ominous threats to her stability.

WILL U.S. TROOPS STAY PERMANENTLY IN THAILAND?

Critics of U.S. policy in Thailand and Southeast Asia maintain that the bases in Thailand and Southeast Asia help form the perimeter for containment of mainland China and even Soviet Russia. The fear is that the U.S. is inextricably caught up in Thailand, a fear that government officials in Thailand have reinforced.

"Most United States planners in Bangkok see far greater strategic benefits from the rapid construction of Sattahip's new deep-water port, its depots and its direct road links to existing United States air and supply bases in Northeast Thailand . . . In case of a buildup by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to meet a major Communist threat to Thailand, Bangkok would become as serious a bottleneck as Saigon was . . . in Vietnam, according to qualified sources . . . Some United States officials see Sattahip as a logical successor, under SEATO auspices, to Britain's Singapore's base . . . Sattahip could also give the United States a continued foothold in the Southeast Asian mainland if a Vietnam settlement results in a drastic decline of United States strength to the east." [20]

Military and State Department spokesmen presently deny these implications and in fact bemoan the short-sightedness of many of the expenditures in Thailand—attributing the major ones only to the Vietnam War. According to some military officials, the proved ineffectiveness of the U.S. Air Force in fighting a guerrilla war and the cuts in the defense budget preclude any troop presence beyond the termination of the Vietnam War—whenever that will be.

The Thais themselves would like to get rid of the provoking presence of troops whom the Senate has forbidden to come to Thailand's defense. In conjunction with the Guam Doctrine, Thanat Khoman, the Foreign Minister of Thailand for the past 11 years, has said: "Thailand on its part has never made, nor does it intend to make, any call on its SEATO allies to help with manpower in dealing with the communist activities sponsored and directed by neighbouring Marxist regimes." [21]

According to the Guam Doctrine, it would appear that the U.S. commitment to Thailand's defense remains the same, but might not include a U.S. military presence:

1. ". . . The U.S. will keep all of its treaty commitments.

2. ". . . We shall provide a shield if a nuclear power threatens the freedom of a nation allied with us, or of a nation whose survival we consider vital to our security.

3. ". . . In cases involving other types of aggression we shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested in accordance with our treaty commitments. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense." [22]

ARE THE THAIS PREPARING FOR A WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. TROOPS?

In a speech delivered at the 1969 SEATO conference in Tokyo, Thanat Khoman indicated the growing disenchantment with the American presence:

"There must be recognition and perhaps acknowlegement of the fact that the intervention of outside powers in dealing with Asian problems may not be the most effective nor the most desirable device for their settlement. Either those powers may become tired of the exacting ordeals of their domestic public opinion may find the burden of responsibility too heavy for their taste. . . . We would do well, therefore, to acknowledge this new mood and prepare ourselves accordingly."

The preparations are pragmatic, not particularly dramatic, but cumulatively significant. Thailand "has met with Red China several times" and "would be ready to have a dialogue with Red China if that could help lessen the danger of Communist subversion in the country." [23] From the Asia Society speech:

"The nations on the spot, by joining together and combining their moral, political and diplomatic resources and ingenuity may present a worthwhile persuasive opportunity to Peking to alter its militant inclinations and follow a more peaceable course of coexistence with fellow Asians and Pacific nations."

In recent months trade agreements were signed by the Thais with the USSR, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Products from Japan comprised 34% of Thai imports in 1968 as compared with 19% from the United States.[24] The Thais are attempting to maintain as much maneuverability as possible. If the U.S. withdraws aid from Thailand in the 1970's, the USSR may help the Thais in resisting what now appears to be a threat from China. Thanat Khoman in the Asia Society speech:

Footnotes at end of article.

"Brezhnev's proposal for Asian collective security, in our opinion, seems to envisage the departure from the scene of the western powers and the eventual occurrence of a power vacuum which may be filled by a large nation presently inimical to Russian interests."

The historical Thai search for a *naaj* (patron) to protect against China will go on despite ideological implications. Withdrawal of U.S. troops from Thailand and Southeast Asia will probably result in a non-aligned stance for Thailand.

HOW DID CAMBODIA AFFECT THE THAI POLITICAL SCENE?

Development of parliamentary government was jeopardized recently by the close vote on new governmental taxes in July, 1970: 102 for, 101 against. You can say it was Parliament that survived by a single vote, not the government, said one western diplomat.[25] The critical vote came over cabinet decreed heavy increases in import duties on some 220 items and a boost in the country's value added tax by two percent. Such a budgetary move had been anticipated since last year's balance of trade had shown a record $533 million deficit—the second in succession of over half a billion dollars.[26] Up to now the Thai economy, buttressed by U.S. military spending and other U.S. aid, has avoided the less developed country pitfall of declining prices for agricultural exports and increasing prices of those imports vital to development. U.S. officials recognize the negative impact of a troop withdrawal on the Thai economy and the U.S. Embassy in Bangkok has done a study outlining alternative approaches to U.S. responsibility for the Thai economy. The Cambodian incursion of May, 1970, has served to worsen the traditional balance of payments problem. The war is brought closer to Thailand's door, and Senate critics of U.S. involvement are threatening to cut off funds.

Thailand's political leaders are concerned. The Red scare and military alert during the parliamentary vote have been the manifestations of the concern. Already sensitive to criticisms of U.S. payments to the 12,000 Thai soldiers fighting in Vietnam ($200 million since 1966),[27] Thais recognize that the U.S. cannot underwrite the despatch of Thai troops to Cambodia without difficulty. The economic problems are bound to worsen and the Thai politicans are well aware that economic instability leads to political unrest.

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS FOR THAILAND?

I. *If there is no political settlement of the Vietnam War and Vietnamization continues . . .*

The Nixon policy of Vietnamization, i.e., letting the South Vietnamese undertake the combat duties, assumes U.S. air support and advisory assistance into an as yet undefined future. Thailand now provides bases for a major part of the air support effort in Vietnam and the same arrangement is likely to continue with Vietnamization as the U.S. policy. U.S. underwriting of the Thai military efforts in Cambodia and Laos will continue as well as funds for the 5,000 Thais fighting in Laos.

II. *Or if there is a political settlement in Vietnam and withdrawal of the United States from Southeast Asia . . .*

According to Nixon administration spokesmen, the U.S. presence in Thailand is linked directly to the Vietnam war effort. All U.S. troops will be withdrawn from Thailand upon a political settlement of the war in Vietnam.

III. *If there is increased insurgency activity in Thailand with Chinese support of the insurgency . . .*

Thais have steadfastly rejected the possibility of outside help in combatting internal insurgency problems. The U.S. will be asked for continued military aid and advisors. The attitude of the U.S. Congress is crucial in determining the amount and the form of aid to Thailand.

Students of Asia have urged U.S. rapprochement with China as the key to alleviating the problems in Southeast Asia. Nixon administration spokesmen point to U.S. efforts at rapprochement: permission to travel to China to four categories of persons, $100 allowance for Chinese goods to U.S. tourists, the stop to 7th Fleet patrols of the Taiwan Strait. Critics state the Vietnam War, U.S. overflights of China, and the recently noticed B–52 runways prepared in Taiwan overshadow other U.S. gestures.

The U.S. military in Thailand is going ahead confident that the U.S. is committed in Thailand and aware that the politicians have been known to change thier minds. The National Security Council staff is preparing a memorandum for the President on Thailand—setting forth the various alternatives, the parameters of action, and their estimate of consequences. The framework for the memorandum is the Guam Doctrine and the NSSM (memo) will probably amount to a bureaucratic and political re-phasing of present U.S. commitments to Thailand.

Senate critics of U.S. involvement in Thailand take heed of the domestic political climate. The Senate sense of what should be our policy toward Thailand is admonitory:

1. First Cooper-Church amendment of December, 1969, forbids the introduction of ground combat troops into Thailand.

2. Second Cooper-Church amendment of June, 1970, prevents without Congressional consent the financing of Thai soldiers in Cambodia.

3. Armed Services Report. Equipment given to Thailand from Department of Defense stocks cannot be used in other than border sanctuary areas without prior Congressional approval.

4. An August 20, 1970, amendment to H.R. 17123 prohibits the payment of special overseas allowances to Thai or other foreign forces in Vietnam, financed through the Department of Defense budget at a rate greater than the combat pay allowed American servicemen fighting there.

The educated and moneyed elite in Bangkok has long expressed dissatisfaction with the military domination of the political scene. United States policy and its stress on military security has led to the support of military strongmen with a penchant for corruption. There have been intermittent Thai flirtations with respresentative government—the latest coming in June, 1968, with the promulgation of the eighth post-revolutionary constitution, but the military still provides the leaders.

Prime Minister Thanom Kittachakorn, the leader of the ruling United Thai People's Party (UTPP) and the Minister of Defense, is a field marshall. General Prapes Chrausathira, the Deputy Prime Minister, is the powerful Minister of the Interior. Air Chief Marshall Dawee Chulasapya is the Minister of Communications. Police General Prasert is the Director General of the Police Department and the Minister of Health.

The urban-intellectual dislike of a government deriving power from control of the countryside where the overwhelming majority of the people live (85%) reminds us of a situation in another Southeast Asian country. The "intellectual" five percent resident in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, regarded Prince Sihanouk as a dictator while the other 95%, farmers or fishermen, worshipped Sihanouk as the embodiment of all religious and secular authority. The five percent maneuvered the overthrow of Sihanouk and opened their country to possible disaster.

As the economic conditions in Thailand worsen, we may witness a replay of the Cambodian scenario.

WHAT WILL BE OUR POLICY TOWARD THAILAND?

Discussions with officials in the Department of State, AID, Department of Defense, and the National Security Council, reveal little public questioning of U.S. policy toward Thailand over the past 20 years. There may be a de-emphasis in the importance placed on Thailand, but the same approach, military solutions to political problems, seems to predominate.

Even if there were a cessation of verbal and actual hostilities today, it would be a staggering task to dispel the mutual distrust engendered to date. The pragmatic policy for the U.S. is to strengthen *all* the nations that form the Chinese perimeter, while making real attempts at rapprochement with China.

IV. *Japan and Russia . . .*

Japanese economic, political and perhaps military hegemony in Southeast Asia and, therefore, Thailand, will become more and more pronounced. Cordial relations with Japan will prove fundamental if U.S. influence in Southeast Asia is to continue. Japan wants to mute the U.S. military and political presence in the Far East and to stall trade liberalization.

The Soviets will continue to expand their naval and economic presence in Asia.

Thailand may find the stance of a non-aligned nation to be very attractive.

V. *The present . . .*

U.S. involvement in Thailand has contributed to the development of the military sector in Thai society at the expense of the civilian sector. The prosperity brought by the U.S. military presence is transitory and corrupting: it takes the form of nightclubs, hotels, jewelry shops, bars, massage parlours, brothels, and rented wives. U.S. spending of all kinds—military, rest and recreation, and economic—has spread a false veneer, a veneer that threatens to disappear soon.

The slight rumblings heard in Bangkok in July, 1970, indicate that Thailand is presently encountering real threats to her stability. The wavering nature of the U.S. commitment only exacerbates the precariousness of Thailand's position. A responsible scrutiny of U.S.-Thai relations is imperative for both nations.

FOOTNOTES

[1] For a breakdown of the $2 billion on U.S. investment in Thailand, see the Symington Subcommittee Hearings on Thailand of November, 1969, p. 748.

[2] The troop build-up in Thailand is directly related to the Vietnam war, not to the defense of Thailand. During the year, 1970–1, 9,800 troops will be withdrawn and one of the bases, Takhli, will be turned over to the Thais.

[3] "Spotlight on Thailand," *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1954, p. 85.

[4] *New York Times*, May 18, 1961.

[5] Hearings, *op. cit.*, pp. 342–44.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 610.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 646.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 610.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 653.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 610.

[12] *The Mirror: a weekly almanac of current affairs*, Singapore, December 30, 1968.

[13] Ambassador at large Phillip C. Jessup quoted in the *New York Times*, February 13, 1950.

[14] *The Bangkok Conference of the Manila Pact Powers*, Department of State Publication 5909 (G.P.O., Washington, 1955), p. 26.

[15] *New York Times*, March 27, 1961.

[16] Hearings, *op. cit.*, p. 676.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 613.

[18] AID pamphlet, *United States Aid to Thailand*, Economic Assistance section, pp. 2–3.

[19] *Ibid.*, Effectiveness of Thai Government Institutions and Rural Development section, p. 8.

[20] *New York Times*, April 18, 1967.

[21] Speech to the Asia Society, New York, February 24, 1970.

[22] Nixon, Washington, November 3, 1969.

[23] *Foreign Affairs Bulletin*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Bangkok, Thailand, February, 1969, p. 279.
[24] Market Profile—Thailand, U.S. GPO: 1970 392-360/66.
[25] *Washington Post*, July 19, 1970.
[26] American Embassy, Bangkok: "Economic Trends in Thailand," p. 4.
[27] Hearings, op. cit., p. 657.

POLICE NEED SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE THEY PROTECT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1970, the U.S. Capitol Building was treated to a different kind of demonstration.

It has had on its steps frequent demonstrations by student groups and antiwar activists, but on that day it was the scene of nearly 2,000 uniformed policemen, demanding Federal laws to halt assaults on lawmen.

Instead of "Stop the War," the posters designated Fraternal Order of Police Lodges. Instead of peace signs, there were American flags. Instead of chanting and singing, there was applause.

The policemen, representatives of the 120,000 member national Fraternal Order of Police, were seeking legislation designed to make it a Federal crime to kill policemen, and providing Federal assistance in solving assaults on police.

They came from as far away as Arizona, and their ranks had men from 25 States of the Union. Most were rank-and-file; they ranged from rookies to gray-haired veterans. I quote from the Washington, D.C., Post:

> In conversations, the policemen expressed frustration with the courts, a general feeling of pride in their jobs and discouragement over the lack of respect of some young people have for the police.

The ominous backdrop of daily newspaper headlines is enough to give anyone cause for concern. The FBI Uniform Crime Reports for 1969 showed that in 1969 a record high of 84 law enforcement officers were murdered. This was a 34-percent increase over 1968, when 64 officers were slain. And for the years 1960–69, a total of 561 law enforcement officers were killed by criminals.

In a statement issued earlier this month, J. Edgar Hoover put the issue squarely in focus:

> The law enforcement officer today bears a heavier burden, faces more frustrations, and is second-guessed more than ever before. The public asks more and expects more of the present-day policeman because the public need for protection is greater. When a policeman is assaulted or slain, the criminal significance of the incident extends far beyond the victim officer. It extends to the door of every law-abiding citizen.

On Monday, October 12, 1970, one of the toughest anticrime bills ever to clear the Capitol was sent to the President for signature. It provides the death penalty for anyone convicted of a fatal bombing; it permits the FBI to investigate, and Federal attorneys to prosecute, bombings and arsons on college campuses and at every other institution or organization receiving Federal funds.

To fight organized crime, judges are permitted to impose additional sentences of up to 25 years on certain "dangerous and adult special offenders" who are convicted of crimes that carry lesser penalties.

The legislation also:

Makes it a crime to use money from organized crime to establish a legitimate business in interstate commerce;

Makes it a Federal crime to participate in a conspiracy to obstruct the enforcement of State or local gambling laws;

Establishes Federal control over interstate and foreign commerce in explosives;

Creates a national commission to determine if the crime bill or any current laws infringe on individual rights.

Canada, our neighbor to the north, has a horrible example of terrorism run wild. Organized bands of terrorists have pulled two political kidnapings in the hope that the Canadian Government will be forced to spring 23 other terrorists, now held in prison, and yield to various other fantastic ransom demands.

Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau has instead thrown troops into Ottawa—the first such move in peacetime in Canadian history—and had this to say:

> There are a lot of bleeding-hearts who just don't like to see people with helmets and guns. All I can say is, go ahead and bleed . . .
>
> It is more important to keep law and order in the society than to be worried about weak-kneed people . . . I think society must take every means at its disposal to defend itself against the emergence of a parallel power which defies the elected power in this country and thinks it can go any distance.

Do we remember the days of the early 1960's when it became fashionable to break the law? When it was the "in" thing to do, to "protest" against "unjust" laws—after anyone could determine, for himself, what was "just" and "unjust"?

Do we remember the early warning cries of alarm, that this attitude, this sanction of these things, was tearing apart the very fabric of our society? Can we think back now to the voices that said bitter seeds were being sown, that would bear poisonous fruit? And can we remember how it was equally fashionable to denounce these warning voices as being those of "repression"

I said in 1964 that:

> There seems to be a concentrated effort to change the basic thinking of the American people. For many years the youth of America, even in their games, have considered the criminals the 'bad guys' and the law enforcement officers the 'good guys.' Now too often the cops are the bad guys and the criminals the heroes. A maudlin cult has been growing—as yet still small but vocal—which would have us class the criminals as the good guys and the policemen as the bad guys.

The police that gathered on the Capitol steps expressed concern over increasing assaults on them and on their brother officers, but they vigorously denied they were afraid. There was one remark in particular that struck me:

> Call it apprehension, not fear. If we were afraid we wouldn't remain officers.

No, they are not afraid. They know they cannot afford to be. They are the last bulwark that stand between society and chaos, between orderly government and anarchy.

The American Republic has faltered in its support of them. We must reaffirm this support now, stronger than ever before. They will not fail us, but we, those whom they protect, cannot and must not fail them.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as you know, on August 27 I introduced, with 16 other Senators, S. 4297, the Health Security Act to establish a program of comprehensive national health insurance. The key to this program, capable of bringing high quality health care to every man, woman and child in the Nation, is the use of national health insurance as a lever to improve all aspects of health care. I believe that only national health insurance will provide the vehicle by which so many of the urgently needed reforms can be achieved.

On September 23 and 24, hearings were held on this legislation, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Many of the aspects surrounding this legislation were extensively discussed. Hearings will continue in the future, and the movement we have witnessed in recent weeks will continue to grow, and I look forward to early enactment of such legislation.

One sign of the rapidly growing discussion on national health insurance is the large number of articles—both pro and con—that appeared on the subject at the time of the introduction of S. 4297, and at the time of the hearings.

On September 29, I placed a series of editorials in the RECORD. Since that time, a large number of other editorials have come to my attention. I believe that these additional articles—42 in all—will be of interest to Members of Congress who are concerned with the quality of health care in America. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Weekly Bond Buyer, Sept. 8, 1970]

PRIVATE PROGRAMS FALLING SHORT: NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGNOSIS: 3 OR 4 YEARS

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON.—From the time it was proposed by former President Harry S. Truman in 1945, the current Federal Medicare program, which now provides limited benefits to people 65 and over, took two full decades to work its way through the Congressional traces before finally winning approval. Chances are excellent today that the newly proposed national health insurance program, which would cover virtually every man, woman and child in the country, will become the law of the land within the next three or four years.

There's no gainsaying the fact that the current private health insurance industry, a very substantial $12 billion-a-year industry, is falling short of the desired goal and that it's high time that the U.S., the only major industrial country in the world without some form of national health insurance, should take decisive steps toward correcting a truly sorry situation. To most Americans, immersed as they are in the "we-are-better-off - than - anyone - else - in - the - world" syndrome, some of the comparative health statistics may come as something of a shock, today, for example:

The U.S. ranks 13th in infant mortality, trailing all the Scandinavian countries, most of the British Commonwealth and even East Germany.

The U.S. ranks seventh among the nations of the free world in the percentage of others who die in childbirth.

INFANT MORTALITY RATE

The infant mortality rate in the U.S. for non-whites is twice the rate of whites, nearly three times as many non-white mothers die in childbirth as do white mothers, and in large areas of the country effective prenatal and postnatal care is either non-existent to most low-income families or is so spotty as to be almost a rarity.

The U.S. ranks 18th among the free nations in life expectancy for males, 11th in life expectancy for females, and is behind 15 other nations in the life expectancy of middleaged males.

Some 20 per cent of the total population has no private health insurance whatever, 22 per cent have no surgical insurance, 34 per cent have no in-patient medical insurance, 50 per cent have no out-patient x-ray and laboratory insurance, 57 per cent have no insurance to cover visits to doctors' offices or doctors' home calls, 61 per cent have no insurance to cover drug costs, even partially, and 97 per cent have no dental insurance whatever.

Americans today are spending about $63 billion a year on health care, which includes doctor's bills, hospital bills, drugs, nursing homes and all the rest, and of this total amount, less than one fifth of the expense is covered by adequate private insurance programs.

NIXON ENDORSED

These, and a batch of other dismal health statistics, which together put a badge of discredit on the "most advanced nation in the world," came to light recently with the introduction in the Senate by Senator Edward M. Kennedy of the proposed Federal "health security program," which has the nonpartisan backing of 15 declared members of the Senate and an uncounted number of members of the House.

Additionally, President Nixon has endorsed the general idea of a national health insurance program, albeit he has not, for obvious reasons, embraced the measure proposed by Senator Kennedy with Senators Ralph Yarborough, of Texas, John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky and William B. Saxbe, of Ohio.

Adding to the belief that some form of national health insurance will become a reality in not too many years is the fact that the American Medical Association, which for 20 years successfully lobbied against enactment of the Medicare and Medicaid programs the principle that they would bring about "socialized medicine," has its own plan for national health insurance, not quite so generous as the pending bill, and containing stouter guarantees to immunize doctors from the possible stigma of getting some of their earnings from "the state."

BENEFITS AVAILABLE TO ALL

The overall Health Security Trust Fund would derive its revenues from three sources—40 per cent from the general Treasury funds, 35 per cent from an employers' payroll tax of 3.5 per cent, and 25 per cent from a 2.1 per cent tax on individual incomes, up to $15,000 a year.

Employers, many of whom now pay the full costs of their employees' private health insurance premiums, would be allowed to pay their workers' health security tax. A variation of the proposed 2.1 per cent add-on to the going income tax rates could be to withhold the health security tax from employees' pay checks, just as unemployment compensation withholdings are now made.

With only a few exceptions the benefits of the new program would be available to everyone beginning, the pending bill sugests, in 1973. This date, of course, could be passed forward up to 1974 or 1975, depending on how long it may take to work the measure through Congress.

Eligibility for benefits would require neither an individual contribution history, as in the case of Social Security benefits, nor would any insured person be required to meet a "means test," as in the case with Medicaid.

The entire range of medical service would be covered, with four exceptions—nursing home, psychiatric treatment, dental care, and certain types of medicine and prosthetics.

The patients would never get a bill either from their doctors, druggists or hospitals. Suppliers of medical or health services would elect the way in which they wanted to be paid from various methods—fee-for-service, capitation payments or in some cases, retainers—or any combination of these three. Other independent providers of medical-health services, such as pathological labs, radiology labs, pharmacies or eligible appliance-makers would be paid on a fee-for-service basis.

The resources development fund would be a continuing affair, being financed with a 5 per cent take-out of the Health Security Fund's total annual receipts. After the preliminary organization stages were ended, the resources fund would devote its time and money to the continuing development of health services, doctors' and nurses' training programs and to help finance new researches into medical science.

EXISTING PROGRAMS SUPERSEDED

Various existing health programs would be superseded in whole or in part, by the new Health Security Program. Since all persons over 65 would be automatically covered. Medicare under the Social Security system would end. Federal Aid to State Medicaid programs would also be terminated, except to the extent that the benefits provided by existing State Medicaid programs might be broader and more comprehensive than those to be provided by the Health Security Program.

The program would be managed by a five-man, full-time Health Security board. Board members would be appointed by the President, subject to Senate approval, and members' terms would run for five years. The immediate supervisory agency would be the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The insurance program, as it is envisioned by its senatorial sponsors (the basic idea was originally produced by the "committee of one hundred for national health insurance," founded by the late Walter Reuther), is based on three guiding principles.

There is no provision by which the government would down health care facilities, employ medical personnel or would manage the finances of the health system. By contrast, the program, operationally, would be a sort of partnership between the public and private sectors, with no intrusion into the private activities of professional medical people.

The program is to be phased in on a gradual basis, rather than being thrust upon the country and the medical profession in a single action.

MANAGED ON BUDGETED BASIS

The services to be covered by the insurance system will be managed on a budgeted basis, via a health security trust fund, that will operate in the same manner as the Social Security trust fund now operates.

In the so-called transition period, which the pending bill fixes now at three years, there would also be created and financed out of the new trust fund resources, a $1 billion resource development fund. Purpose of this subsidiary fund would be to provide the necessary money to help increase the size of medically-trained manpower and to bolster the construction of hospitals and other medical care institutions.

It is, of course almost impossible to project what the ultimate total out-payments of the health security program would be, when the program became fully operative. However, on the basis of medical cost data now available from public and private sources for last year, it is estimated that, if the fund had been functioning in 1969, it would have paid out about $37 billion in health benefits. This works out to slightly less than 60 per cent of the nation's total medical-hospital-health bill last year of about $63 billion.

Obviously, there will be no action on the national health insurance proposal in the closing days of the current session, but it appears likely that debate will begin in the next session before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Assuming the Democrats get control of the Senate, Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey, is in line to become the new committee chairman, since the present chairman, Senator Yarborough, lost his seat in the Texas primaries last Spring. Senator Williams is one of the members of the Senate who favors the health insurance program.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Sept. 26, 1970]

EVALUATION NEEDED FOR HEALTH SYSTEM

(By Jim Hazelwood)

"It would be foolish to impose a whole new system of health care onto a nation without testing things in an intelligent and limited way.

"We need years of evaluation, aided and hurried along by government subsidies.

"There is still a question as to whether the nation can afford a program of such magnitude."

The speaker was Geoffrey V. Heller, a consultant on health plan developments at the University of California School of Medicine.

Heller is a former vice president of California Blue Shield and a recognized authority in the field of pre-paid medical plans.

He was discussing his views on some of the difficulties and satisfactions America might encounter if the nation embarks on a national health plan.

Some authorities fear there will be a total breakdown in the provision of health care in the U.S. unless such a plan is adopted.

A 27-member panel, headed by Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association, recently recommended such a course to Secretary Elliot L. Richardson of the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

The Committee for National Health Insurance asked for a total health coverage plan several months ago, backing up the request with an impressive amount of research.

The committee was founded by labor leader Walter Reuther who worked tirelessly on it until his untimely death in a plane crash.

The chairman now is Leonard Woodcock, who succeeded Reuther as president of the United Auto Workers.

Vice chairmen include Dr. Michael DeBakery, the fierce, dedicated heart surgeon who implanted the first artificial coronary bypass pump; Mrs. Albert D. Lasaker, presi-

dent of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, and Whitney M. Young Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

The membership roster includes some of the biggest names in politics, religion, civil rights, business, medicine and practically every legitimate field of endeavor in the nation.

America may be divided on many fronts, but it seems united in its desire for a national health plan.

The big questions are, "How much, and how soon?"

Heller was interviewed as an architect of health plans that do work and as one who has long experience with the problems involved.

One of his main concerns is "an unknown reservoir of people presently barred from care because of financial inability to pay."

This could throw a strain on a new and untried medical system which could sorely try its ability to get off the * * * of experiments should be * * *.

"It could open an enormous pent-up demand, the size of which is not understood at this moment," Heller said.

"For example, as people age, they often find that their friendliest and most civilized contact is their doctor.

"We call them the worried well.

"There are a certain number who really should have the sympathy and understanding which comes from talking to their doctor, and they would be dealt with helpfully.

"But there are an unknown number of others in the worried well category who must be weeded out if a national health plan is to work."

Heller believes that a number of experiments should be launched before determining the final form of a national health plan.

"The existing Medicare and Medi-Cal programs could set aside certain groups to try different types of plans," he said.

"In a year or so, we would see whether they work.

"Some of these ideas look very good on paper, but they won't fly. Others will work. The job is to separate the two."

Heller believes the role of the Federal government will be limited to providing a share of the cost for each individual enrolled in a national health plan.

The balance of the cost would probably be shared by the individual himself and his employer, if he has a job.

"They will likely go to established medical groups with about $400 per person per year and ask them to guarantee that each individual will receive whatever health care he needs," he said.

"The amount which is left over will be used for payment to physicians."

This is essentially the same kind of payment developed by the Oakland-based Kaiser Health Plan, which Heller sees as a likely model for a national plan.

Heller suggested one aspect of national medicine which could mean serious trouble for both doctors and hospitals in the Bay Area.

"My feeling is that the hardest hit providers of medical care (under a national health plan) are going to be those who practice in high-cost areas," he said.

"Often, the more skilled practitioners drift to areas where people are able to pay the cost.

The larger cities of California are such areas, he said. There are probably as many medical skills and services available here as anywhere in the world.

But the people who receive these skills, naturally, have to pay a premium for them. Specially trained physicians require higher fees.

"It may not be possible for a national health plan to pay the usual and customary charges as practiced in the Bay Area," he said.

In other words, a physician practicing in the Bay Area probably wouldn't be able to not charge the plan any more than a small town doctor.

"The main differential in reimbursement to physicians which might be recognized by such a plan would likely be the difference in office costs, rather than physicians' fees," he said.

Heller said there is a possibility that the plan might offer incentives for a more equitable distribution of doctors.

"The plan might offer incentives for physicians to gravitate to areas where income possibilities are now severly limited," he said.

Heller insists that these are only speculations because no one knows what final form a national health plan might take.

"We will just have to wait to see what happens before we can make realistic predictions," he said.

[From the Cleveland (Tenn.) Banner, Sept. 10, 1970]

A FEASIBLE PLAN

The present advocacy by the American Medical Association and the National Medical Association of a medicredit program of national health insurance is not a switch in policy. U.S. medicine, now as always, opposes what it considers unworkable plans to extend health care and supports what in its wisdom and experience it believes to be workable plans.

The country is finding that merely pouring out billions of dollars on health care schemes can in no way improve the quality or availability of medical care. The health insurance plan proposed by the Nixon Administration is similar to the proposal which has been urged upon Congress by principal medical spokesmen. The health plan offered by the latter includes a three-point program which "the medical profession hopes to see that nation pursue" in efforts to provide quality health care for everyone as economically as possible.

An AMA spokesman, in describing the medicredit health insurance proposal his association advocates, says, "Under our plan, each low income person or family would receive a certificate for the purchase of a qualified and comprehensive health insurance plan. The protection would be theirs without expense or contribution since the cost of the program would be borne entirely by the federal government." A second phase of the plan, "offers tax credits, on a sliding scale based on the tax liability of a family, for the purchase of qualified health benefits coverage." A third phase of the plan, as proposed by the AMA, "calls for a structured peer review mechanism to insure high quality of care and to prevent abuses of the medicare and medicaid programs."

The doctors have given assurance of the medical profession's cooperation in solving the nation's health care problems. As the nation realizes the solution to these problems must be feasible—as well as liberal—the health care picture will grow immeasurably brighter.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, Sept. 4, 1970]

TODAY'S MEDICINE: HEALTH ADVICE FROM ABROAD

After seven months in the United States as a visiting professor a British physician believes that "some form of national health insurance" must be introduced here to avoid a "complete breakdown of health services."

"American medicine is more advanced technologically but there is little doubt that it is possible for doctors to practice better medicine in Britain," Dr. W. W. Holland, of St. Thomas's Hospital Medical School, London, writes in Lancet, a British medical journal.

In Britain, where there is a national health scheme of long standing, the number of general practitioners is increasing; the trend in the United States, on the contrary, is toward specialization. The result, Dr. Holland says, is that poor people "wait in dirty, ill-lit corridors" of big county hospitals for attention and because of the time required to see a doctor, often fail to seek treatment until a disease is in an advanced stage.

"Parallels may be found in developing countries or in the treatment of the poor in London teaching hospitals before 1914," he says.

Operating on 20 Jehovah's Witnesses (who refuse transfusion because of their religious beliefs), the Texas surgeons say they were able to reduce blood loss to a minimum by rapid and meticulous clamping of all cut blood vessels and to replace blood loss with a solution of salt, carbohydrate, potassium and calcium, keeping circulation stable both during and after the operation.

"Blood transfusion involves the risk of hepatitis and is used cautiously in this hospital," the surgeon says.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times, Sept. 5, 1970]

HEALTH STATISTICS UNJUGGLED

In an editorial about the need for national health insurance, we mentioned statistics which place the United States 14th among nations in infant mortality, 18th in male life expectancy and 11th in maternal mortality. The statistics seem to indicate, we noted, that we are doing, as a nation, far less than we can or should do for our own health and welfare.

A local doctor responded, calling national health insurance socialistic and claiming that the statistics were erroneous. Most European countries, he said, do not report infant births before the age of one year, and therefore "neonatal death statistics are largely a statistical juggling act and cited frequently by gullible politicians and unwitting journalists."

Checking, we found the same statistics reported by the World Health Organization and other governmental and health organizations, and we wrote to the Health Services and Mental Health Administration of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, asking about the reliability of the figures reported. We received this reply:

"Deaths of infants who die before registration of birth or before 24 hours of age are excluded from the totals for certain countries. In this case they are also excluded from the birth total. In the recent past Belgium and France have used this method of counting infant deaths.

"Also some countries, notably the USSR in 1968, exclude infants born alive from their total of live born infants if their length of gestation was less than 28 weeks, they weighed less than 1000 grams, and measured less than 35 centimeters in length, if they die within 7 days of birth.

"In both the foregoing examples, data from countries following the indicated registration procedures are not compared with data from the United States. Thus comparisons and rankings when they are published by the National Center for Health Statistics have been done on the basis of essentially comparable data, excluding those countries whose procedures differ significantly from the World Health Organization recommendations."

A little confusing perhaps, but hardly a juggling act. And the main point stands: we let too many babies and mothers die; our medical facilities, procedures, arrangements lag behind those of a few other nations—which is bad not because we're in some kind of a race but because it is necessary. We could take much better care of ourselves than we are taking, and have only ourselves to blame.

[From the Donora (Pa.) Herald-American, Sept. 11, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

A bi-partisan group of fifteen Senators has introduced a bill to provide, for the first time, national health insurance for citizens of the United States, of all ages, not just those over 65.

National health insurance is a government service voted into existence in practically every western democracy this century. Its proponents believe the United States is certain to eventually adopt it, as this country has adopted social security and Medicare.

Proponents argue there are still too many Americans, especially children, who cannot afford adequate medical and dental care. They estimate the cost of national health insurance at forty billions a year and the current bill would set up a Health Security Trust Fund to finance the program. Sixty per cent of the forty billions would come from special income and payroll taxes. The other forty per cent of needed funds would come from general tax revenue.

There seems little chance the proposed Health Security Act will be enacted by the current Congress. But having been introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy, national health insurance is certain to be an issue in the 1972 political campaign. (Of its fifteen sponsors, twelve were Democrats.)

There are reports President Nixon is considering endorsing such a program by 1972, his aides have estimated the additional cost, over what the government now spends, as ten billion dollars. There is still strong opposition to the program, but the President is reportedly concerned over the fact that too many Americans still lack adequate medical and dental care.

From the viewpoint of history, and the world trend, a good guess is that the nation will have some form of national health insurance before the end of the seventies.

[From the Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News, Sept. 11, 1970]

WRONG PRESCRIPTION FOR MEDICAL CARE

Since Medicare was added to Social Security benefits and Medicaid began providing health care to welfare recipients, it has been as certain as the next sunrise that an effort would be made to pull the rest of our population into some kind of government-sponsored, tax-supported medical program.

That hour has come. Legislation is now before Congress to create "National Health Insurance" covering all Americans from the cradle to the grave. The debate on this issue will be of profound significance, our philosophies, involving our health, our pocketbooks, and the future of the medical profession

There is no denying that a crisis of serious proportions is overtaking the complex of doctors, hospitals, clinics and laboratories that has come to be known as the health care industry. The gap between the cost of medical care and our ability to pay it is widening. So is the gap between the medical needs of our population and the personnel and facilities available to meet those needs.

The decision to be made is whether we will seek to relieve that crisis within our tradition of private, voluntary medical service or whether we will turn the whole problem over to the government.

It is the latter course that would be followed under the proposed Health Security Act introduced last month by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts with the cosponsoring of 15 Democratic and Republican Senators. The plan follows recommendations of a committee for national health insurance organized by the late Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers.

The plan would sweep Medicare, Medicaid and the health care of every resident of the United States of America into a system to be administered like Social Security and financed by new payroll taxes and income taxes and from general federal revenues.

Our unhappy experience with Medicare and Medicaid should be argument enough that making government commitments to provide health care is not a solution to the problem—but part of the problem itself. Medicare and Medicaid have put a crushing demand on health care facilities that were overburdened to begin with. They have disclosed glaring opportunities for abuse. Their huge budgets have contributed to the inflation of medical costs and have proved inadequate to meet the demand for services which the two programs have stipulated.

To attack the health crisis in a rational way means we must first bring the Medicare and Medicaid programs into manageable bounds and provide the doctors, hospitals and other personnel and facilities to meet the present level of demand for health care. It is cynical to speak of the government's guaranteeing medical care for the entire population when the means of providing it are simply not at hand. The breakdown in the quality of care that would occur under such circumstances is frightening.

It is ironic that a nation which has made so many breakthroughs in medical research and technology should face such problems in delivering the end-product of medical science to those who need it. Experience should teach us, however, that greater nationalization of medicine—more commitments backed up by more tax money—is the wrong prescription.

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Courier-News, Sept. 11, 1970]

A CURE OR A CRISIS? EVERYMAN'S HEALTH CARE

Since Medicare was added to Social Security benefits and Medicaid began providing health care to welfare recipients, it has been as certain as the next sunrise that an effort would be made to pull the rest of our population into some kind of government-sponsored, tax supported medical program.

That hour has come. Legislation is now before Congress to create "National Health Insurance" covering all Americans from the cradle to the grave.

The debate on this issue will be of profound significance involving our health, our pocketbooks and the future of the medical profession.

There is no denying that a crisis of serious proportions is overtaking the complex of doctors, hospitals, clinics and laboratories that has come to be known as the healthcare industry.

The gap between the cost of medical care and our ability to pay it is widening. So is the gap between the medical needs of our population and the personnel and facilities available to meet those needs.

The decision to be made is whether we will seek to relieve that crisis within our tradition of private, voluntary medical service or whether we will turn the whole problem over to the government.

It is the latter course that would be followed under the proposed Health Security Act introduced last month by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts with the cosponsorship of 15 Democratic and Republican Senators. The plan follows recommendations of a Committee for National Health Insurance organized by the late Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers.

The plan would sweep Medicare, Medicaid and the health care of every resident of the United States of America into a system to be administered like Social Security and financed by new payroll taxes and income taxes and from general federal revenues.

Our unhappy experience with Medicare and Medicaid should be argument enough that making government commitments to provide health care is not a solution to the problem—but part of the problem itself.

Medicare and Medicaid have put a crushing demand on health care facilities that were overburdened to begin with. They have disclosed glaring opportunities for abuse. Their huge budgets have contributed to the inflation of medical costs and have proved inadequate to meet the demand for services which the two programs have stimulated.

To attack the health crisis in a rational way, means we must first bring the Medicare and Medicaid programs into manageable bounds and provide the doctors, hospitals, and other personnel and facilities to meet the present level of demand for health care.

It is cynical to speak of the government's guaranteeing medical care for the entire population when the means of providing it are simply not at hand. The breakdown in the quality of care that would occur under such circumstances is frightening.

It is ironic that a nation which has made so many breakthroughs in medical research and technology should face such problems in delivering the end-product of medical science to those who need it. Experience should teach us however, that greater nationalization of medicine—more commitments back up by more tax money—is the wrong prescription.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal of Commerce & Commercial, Sept. 15, 1970]

HEALTH COVER BILL PROPOSED TO CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, September 14.—A bill to create a system of national health insurance and to use the insurance program to bring about major improvements in the organization and delivery of health care has been introduced by Rep. James Corman, D-Calif., and 32 cosponsors. It is a companion measure to the Health Security Bill introduced last month by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., and 14 other senators.

Rep. Corman is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over his proposed legislation. The bill is based on a two-year study and recommendations of the Committee for National Health Insurance established by the late Walter Reuther in 1968.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM NEED

"Nothing short of a comprehensive national program can now deal with the component parts of our health crisis and satisfy the nation's needs," Rep. Corman said in a speech on the House floor.

"National social policy now demands that we have a health system which undertakes to assure the availability of personal health services to everybody—as a right, without a test, without financial barriers or burden at the time care is needed, and with access to all needed services and not merely those which it is convenient for private carriers to insure."

Senate Labor Committee Chairman Ralph Yarborough, D-Tex., meanwhile, said he will hold hearings Sept. 23–24 on legislation to establish a national health insurance system.

The lame duck senator, who was defeated in the Texas Democratic primary, said he was reintroducing the "Health Security Act," which he and several other senators first dropped in the hopper last month in a form that would make it possible for the Labor Committee to hold hearings.

Under the original version of the plan developed by the Committee on National Health Insurance, the program would be funded primarily through the establishment of a "health security trust fund," Sen. Yarborough explained.

NEW FINANCING METHOD

The new version calls for complete financing out of general revenues—the first bill

would provide 40 per cent of the money from this source—so that it comes under Labor Committee jurisdiction, he said.

The Yarborough bill was cosponsored by the same bipartisan group that supported the first bill—Sens. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky., and William Saxbe, R-Ohio.

Some of the cost estimates on the national health insurance proposals "are too low," former chief actuary of the Social Security Administration Robert J. Myers told the Senate Finance Committee, which has resumed hearings on House-passed omnibus Social Security legislation.

Committee Chairman Russell B. Long, D.-La., queried him on national health insurance cost estimates and asked his opinion of this legislation.

"Such legislation is not desirable," Mr. Myers replied, "because the health needs of the vast majority of the American people are being taken care of by Blue Cross, Blue Shield and a vast network of health insurance plans."

[From the Geneva (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 10, 1970]

MOVE ON HEALTH CARE

There is nothing new about compulsory national health insurance. Its serious espousal goes back at least to the New Deal era, but Americans have always been persuaded that it wasn't needed or that it somehow was incompatible with our so-called free enterprise system. So what is so special about the health insurance bill introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy and a bipartisan group of 13 colleagues? What makes it special is that the notion of national health insurance is now acceptable to a far greater portion of the American public than ever before.

Medicare, which took almost 20 years to enact, paved the way, of course, as did medicaid. Millions of Americans have appreciated being rescued by medicare from a great financial burden. But perhaps the most important element is the realization that medical care is becoming inordinately expensive without any concomitant improvement in the availability or quality of the care. If this problem existed for only one segment of the population, the poor or the elderly, for example, then a special program would be in order, but the fact is that virtually every segment of the population is affected.

The statistics are by now familiar: One out of five Americans under the age of 65 had neither hospital nor surgical insurance in 1968; two out of three persons under 65 have no insurance for physicians' services rendered outside the hospital; health insurance in 1968 paid only 36 per cent of all consumer expenditures for health services, and at the rate at which private health insurance benefits are increasing it will be the year 2000 before insurance covers even two-thirds of the nation's health care bill. Finally, in the past 10 years the consumer price index has risen 29 per cent, but the outlay for health care has gone up 50 per cent.

Leaving aside the point that health care, like education, ought to be available to all as a matter of right, it is plain that the practical and equitable solution to the cost crisis is national insurance, a fact most other industrialized democracies recognized years ago. Under Senator Kennedy's bill, which is modeled on a plan advanced by the Committee for National Health Insurance, physicians' services, hospital services and most other health care would be paid for in full. The exceptions are for some nursing home care, mental illness, some dental care and some drugs and medical appliances.

Forty per cent of the financing would come from ordinary federal revenues, 35 per cent from an employers' payroll tax and 25 per cent from a tax on individual earnings up to $15,000 a year. The amount of the employer and individual taxes would vary with the funds required, but if the program had been operating in 1969, its sponsors say, expenditures would have amounted to 37 billion dollars, requiring an employer tax of 2.8 per cent and an individual tax of 1.8 per cent.

An important feature of the bill is provision for funds ($800,000,000 in the first year) to improve the health care system by training more health care personnel and providing various incentives to establish more efficient methods of providing health care. This program would become operative before the insurance went into effect, for it is evident that until the health care system is greatly enlarged and modernized it could not meet the increased demand the insurance would generate.

The Kennedy bill may not be the one finally enacted, but we are confident that the day when national health insurance proposals could be easily turned aside by special interest lobbyists has gone forever.

[From Newsday magazine, Sept. 21, 1970]

MEDICINE'S NEXT STEP

Getting sick is bad, and getting well is becoming almost as bad. That's when the bills start arriving.

The $100-a-day hospital bill is no rarity, and there is no indication that the super inflation that has hit the cost of medical care is waning. In the past decade, the fees demanded by doctors have gone up 30 per cent and hospital costs have almost doubled. In 1948, Americans were spending $7.5 billion for medical care; two years ago they were spending $50 billion and by 1975 the figure is expected to hit $100 billion.

Despite a Medicare program that is costing $8.3 billion a year and a $5.5-billion Medicaid program, there are still many Americans who are not getting the medical care they need. And despite private health insurance systems, such as Blue Cross, serious illness is driving millions to the economic wall. It is clear that the U.S. medical-care system is, itself, gravely ill. Beyond the obvious staggering costs, there are other statistics that show that these vast expenditures are buying less than full value. Male life expectancy in the U.S., for example, is lower than in 17 other industrialized countries. We are 13th in the number of infants who die and 11th in female life expectancy. These are the figures for a nation that spends more of its gross national product on medical care than any other nation in the world. To put it bluntly: We're getting gypped.

Why? We'll let writer Michael Crichton, himself an MD, offer part of the explanation. Says he in his book "Five Patients": "The American physician has been grossly irresponsible in nearly all matters relating to the cost of medical care. One can trace this irresponsibility quite directly to the American Medical Association. . . . Beginning in 1930 it opposed voluntary health insurance, such as Blue Cross. In 1932, it opposed prepaid group-practice clinics. In 1933, it began a successful campaign to block the construction of new medical schools and limit enrollment in those already in existence. We now have a shortage of doctors. More recently the AMA spent millions—probably no one knows exactly how many millions—to fight Medicare."

Doctors in the U.S. are accorded tremendous prestige. The AMA has used this precious commodity to oppose almost all suggestions for changes in the system. With so many Americans dissatisfied with anachronistic practices that make medical care an increasingly heavy financial burden, the AMA may find it has depleted its greatest resource, the respect of the American people. In 1945, President Truman first suggested a system of national health insurance. Twenty years later, in 1965, the Congress, over vehement AMA objections, passed the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Now the congress has before it a bill that would take these two programs one natural and logical step further. Instead of covering only the poor and the aged, all Americans would be guaranteed medical care. It may not come during this session of the Congress. But it's in the cards.

To quote Dr. Crichton again: "Without question, the notion of the doctor as a legitimate fee-for-service entrepreneur, making his fortune from the misfortunes of his patients, is old-fashioned, distasteful, and doomed. It is only a question of time."

[From Newsday magazine, Sept. 21, 1970]

A REFORM PROGRAM

Crichton is by no means alone in his vigorous indictment of the prevailing system of medical care. Some of the nation's most prominent citizens were concerned enough to take a long, careful look into this shameful mess and produce some workable suggestions for changing the system. The late Walter Reuther formed these 100 citizens into a committee that put forth a comprehensive program of reform. Last month, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), one of the members of the committee, introduced a bill embodying this reform program.

It is called the Health Security Act, and it would not only reorganize the way Americans pay for medical care; it would also seek to revolutionize the entire medical-care system. In its economic provisions, the bill would set up a Health Security Trust Fund, similar to the Social Security Trust Fund. New payroll and income taxes would be routed to this fund to pay for 60 per cent of the cost of the program. The remaining 40 per cent would be drawn from general tax revenues. The program would be designed to pay three-quarters of all personal health expenses for all Americans.

This is not "socialized" medicine in the general European pattern. In most cases, those governments own the medical facilities and employ the doctors. In the U.S., bringing about long-overdue reforms in the way medical care would be delivered to the public would be done more by the carrot than the stick. Group practice, for example, is one of the most promising ways of holding down costs. It is a central feature of the plan suggested by the committee of 100. The Kennedy bill calls for the creation of an $800,000,000-a-year fund to help pay for manpower training and for the construction of new facilities through direct grants and loans. Requests for aid from this fund would be considered according to a strict hierarchy of priorities. Group practices would have the top priority. Individual physicians practicing alone would have the lowest.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Sept. 27, 1970]

ACTION NEEDED ON NATION'S HEALTH

Fourteen months after he said the country was facing a "massive crisis" and possible breakdown in health care, President Nixon has called for the drafting of a remedial program. And the word is out that he won't settle for just shoring up the presently rickety health services system. He has ordered a blueprint for making Americans the healthiest people on earth, which they now decidedly are not.

If that is indeed his goal, he deserves every encouragement. This is a mission of necessity upon which the nation should have embarked many years ago. In this field, the United States is in a third-rate position among the industrial nations. It just muddles along, tolerating incredible disorganization, appalling inequities and financial ruin for people who get too sick for too long. For millions, adequate care simply is unavailable. Distribution of services is drastically uneven across the nation.

Officials of HEW are reported to be working nights and on weekends on Mr. Nixon's program, and a bundle of recommendations should shortly be on his desk. He will need to sit down when he reads the cost projections. If the formulators come up with a plan scaled to actual needs, the price will be jolting. It will make the welfare reform legislation he is trying to push through Congress look like a penny's worth of peanuts. No doubt that is why he has delayed so long in acting on his own health-care crisis alarm, sounded in July of last year. A glimmer of what may be expected was given by Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, an assistant HEW secretary: ". . . as I see the problems, they are awful. Our needs for money are almost insatiable."

Before any hallelujahs are heard, it should be noted that no real movement is visible, except backward. All that is promised is a plan, and that has come not directly from the President but from a third-level administrator, Dr. Egeberg. The doctor has long been agonizing over the deteriorating health-care situation and trying to direct the President's attention to it. Now he vouches for Mr. Nixon's interest and we hope he is correct. We also hope that another year will not elapse before a comprehensive, sensibly graduated program is laid before Congress and the people.

This is a cause to which the public would rally. Most people are gravely concerned about the cost and uncertainty of medical care, and most still have not been exposed to the more shocking evidence which the President could offer.

There is abundant evidence of that concern. For example, on Labor Day the AFL-CIO president delivered a most untypical speech. It wasn't about labor itself, but rather was a statement of labor's No. 1 goal for the Seventies. That, George Meany said, "is to upgrade America's standard of health, to establish a new and better system for delivering health care and health services to the people who need them." He strongly endorsed the national health insurance program now before Congress.

Fifteen senators are sponsoring the insurance bill, which will not and should not be passed in this session. To place it in effect now would be like installing a jumbo jet engine on a Ford Tri-motor plane; it would pull the whole fragile health works to pieces. It is the only logical long-run objective, but preparations must be made. Crippling deficiencies of manpower, money and planning must be dealt with.

The administration, though, has shown no inclination to come to grips with the core problems, and its shotgun assault Wednesday on the health insurance bill bespoke too strong an attachment to the status quo. It revealed an affection for the private health insurance system that seems out of all proportion to that system's achievement record. Indeed the health needs picture drawn by HEW Assistant Secretary John G. Veneman, who presumably was speaking for the administration, was depressing in its narrowness.

He said national health insurance would cost too much (which it probably would if it were immediately implemented), and that it would "radically restructure the health financing and health service industry" with untested new processes. Certainly the present processes have been tested, and in view of the sorry state of health services, some radical restructuring seems inevitable.

Most discouraging, however, was Veneman's conclusion that, over-all, "the best investments that we can make as a nation in improved health are those directed toward assuring sufficient food and an adequate income, and a healthy environment for all." That was a platitudinous evasion of the health-care issue—about on the level of prescribing an apple a day to keep the doctor away. But people more zealous to assure first-rate health services for everyone, regardless of income, are hamstrung until some expensive foundations are laid.

A major expansion and upgrading of services is out of the question until the medical personnel shortage is relieved. The Nixon administration has avoided confronting that primary obstacle which, as a result, is growing larger. New York hospitals now are so desperate for nurses that they are advertising in Europe, Canada and Australia. Probably a fourth of the nursing stations in the country are unfilled. The doctor shortage stands at more than 50,000 and is worsening daily, yet U.S. medical schools turned away 15,000 well-qualified applicants this year. Faced with this predicament, the administration has trimmed federal assistance to medical schools and many are staggering financially. Two of the three here in the District are threatened with closing if they do not receive emergency grants. Johns Hopkins at Baltimore is in serious difficulty.

The President's first concern in the health field should be the rescue of the medical schools, and then their enlargement. The government also should set up improved machinery for measuring their efficiency and for obtaining the largest possible output of new doctors and nurses for the dollars spent.

And some way must be found to improve the dispersal of physicians. More med school graduates must be gotten into practice out among the populace, in localities where they are desperately needed, instead of adding to the urban concentration of specialists. There has been no planning for distribution of medical manpower in relation to needs. Hence some whole counties have been without general-practice doctors, while more attractive areas and specialties have been overloaded. Location incentives can be provided and the fadeout of the general practitioner can be reversed.

Another urgent need is for commitment by the profession to increased use of medical assistants—to the training of a new grade of personnel who in effect would be super-nurses. These aides—extensions of the doctor but at a level just below him—could contribute immeasurably to the creation of an efficient, full-service system. Professional obstinance has suppressed this concept, but there have been recent encouraging experiments.

Action is needed to extend prepaid group practice services to more Americans. About five million now are covered by group plans, which assure treatment at minimal cost. Again, there is resistance in the medical profession, but the AMA president recently voiced strong support for group practice and urged his organization and the federal government to promote it.

The President has been accused of giving health care a low priority rating, and we hope he will soon lay that charge to rest. If his administration can put together a program to create efficiency and sufficiency where there is now chaos and paucity, he will be long remembered. The pattern for advancement should be drawn to culminate with cradle-to-grave national health insurance, when the services structure can support it. Whether health services are a right or a privilege is an old argument, but Americans have settled it in their minds, and George Meany asserted that decision: "We must stop restricting the right to life and death to those who can pay, and denying it to those who cannot."

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) News, Aug. 28, 1970]

BIGGER HEALTH PLAN; HIGHER COST

Sen. Edward Kennedy made two false assumptions in explaining and promoting his newly-introduced bill providing for a system of national health insurance.

One of these was that today's absence of a federally-sponsored national system and the existence of private agencies in this field results in a "large amount of wasteful and inefficient expenditures . . . made by private citizens, by employers, by voluntary private agencies, and by federal, state and local governments." A government system, experience indicates, would be more "wasteful."

Another was that the quality of health care in America is declining. He put it this way: "America faces many serious and critical domestic problems, but none is more pervasive or more difficult than the deterioration of our once proud system of health care."

There are doctor shortages in critical areas, hospitals and clinics that need improvement and places where new facilities are badly needed. But more Americans are getting better medical treatment today than ever before.

Cost remains a significant problem. It has always been so, and medical costs seem to grow disproportionately to inflation. One of the recent reasons is the government's adoption of Medicare and Medicaid programs for the elderly. The aged have been helped immeasurably but the burdens on the medical facilities have been great. Demand has overtaken supply, and economic laws have been affected accordingly.

The Kennedy program, in which he was joined by several other senators, notably Ralph Yarborough (D.-Tex.), John Sherman Cooper, (R.-Ky.) and William Saxbe (R.-Ohio), envisions financing by a 3.5 per cent tax on employers' payrolls, a 2.1 per cent tax on individual income up to $15,000 a year plus income from general revenues of the federal government making up 40 per cent of the total. Under his plan, $37 billion would have been paid out, based on 1969 figures. Presumably, that amount would also have been taken in to pay for the system.

The political appeal of attempting to reduce health care costs to individuals through such a plan will prove irresistible to many in Washington. But all the low and middle-income earners to whom such plans are supposed to be so enticing need to take these things into account before praising the senators for their "foresight" and humanitarianism: 1) The costs will be coming mostly from the same people to be assisted, many of whom now have satisfactory, workable health care programs; 2) Experience with medical aid for the elderly programs has proved that government's intrusion served to drive costs much higher.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 4, 1970]

THE NEXT STEP

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

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

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

Americans know they are paying more. But less generally understood is the fact that they are getting considerably less for their money than most citizens of technologically advanced nations. The United States ranks No. 1 in the total and per capita amount spent on health and medical care. But in re-

turn for the yearly investment of $63 billion, or $294 per person, America ranks 13th in infant survival, 13th in maternal survival, and 18th in male life expectancy. By contrast, Sweden, which ranks first in the field of national health, spends $45 a year less per person than does the United States.

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

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

The time for opposition is past.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Aug. 31, 1970]

THE BILL YOU'D HAVE TO PAY

Almost anybody with a big hospital bill in these days of high medical costs would be appreciative if someone came along and offered to pay it for him—unless the cost of that "favor" were worse than the original bill.

Medicare and medicaid haven't worked out. They have been pretty much as predicted in advance—very costly and spotty and not what they ought to be. So the crowd of liberals who proposed these unsatisfactory programs are promoting a more expensive coverup for their failures that are just beginning to hatch.

Sen. Teddy Kennedy, introducing a measure he knows won't pass this year but which he hopes will be a major platform plank for him in a presidential race one of these days, has proposed what is called "national health insurance" to replace Medicare and Medicaid. To give you just an idea of what it would mean, Sen. Kennedy's plan would cost twice what the current plans cost.

Estimated on the basis of 1969 health care, the cost for one year would be 37 billion dollars.

Where would the money come from? Well, says Sen. Kennedy, 40 per cent would come from "general revenues" of the Federal government. The catch is that the general revenues do not produce enough to cover current expenditures—without national health insurance. An increase of about 15 billion dollars in general taxes would be required.

All right, what about the rest? He says 35 per cent would come from a tax on employers' payrolls, meaning the people who provide your paychecks would have less money to put into those paychecks since they would have it taxed away for this program.

Then for the 25 per cent of the cost that still would not be covered, Teddy Kennedy says he would tax your income at a rate of 2.1 per cent up to $15,000 a year.

And this would be just the beginning. Does this look like someone paying your hospital bill for you or does it look like another high-tax adventure in socialized medicine.

[From the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times Sept. 3, 1970]

THE HOSPITAL INCREASE

The price of a hospital bed in ward room at St. Luke's Hospital is now $38 a day under the $5 general increase effective on Tuesday. It is difficult to challenge the need for the increase since hospitals have not only been hit equally hard by inflation but they have been forced to close the gap on long-standing inadequate salary scales simply to find personnel. However, the disturbing question is how can the average person without Blue Cross protection afford to pay his medical bills without wiping out his life's gains? Despite being one of the most heavily saturated health insurance areas in the nation, about 55,000 people in Lehigh and Northampton counties alone are not covered by Blue Cross.

The soaring cost of medical care is the biggest factor that has given recent impetus to a drive to establish a national health insurance program. The 15 U.S. Senators who have introduced the necessary legislation are concerned by the mounting evidence that the nation's health needs are not being met fairly, equitably or efficiently. They are troubled also by the shortage of doctors, the lack of emphasis on preventive medicine, and the uneven manner in which available medical services are allocated to various segments of the public.

History shows that important social advances are not achieved suddenly. The nation debated the issue of Social Security for two decades before it decided it wasn't a wild-eyed dream. Unemployment compensation was dismissed for years as a socialist scheme of far left radicals. The same pattern prevailed in the drives to enact the program which we now call Medicare.

The national health insurance issue now enters a like period of study, discussion and impassioned controversy. The plan advocated in the Senate asks, in brief, an extension of the Medicare program to embrace the entire population rather than just those over 65. It would be financed out of special taxes, out of general revenue, or out of a combination of the two.

The reception to the Senate measure indicates that this is an idea whose time has not yet come. But the ball is in motion. As medical costs continue to soar more and more people will feel the impact. How soon the nation accepts the concept of national health insurance depends now on how fast medical services are priced out of reach of the average American.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Sept. 4, 1970]

TIME TO MOVE ON HEALTH CARE

There is nothing new about compulsory national health insurance. Its serious espousal goes back at least to the New Deal era, but Americans have always been persuaded that it wasn't needed or that it somehow was incompatible with our so-called free enterprise system. So what is so special about the health insurance bill introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy and a bipartisan group of 13 colleagues? What makes it special is that the notion of national health insurance is now acceptable to a far greater portion of the American public than ever before.

Medicare, which took almost 20 years to enact, paved the way, of course, as did medicaid. Millions of Americans have appreciated being rescued by medicare from a great financial burden. But perhaps the most important element is the realization that medical care is becoming inordinately expensive without any concomitant improvement in the availability or quality of the care. If this problem existed for only one segment of the population, the poor or the elderly, for example, then a special program would be in order, but the fact is that virtually every segment of the population is affected.

The statistics are by now familiar: One out of five Americans under the age of 65 had neither hospital nor surgical insurance in 1968; two out of three persons under 65 have no insurance for physicians' services rendered outside the hospital; health insurance in 1968 paid only 36 per cent of all consumer expenditures for health services, and at the rate at which private health insurance benefits are increasing it will be the year 2000 before insurance covers even two thirds of the nation's health care bill. Finally, in the past 10 years the consumer price index has risen 28 per cent, but, the outlay for health care has gone up 50 per cent.

Leaving aside the point that health care, like education, ought to be available to all as a matter of right, it is plain that the practical and equitable solution to the cost crisis is national insurance, a fact most other industrialized democracies recognized years ago. Under Senator Kennedy's bill, which is modeled on a plan advanced by the Committee for National Health Insurance, physicians' services, hospital services and most other health care would be paid for in full. The exceptions are for more nursing home care, mental illness, some dental care and some drugs and medical appliances.

Forty per cent of the financing would come from ordinary federal revenue, 35 per cent from an employers' payroll tax and 25 per cent from a tax on individual earnings up to $15,000 a year. The amount of the employer and individual taxes would vary with the funds required, but if the program had been operating in 1969, its sponsors say, expenditures would have amounted to 37 billion dollars, requiring an employer tax of 2.8 per cent and an individual tax of 1.8 per cent.

An important feature of the bill is provision for funds ($800,000,000 in the first year) to improve the health care system by training more health care personnel and providing various incentives to establish more efficient methods of providing health care. This program would become operative before the insurance went into effect, for it is evident that until the health care system is greatly enlarged and modernized it could not meet the increased demand the insurance would generate.

The Kennedy bill may not be the one finally enacted, but we are confident that the day when national health insurance proposals could be easily turned aside by special interest lobbyists has gone forever.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, Sept. 18, 1970]

IMPERSONAL HEALTH CARE PLAN OPPOSED

Sen. Roman L. Hruska, R-Neb., said Saturday that Americans will not stand for a national health insurance program which destroys the close personal relationship between the health practitioner and his patient.

Hruska commented on a proposed health care bill at the Nebraska Chiropractic Association convention held in Lincoln Saturday.

The $37 billion national bill would provide all hospital, medicine and physicians' costs be paid for all approved health facilities patients.

Dr. Howard C. Nelson of Columbus was introduced as chiropractor of the year.

Dr. C. H. Stohs of Grand Island, state association president, said that while Blue Cross-Blue Shield is now reimbursing insureds for X-rays taken in chiropractic treatment, they should also recognize payments for office visits.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Sept. 15, 1970]

HEALTH INSURANCE CALLED INEVITABLE

A system of national health insurance is "inevitable," Thomas M. Tierney, director of the Social Security Administration's Bureau of Health Insurance, said here Monday.

Tierney said such a system will be "complex and very costly," but that it probably is the best way to insure all Americans getting comparable health care services.

New solutions to the health manpower crisis must be found before a tax-based insurance program could work, he said.

Tierney spoke at one of the instructional workshops at the 72nd annual meeting of the American Hospital Association at the Astrohall.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Labor, Sept. 11, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE LABOR'S PRIME OBJECTIVE

A prime objective of the labor movement is the adoption of a national health insurance program through legislative action. Attainment of the objective by an act of congress next year seems quite possible.

The growing feeling for such a program has been shown in recent weeks by announcement of the Walter Reuther plan and by reports that Rep. Martha Griffiths, Michigan Democrat, will re-introduce a national health bill in the next congress—an improved version of a bill that last February was cosponsored by 20 congressmen.

The basic reason for pushing a national program now is that the costs of medical care are running wild and most Americans are ready for a change in the system. An indication of this was a recommendation by a task force appointed by President Nixon that Medicaid, which is a federal-state program, be replaced with a national health insurance program for the poor. The "catastrophic" costs of medical care will be cited in every hearing coming up.

A brief observation on words. "National health insurance" is the current term; it seems to provoke no over-reaction. The word "compulsory", included in discussions on the subject a few years ago, seems edited out. And nobody nowadays says "socialized medicine," because the American Medical Association succeeded in making that real bleepbleep.

But call it what they may, it's coming, we believe. People want insurance for medical care, and a national program would be better than the way things are. Here are some of the reasons why:

Under group insurance plans in which premiums are paid entirely by the employer, the insurance is cancelled when the worker leaves the employer for any reason. Under national insurance, the worker would be covered all the time.

Under voluntary plans, the healthy tend to stay out and the "least healthy" enter. This means the average risk and the premium must be higher than would be the case under insurance covering everybody.

Many people are uninsured now, including those who need insurance most—low-paid workers such as seasonal and transient workers who are not covered by group insurance and cannot afford individual policies.

The forms of voluntary health insurance are extremely varied. The rates of coverage vary considerably—in urban and rural areas, in geographic areas and among age groups. In contrast, public insurance would be uniform and comprehensive as it ought to be, easier to understand, more efficient, and cheaper, particularly since no expense would be needed to sell it—no advertisements, no commercials.

National insurance would accord with the medical profession's principle concerning medical care: to each according to his need, from each according to his ability to pay.

Underlying all the particular reasons for national health insurance is the fundamental fact that laissez-faire does not work. In the development of various social and economic measures to provide income in the absence of work and jobs, such as unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation and old age and survivor's insurance, there has been an increasing acceptance of the idea that the security of workers cannot rest upon their freedom of individual choice.

That freedom is the laissez-faire notion that the individual should be free to save for the future or buy various types of insurance or not, just as he pleases, but always assuming that he is able to do this, and that whether he does or not is a personal and not a social problem.

But more and more we see and understand that lack of foresight on the part of any private individual (and all the bad luck too, that he may run into) is far more a social than a private problem For example, the worker who does not save and insure against the future does not starve to death or die in sickness unattended. Society must support him in his time of need.

Hence society interferes by providing insurance for the individual in the most efficient ways it can. A principle seems to emerge that no individual should be allowed to make choices which may place the burden of his support and his family upon other workers, say, in locality.

It comes to this: Insurance for health and medical care should be handled on a national basis because it is a national social problem. And our society is competent to do it this way.

[From the Harrodsburg (Ky.) Herald Sept. 10, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

A bi-partisan group of fifteen Senators has introduced a bill to provide, for the first time, national health insurance for U. S. citizens of all ages, not just those over 65.

National health insurance is a government service voted into existence in practically every western democracy this century. Its proponents believe the United States is certain to eventually adopt it, as this country has adopted social security and Medicare.

Proponents argue there are still too many Americans, especially children, who cannot afford adequate medical and dental care. They estimate the cost of national health insurance at forty billions a year and the current bill would set up a Health Security Trust Fund to finance the program. Sixty per cent of the forty billions would come from special income and payroll taxes. The other forty per cent of needed fund would come from general tax revenue.

There seems little chance the proposed Health Security Act will be enacted by the current Congress. But having been introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy, national health insurance is certain to be an issue in the 1972 political campaign. (Of its fifteen sponsors, twelve were Democrats).

There are reports President Nixon is considering endorsing such a program by 1972, his aides have estimated the additional cost, over what the government now spends, as ten billion dollars. There is still strong opposition to the program but the President is reportedly concerned over the fact that too many Americans still lack really adequate medical and dental care. From the viewpoint of history, and the world trend, a good guess is that the nation will have some form of national health insurance before the end of the seventies.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, September 18, 1970]

HEALTH-CARE QUALITY AT STAKE: NATIONALIZATION OF MEDICINE IS THE "WRONG" PRESCRIPTION

Since Medicare was added to social-security benefits and Medicaid began providing health care to welfare recipients, it has been as certain as the next sunrise that an effort would be made to pull the rest of our population into some kind of government-sponsored, tax-supported medical program.

That hour has come. Legislation now is before Congress to create "National health insurance" covering all Americans from the cradle to the grave.

There is no denying that a crisis of serious proportions is overtaking the complex of doctors, hospitals, clinics and laboratories that has come to be known as the health-care industry.

The gap between the cost of medical care and our ability to pay it is widening. So is the gap between the medical needs of our population and the personnel and facilities available to meet those needs.

The decision to be made is whether we will seek to relieve that crisis within our tradition of private voluntary medical service or whether we will turn the whole problem over to the government.

It is the latter course that would be followed under the proposed Health Security Act introduced last month by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts with the cosponsorship of 15 Democratic and Republican senators. The plan follows recommendations of a committee for national health insurance organized by the late Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers.

The plan would sweep Medicare, Medicaid and the health care of every resident of the United States into a system to be administered like social security and financed by new payroll taxes and income taxes and from general federal revenues.

Medicare and Medicaid have put a crushing demand on health-care facilities that were overburdened to begin with. They have disclosed glaring opportunities for abuse. Their huge budgets have contributed to the inflation of medical costs and have proved inadequate to meet the demand for services which the two programs have stimulated.

[From the Torrance (Calif.), South Bay Breeze, Sept. 13, 1970]

THE CRADLE TO THE GRAVE

Since Medicare was added to Social Security benefits and Medicaid began providing health care to welfare recipients, it has been as certain as the next sunrise that an effort would be made to pull the rest of our population into some kind of government-sponsored, tax-supported medical program.

That hour has come. Legislation is now before Congress to create "National Health Insurance" covering all Americans from the cradle to the grave. The debate on this issue will be of profound significance, to our philosophies, involving our health, our pocketbooks and the future of the medical profession.

There is no denying that a crisis of serious proportions is overtaking the complex of doctors, hospitals, clinics and laboratories that has come to be known as the health care industry. The gap between the cost of medical care and our ability to pay it is widening. So is the gap between the medical needs of our population and the personnel and facilities available to meet those needs.

The decision to be made is whether we will seek to relieve that crisis within our tradition of private, voluntary medical service or whether we will turn the whole problem over to the government.

It is the latter course that would be followed under the proposed Health Security Act introduced last month by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts with the cosponsorship of 15 Democratic and Republican Senators. The plan follows recommendations of a committee for National Health Insurance organized by the late Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers.

The plan would sweep Medicare, Medicaid and the health care of every resident of the United States into a system to be administered like Social Security and financed by new payroll taxes and income taxes and from general federal revenues.

Our unhappy experience with Medicare and Medicaid should be argument enough that making government commitments to provide health care is not a solution to the problem—but part of the problem itself. Medicare and Medicaid have put a crushing demand on health care facilities that were overburdened to begin with. They have disclosed glaring opportunities for abuse. Their huge budgets have contributed to the inflation of medical costs and have

proved inadequate to meet the demand for services which the two programs have stimulated.

To attack the health crisis in a rational way means we must first bring the Medicare and Medicaid programs into manageable bounds and provide the doctors and other personnel and facilities to meet the present level of demand for health care. It is cynical to speak of the government's guaranteeing medical care for the entire population when the means of providing it are simply not at hand. The breakdown in the quality of care that would occur under such circumstances is frightening.

It is ironic that a nation which has made so many breakthroughs in medical research and technology should face such problems in delivering the end-product of medical science to those who need it. Experience should teach us, however, that greater nationalization of medicine—more commitments backed up by more tax money—is the wrong prescription.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Sept. 19, 1970]

UNCLE SAM IS NO DOCTOR

In Great Britain, it goes by the name of socialized medicine. In this country, which shrinks from the name, many persons find the concept fetching under a variety of aliases. National Health Insurance is one, and two bills now before Congress proposes to force this system on the public.

"The two bills are similar," as Congressional Quarterly observes. "They would provide health insurance for all Americans, financed largely through Social Security-type taxes on employers and employes and also from general federal revenues. Total cost is estimated at between $40 billion and $45 billion per year."

The price-tag alone ought to be sufficient to discourage efforts in this direction. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which consumes more money than any other federal department except Defense, spent $46 billion last year. National Health Insurance would effectively double the HEW budget, which already includes about $12 billion for Medicaid and Medicare.

Other objections have less to do with money than with the need to maintain high quality medical practice and research. The experience in other countries where the government has taken under its wing the healing arts is not of the sort to inspire much confidence. Medicine has tended to wither in these countries in the same way that many vigorous enterprises shrivel up when touched by the deadening hand of bureaucracy.

No one suggests that there do not exist in this country persons for whom adequate medical care is unavailable. Such persons do exist, especially in urban areas where slums contribute to disease and where medical facilities are greatly overtaxed.

The solution, however, is to provide for the unfortunate at government expense while allowing the vast majority of persons, who can afford private medical attention, to tend to their own health. This is not the solution proposed. What is proposed is that everyone be required to participate in a government-financed program of medical insurance, regardless of need.

Such a comprehensive, compulsory, and costly federal program of health insurance cannot be justified. A better plan would be something like the so-called "Medicredit" plan advanced by the American Medical Association. This provides tax incentives for private health insurance, with the government paying the costs for those persons paying less than $300 annually in federal taxes.

There remain those, however, who are determined to have Uncle Sam become everyone's family doctor. They are infected by the statist virus; in their fever they imagine that federal control endows every enterprise with magical properties. They are mistaken, as should be apparent from any study of American history—and of the American character.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Sept. 8, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE CAN'T COME TOO SOON

Among the world's major nations the United States enjoys a per capita income second to none. Although Americans spend twice as much for health services as do Swedes and Britons, they do not live longer than residents of those lands, and their infant mortality rates are higher. Survey after survey shows that in the categories of longevity and infant deaths, this society is behind at least a dozen others.

The United States is also the last major nation without a national health insurance system supervised and supported by government. Many Americans own private health insurance, but in the words of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, "Health insurance coverage in America today is more loophole than protection." For example, from 20 to 97 per cent of Americans ineligible to acquire medicare lack insurance needed to defray costs of one or more of the sundry health problems apt to arise before age 65, when they finally qualify for medicare.

Even those individuals having broad insurance coverage are finding their premium payments mounting while benefits shrink. In some states, not all by any means, low income families may enroll in medicaid programs. Such plans vary widely and rarely meet full costs. Middle-income families, moreover, have nothing save their own resources for health protection, and often in the event of serious and prolonged illness these resources are pitifully inadequate. Kidney transplants or treatment of leukemia can eat up an insurance policy and then wipe out the life savings of a moderately well-to-do couple in very short order.

For these and other reasons equally disturbing it has become clear to most Americans that their hodgepodge health care system is a failure. And the solution isn't wholly money. Great Britain and Sweden, as aforementioned, spend per capita far lesser sums on health than does the U.S. Yet their health services are as excellent and, what is perhaps more important, they are accessible to all, which they are assuredly not here. The Lord knows how many Americans in need of hospitalization or a doctor's attention each year are neglected.

Two weeks ago 15 senators introduced legislation establishing a Health Security Program designed to pay three-quarters of the health care costs of all Americans. Excluded from the plan are some dental, psychiatric, nursing home and drug expenses, but just about every other conceivable type of medical cost is covered.

The bill won't be enacted this congressional session or the next. Nevertheless, no less an authority than Wilbur Cohen, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who originated and was the prime mover of medicare has forecast national health insurance "a lot quicker than most people realize." The truth is national health insurance can't come into being too quickly for most Americans. The situation is that critical.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Financial World, Sept. 16, 1970]

TO YOUR HEALTH

It's difficult to be against good health and "insurance" has a certain sanctified ring in American semantics. So when former Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Wilbur Cohen says of national health insurance, "It's going to come—it may take two, five or even ten years out it's coming, and coming a lot quicker than most people realize," it's hard to disagree.

The problem this poses is what kind of plan. Liberals in the Senate, headed by the senior member from Massachusetts, are pushing an insurance set-up which, if in operation today, would cost an estimated $40 billion a year. They would foot such a bill with more payroll levies. How this is to be borne atop such taxes already burdening employer and employee is apparently not important to the ambitious Democrats.

In contrast, the American Medical Association has a program with an elaborate system of tax credits for those who presumably can afford to pay medical bills and subsidies to these who obviously cannot. What this would do to a tax structure already twisted beyond the understanding of all but the cleverest circumnavigator has not even been suggested.

The only point all these people make is that the United States is the richest country in the world and that we spend more than other people on health. (No one stops to wonder how this is measured; it's assumed the yardsticks are correct because they are used.) Yet, Britishers and Swedes, for example, are said to live longer and have healthier babies.

The President has a commission studying the subject. If we've got to have this medicine, let's not be pushed into taking patent nostrums; let's wait at least until the consultants come in with their report.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Sept. 17, 1970]

NATION MOVES TOWARD HEALTH PLAN

WASHINGTON, September 16.—The medical bill for each American came to about $294 in 1969—double what it was a decade ago and still rising.

The skyrocketing costs of medical care are sharpening interest in proposals for a national health insurance system under which the federal government would help pay the medical bills for all Americans.

Although a national health insurance program has no chance of being enacted in 1970, members of Congress have readied legislation for a debate on the issue in the 92nd Congress, according to Congressional Quarterly, a private research organization.

Representative Martha W. Griffiths (D-Mich.) introduced an AFL-CIO-sponsored national health insurance bill in February. Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) Aug. 27 led a bipartisan group of 15 senators in proposing a Health Security program, based on the recommendations of the Committee for National Health Insurance.

The committee was appointed in November 1968 by the late Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, and assigned the task of recommending a national health insurance plan.

The two bills are similar. They would provide health insurance for all Americans, financed largely through Social Security-type taxes on employers and employes and also from general federal revenues. Total cost is estimated at between 40 billion and 45 billion dollars per year.

Even the American Medical Association—long a foe of what it has considered "socialized medicine"—has proposed reform of health insurance. Its "Medicredit" plan was introduced in the House July 21 by Richard Fulton (D-Tenn.) and Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.).

Under "Medicredit," Americans would receive tax credits for their purchase of health insurance. Health insurance for families paying under $300 annually in federal taxes would be financed by the Government.

Adding to the impetus for health care reform was a June 30 report by an administration task force on Medicaid and related programs.

Under the existing health system, the task force said, "millions of consumers get care on a hit-or-miss basis."

The result, the panel said, is "rising dissatisfaction."

Although the report did not specifically propose a national program, its chairman, Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association, said the task force considered such a program a desirable goal.

When the Social Security Act was being debated in 1935, many of its supporters wanted a health insurance plan to be included in its provisions.

President Truman in November 1945 proposed a comprehensive, prepaid medical insurance plan for persons of all ages to be financed through a four per cent raise in Social Security taxes.

Mr. Truman repeated his proposal but the plan got no further than congressional hearings. The Medicare program for the elderly and the Medicaid program for the needy are partial responses to pressures for health care financed by the government.

Medicare and Medicaid have themselves helped to spur efforts at health reform. They have been factors in rising health costs by giving more people access to an already overburdened health system.

President Nixon proposed replacing Medicaid with a wholly federal program. The new plan would require Americans to pay part of their health insurance cost on a sliding scale based on income.

Medical costs per person averaged $294 in 1969, more than double the cost in 1960. Expenditures for physicians' services alone rose nine per cent.

Hospital room costs are expected to rise by 44 per cent, to $100 a day, by 1973. In some large cities like New York and Boston, they have already reached that amount.

The bill sponsored by Mrs. Griffiths would replace Medicare and Medicaid with a program of comprehensive health care.

The measure emphasizes contractual arrangements between the government and prepaid group insurance plans because Mrs. Griffiths believes that prepaid group health provides health care at lower cost than other forms of insurance. The proposal does, however, permit doctors to continue fee-for-service arrangements, if they prefer.

Coverage would include unlimited hospitalization; physician services, including surgery, subject to a $2 cost-sharing charge per visit after the first visit; preventive care and physical examination, nursing home care without limits; home health services subject to a $2 charge per visit; prescription drugs; eye care; and comprehensive dental services for all children under 16 subject to a $2 cost-sharing charge per visit after the first visit.

The plan would be financed under the Social Security program with employers paying three per cent of pay roll, employes, one per cent of pay roll and the federal government matching the contributions of the employers.

The Human Security Act in the Senate would cover all health services "required for personal health," with the exception of custodial, psychiatric and dental care, and some drugs and medical appliances. Doctors and hospitals would be compensated for their services by the program—either on a fee-for-service or retainer basis.

Financing for the program would be through a Health Security Trust Fund similar to the Social Security Trust Fund. A 3.5 per cent tax on employer pay rolls would provide 35 per cent of the fund; a 2.1 per cent tax on individual incomes up to $15,000 would add another 25 per cent; and federal general revenues would contribute the remaining 40 per cent.

[From the Waukegan (Ill.) News Sun, Sept. 16, 1970]

CRISIS NEARING IN U.S. HEALTH COSTS

(By Edward Neilan)

WASHINGTON.—It used to be a joke when someone said, "The most dramatic moment in medicine is presenting the bill."

Not so many people are laughing any more.

Hospital and health care costs are soaring while services are declining. Congressmen, citizen organizations and the public in general are clamoring for better medical care at a cost that is reasonable.

For millions of Americans, a visit to the hospital for any length of time can mean going broke or at least going into debt.

There seems to be a drift toward the type of solution used in virtually every other major western nation: Adoption of a national health plan.

The Federal government is already deeply involved in medical aid, financing for the elderly, veterans and the poor. But there is a rising crescendo of complaints that the effort is not enough.

Spokesmen for senior citizen groups, especially, complain that Medicare and Medicaid programs are not efficiently administered.

The growing push for a comprehensive medical plan is countered by arguments that it is "another step toward Socialism."

There are already several national health program bills before Congress and there is reason to believe the lawmakers might come to grips with the problem by early 1971.

Even the American Medical Association, which is steadfastly opposed to broad federal intervention in medicine, concedes that something must be done. The AMA, in fact, is endorsing one type of comprehensive health plan that would be tied to income tax levels.

None of the plans now languishing in draft form on Capitol Hill spell out precisely the form a national health plan might take.

But the volume of talk about need for improvements and the number of bills already put forward indicates that changes in health care are in the wind.

Medical costs have simply been getting out of hand. The accompanying conclusion is that although the U.S. is trying to do a better job of delivering health care, the quality of medical care is slipping.

The total health bill for Americans this year will be about $61 billion. This will be nearly 7 per cent of the gross national product, a greater slice of the national resource pie than any other country puts into health care.

The national bill per person for medical goods and services will be just short of $300 per year in 1971, more than double what it was 10 years ago.

And the costs continue to rise. Since 1966 the cost of health care has been escalating at an average annual rate of 7 per cent, considerably above the rate of increase of other consumer prices.

But for all this expenditure, the United States has been slipping behind other nations in the key gauges of national health.

In infant mortality, for example, the U.S. now ranks 14th, behind many Western European countries.

Men live longer in 17 other countries than they do in the United States. Women live longer in 10 other nations.

There is no disputing that the United States is among the world leaders in medical research and that some American hospitals are the best in the world. But the problem seems to be getting this excellence out in the masses at a cost that is acceptable.

The medical profession contends, and with some reason, that it is not completely to blame.

There are social, economic, cultural and even environmental factors at work on the deceptive statistics. Americans may work harder, for example, than some of the Europeans whose countries have better looking statistics.

It is also obvious that statistics covering the millions of Negroes who live in poverty have lowered the overall U.S. health profile.

But even allowances for such glaring conclusion that something is lacking in the U.S. Health care system.

Sweden, by comparison, seems to be able to make national health care work. That country spends 5 per cent of its GNP on health services and gets in return better medical care, lower infant mortality, longer life expectancy and fewer people dying during their productive years.

Ironically, Medicare and Medicaid programs have contributed to the spiraling cost of health care. These programs were not supposed to increase the costs of health care to other patients. But that has been the result.

And the poor and the elderly, despite the fact that plans are already in force to help them, continue to be the big losers.

It is, as some cynics claim, cheaper to die than to become seriously ill.

Since the beginning of 1966, doctors' fees have leaped 29 per cent and hospital charges have gone up 59 per cent.

National health plans as adopted by other nations are not foolproof; they all have problems of one kind or another.

The challenge to the United States would appear to be to turn some of its talents and abilities at management and systems control to delivering medical care to the patient at a cost that is reasonable either to a private budget or on some comprehensive health program or combination of both.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express, Sept. 19, 1970]

CONGRESS SHAPES NEW HEALTH PLAN

(By Barbara Coleman)

WASHINGTON.—The medical bill for each American came to about $294 in 1969—double what it was a decade ago and still rising.

Although a national health insurance program has no chance of being enacted in 1970, members of Congress have readied legislation for an intensive debate on the issue in the 92d Congress.

Rep. Martha W. Griffiths, D-Mich., in February introduced an AFL–CIO-sponsored national health insurance bill. On Aug. 27 Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., led a bipartisan group of 15 senators in proposing a health security program, based on the recommendations of the Committee for National Health Insurance.

The committee was appointed in November 1968 by the late Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, and assigned the task of recommending a national health insurance plan.

The two bills are similar. They would provide health insurance for all Americans, financed largely through Social Security-type taxes on employers and employes and also from general federal revenues. Total cost is

estimated at between $40 billion and $45 billion per year.

Even the American Medical Association—long a foe of what it has considered "socialized medicine"—has proposed reform of health insurance. Medicare and Medicaid have themselves helped to spur efforts at health reform. They have been factors in rising health costs by giving more people access to an already overburdened health system. Inefficiencies and excessive costs have resulted in many cases from loose controls in the programs.

President Nixon June 10 proposed replacing Medicaid, which is financed jointly by the federal government and the states, with a wholly federal program. The new plan would be integrated with the administration welfare reform plan, Family Assistance. Recipients would be required to pay part of their health insurance cost on a sliding scale based on income.

Government officials and health professionals agree that the nation faces a health crisis.

In 1969, expenditures for physicians' services alone rose 9 per cent over the previous year.

Hospital room costs are expected to rise by 44 per cent, to $100 a day, by 1973. In some large cities like New York and Boston, they have already reached that amount.

Health care is a major business in the United States—one that generated expenditures of $60.3 billion in fiscal 1969 or 6.3 per cent of the gross national product. The total was $12.9 billion in 1950.

The bill sponsored by Mrs. Griffiths would replace Medicare and Medicaid with a program of comprehensive health care for all Americans.

The measure emphasizes contractual arrangements between the federal government and prepaid group insurance plans because Mrs. Griffiths believes that prepaid group health provides health care at lower cost than other forms of insurance. The proposal would, however, permit doctors to continue fee-for-service arrangements.

Coverage would include:

Unlimited hospitalization; physician services, including surgery, subject to a $2 cost-sharing charge per visit after the first visit; preventive care and physical examinations; nursing home care without limits; home health services subject to a $2 charge per visit; prescription drugs; eye care; and comprehensive dental services for all children under 16 subject to a $2 cost-sharing charge per visit after the first visit.

[From the Boston (Mass.), Evening Globe, Sept. 13, 1970]

TOP OFFICIAL HITS HEALTH INSURERS

(By Richard Knox)

The Nixon Administration's top health official, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, scolded the nation's private health insurers here yesterday for delaying money-saving reforms.

Egeberg, assistant secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, specifically criticized the health insurance industry for lags in providing payment mechanisms for out-of-hospital diagnostic tests.

Most health insurance policies require patients undergoing tests to enter the hospital before the tests will be covered, a feature which Egeberg said is needlessly wasteful of expensive hospital resources.

"This was a problem when I was practicing medicine in the 1930s and it's still a problem," said the HEW official.

Dr. Egeberg's remarks came during an appearance at a conference on "Changing Opportunities in the Health Care Industry," sponsored by Contemporary Issues, an affiliate of Business Equities Corp. of Boston.

During his prepared address, Dr. Egeberg outlined the administration's efforts to impose order on a burgeoning health care industry which is expected to absorb $100 billion a year by the end of the decade—compared with less than $1 billion in 1960.

He said legislation, now before the Senate, would "put teeth in the comprehensive planning concept by requiring prior approval of major capital expenditures as a condition of reimbursement under Medicare, Medicaid and maternal and child health programs."

These and other Federal health programs account for about one-third of all the money paid each year for hospital and medical expenses, he said.

Another proposal would authorize prepaid health care plans under Medicare. The new plan is known as "Health Maintenance Organization," Dr. Egeberg said. This "would undoubtedly help pave the way for a marked rise in the acceptability of prepaid group practice," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post-Times-Herald, Sept. 17, 1970]

HEW AIDE LAUDS BILL FOR U.S. INSURANCE

(By Stuart Auerbach)

A top administration health official has praised a proposed cradle-to-grave national health insurance program.

In an analysis of the plan, introduced in Congress by a bipartisan team of senators, Dr. Vernon H. Wilson went further than other Department of Health, Education and Welfare officials in applauding a federally financed plan to provide near-complete medical care delivery problems.

He said many of its principles "parallel proposals which we have been engaged in formulating" in HEW's Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

"In summary," Wilson wrote HEW Assistant Secretary Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, "the Health Security Program is a well-conceived thoughtfully prepared, comprehensive and integrated approach to solving many of the nation's health care delivery problems."

Wilson, head of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, is the No. 3 health official in HEW.

His memo to Egeberg surfaced just a week before the Senate Health Subcommittee will hold two days of hearings on the proposal, which was introduced by 15 senators, including Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex). and John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.)

The bill is based on a proposal unveiled in July by the Committee for National Health Insurance, an organization sponsored by the United Auto Workers union. Timing of the Senate hearings should make health insurance a prime issue in the November congressional elections.

Under the bill, national health insurance would go into effect in 1973. It would cover almost all medical expenses with the exception of some nursing home care, mental illness, dentists and some drugs and medical appliances.

On the basis of 1969 expenditures, the program would cost $37 billion a year. This would leave Americans with a $16 billion annual doctor bill.

Plainly angry that his private communication to Egeberg had been leaked, Wilson described his memo as his "professional first response" to the proposal.

"It isn't an endorsement of anything," he said. "I could very well change my mind."

Wilson especially praised the comprehensive nature of the program, its emphasis on creating pre-paid group practice systems, the involvement of consumers and the insistence of minimum quality standards for participants.

He also applauded the establishment of a Resources Development Fund which would begin trying to improve the health care system even before 1973, when the insurance benefits would start.

But Wilson found some parts of the program—especially its starting date—"questionable." Three years, he said, is not long enough "to effect the major changes and improvements to meet the added demands.

This has been Egeberg's main argument against national health insurance plans. He has said repeatedly that the nation needs more medical manpower and a better system for delivering health care before it can take care of the added demands that a national health insurance plan would bring.

This squares with current administration policy, which sees a national health insurance program somewhere in the future—but not as soon as the Senate proposal.

[From the Oakland (Calif.), East Bay Labor Journal, Sept. 11, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

National health insurance now is before both houses of Congress with introduction of a bill by Senator Edward M. Kennedy and 14 other Senators.

Representative Martha Griffin's bill has been in the House for months and has attracted significant support from the nation.

We agree with Senator Kennedy's comment as his measure went into the hopper:

"Health care is the fastest growing failing business in the nation—a $63,000,000,000 industry which fails to meet the urgent needs of our people."

Health care costs go in only one direction—up. While American medical science is far ahead of other nations, health care is not reaching many who need it.

The reason is an outmoded method of distributing care plus its out of reach prices.

National health insurance is a must. We note that even the American Medical Association, which battled Medicare tooth and nail, has its own version.

This should be adequate proof that it realizes the people now demand national health insurance.

[From the San Diego (Calif.), Union, Sept. 13, 1970]

FACILITIES ALREADY JAMMED: NEW HEALTH PLAN IMPRACTICAL

Since Medicare was added to Social Security benefits and Medicaid began providing health care to welfare recipients, it has been as certain as the next sunrise that an effort would be made to pull the rest of our population into some kind of government-sponsored, tax-supported medical program.

That hour has come. Legislation is now before Congress to create "national health insurance" covering all Americans from the cradle to the grave. The debate on this issue will be of profound signficance, involving our philosophies, our health, our pocketbooks and the future of the medical profession.

There is no denying that a crisis of serious proportions is overtaking the complex of doctors, hospitals, clinics and laboratories that has come to be known as the health care industry. The gap between the cost of medi-

cal care and our ability to pay it, is widening. So is the gap between the medical needs of our population and the personnel and facilities available to meet those needs.

The decision to be made is whether we will seek to relieve that crisis within our tradition of private, voluntary medical service or whether we will turn the whole problem over to the government.

It is the latter course that would be followed under the proposed Health Security Act introduced last month by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts with the cosponsorship of 15 Democrat and Republican senators. The plan follows recommendations of a Committee for National Health Insurance organized by the late Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers.

The plan would sweep Medicare, Medicaid and the health care of every resident of the United States of America into a system to be administered like Social Security and financed by new payroll taxes and income taxes and from general federal revenues.

Our unhappy experience with Medicare and Medicaid should be argument enough that making government commitments to provide health care is not a solution to the problem—but part of the problem itself. Medicare and Medicaid have put a crushing demand on health care facilities that were overburdened to begin with. They have disclosed glaring opportunities for abuse. Their huge budgets have contributed to the inflation of medical costs and have proved inadequate to meet the demand for services which the two programs have stimulated.

To attack the health crisis in a rational way, we must first bring the Medicare and Medicaid programs into manageable bounds and provide the doctors, hospitals and other personnel and facilities to meet the present level of demand for health care. It is cynical to speak of the government guaranteeing medical care for the entire population when the means of providing it are simply not at hand. The breakdown in the quality of care that could occur under such circumstances is frightening.

It is ironic that a nation which has made so many breakthroughs in medical research and technology should face such problems in delivering the end-product of medical science to those who need it. Experience should teach us, however, that greater nationalization of medicine—more commitments backed up by more tax money—is the wrong prescription.

[From the Schenectady (N.Y.), Union-Star, Sept. 17, 1970]

ELLIS' DR. GRAHAM PREDICTS NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

The advent of "some form of national health insurance is probably inevitable" during the 1970s, according to Dr. George W. Graham, executive director of Ellis Hospital, Schenectady, and immediate past president of the American Hospital Association.

Speaking this week at the association's 72nd annual convention in Houston, Texas, Dr. Graham said, "Increasing numbers of groups and legislators are publishing their thoughts on what a national health insurance program should be."

He added, "There are proposals which distinguish between service programs, which restructure the health delivery system around group practices and insurance proposals which preserve the role of private practice."

Although the proposals differ "in scope and intent," Dr. Graham said, "much public pressure will be brought upon government to make our health care system one that provides comprehensive quality care for every American, no matter where he lives; does not bankrupt the patient, is readily accessible, is continuously available, is responsive to change and is patient-oriented in nature, as opposed to disease-oriented."

The association, Dr. Graham said, "has much work ahead in the health field if we are to meet these expectations of the future. Unless we work diligently at it, these expectations will be met by a health care system devised, regulated and supported from outside our present one."

Dr. Graham added that the "future development of health care programs does involve soul searching . . . , what we have and what we should have in bringing about what we all deem is absolutely essential for the welfare of our country—a fully comprehensive health care system. If we do this well, we can answer our critics who harangue us continually with statements that the United States is terribly low on life expectancy, high in infant mortality and maternal morbidity and mortality, and other not so happy health statistics seemingly strange for such an affluent and progressive country."

The future role of the hospital and its leaders, Dr. Graham said, "will be dictated, to a large degree, by changing forces external to the institution," and he added that government, "already the largest purchaser of health services, will gain increasing influence in health care affairs."

The voluntary hospital industry, Dr. Graham said, "is not going to meet these forces and solve the task alone. We must seek constantly every avenue of coordination and cooperation we can, joining with all the many health-related organizations interested in our one goal—to better serve the health needs of the people."

The voluntary hospital, "in spite of the inroads of government into its operations, still epitomizes the humanitarian instincts of our people," Dr. Graham said, adding, "The answer to the future of the voluntary hospital will lie in the service given to the public. If the voluntary hospital system can give conclusive proof that such a system is more efficient, more economical, more community minded and contains more of the milk of human kindness, the public will insist upon its retention and give it full support."

He said government involvement in the hospital industry "was inevitable—that is, society as a whole had to become involved in providing supplementary support to our increasingly complex and costly health care services—a situation that even our great system of private philanthropy is finding hard to cope with, as these increasing social responsibilities demand greater outlays of money."

Dr. Graham also said, "We have lived through a period of intensified involvement of government in health affairs and truly demonstrated our ability to meet the needs of government health planners—for example, through the Medicare program—better than many people prophesied.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette, Sept. 19, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN NEEDED

Some kind of national health care plan is a certainty in the Seventies. And for many, many Americans who are old and poor, it can't come soon enough.

An estimated 24 million Americans under 65 have no health insurance at all. About 60 million have no coverage for in-hospital medical expenses. For large numbers of families, serious illness can mean instant poverty.

Private and group medical plans and such government programs as Medicare and Medicaid have helped ease the crisis in the health field, but pressure to expand coverage and broaden the range is rising.

Sen. Edward Kennedy's proposed legislation would cover all citizens over the entire range of health services except for certain nursing home care, mental and dental treatment and some medicines and equipment.

The program would be financed through a trust fund. Income would be derived from federal general revenues, a tax on individual income.

Kennedy says his bill would not create a national health service of government-owned facilities and government-employed doctors. And, "with only four exceptions, there are no restrictions on needed services, no cut off points, no deductibles, and no waiting periods."

Inflation has played a leading role in the health care crisis. The cost of medical treatment has gone up 27 per cent in four years; the cost of a semi-private hospital room has gone up 88 per cent in eight years.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is only one of several groups undertaking new studies of the nation's health care needs and programs.

The poor, the old, those on fixed incomes, the unemployed—these are among the people hit hardest by inflation and soaring medical costs. Whatever the merits and demerits of Kennedy-type approaches to the problem, something is needed if all Americans are to receive maximum value for their health dollar and those not now covered are to receive the same health care as others.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Sept. 21, 1970]

HEALTH CARE: IT HAS TO WORK

Twice within a fortnight, the nation has been told in desperate terms of the sad state of its health care services.

"As I see the problems, they are awful," said Roger O. Egeberg, assistant secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, virtually repeating the words of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy when he introduced a bill for national health insurance.

The big difference between the position taken by the Nixon Administration, as defined by Dr. Egeberg, and that of advocates of national insurance, exemplified by Sen. Kennedy, is that the former calls for study and the latter for action.

Dr. Egeberg says he is no longer frustrated but is now optimistic that the President has determined to do what is necessary to make this country healthier than any other country in the world.

The U.S. has a long way to go to reach this goal. It ranks 13th in infant mortality among industrialized nations, seventh in maternal mortality, 18th in life expectancy for men and 11th in life expectancy for women.

Even admitting these failures is a major hurdle crossed. There was a time not long ago when the medical profession insisted that U.S. health care was superior to that found anywhere, and people paid their money and took their pills, if they could afford to.

Americans spend about $62 billion a year for medical care, more than any other nation.

That was the rub. American medical science is the most advanced, and medical care the best—for those who can afford it. But even with private health and hospitalization

insurance, the cost has become impossible for many to bear. They put off examinations which might have prevented illness, endure pain or sacrifice other needs.

The plan offered by Senator Kennedy to establish nation health insurance, not a national health service, would, he says, provide highest quality care for the total population through a trust fund derived from payroll taxes and general federal revenue.

Dr. Egeberg has not revealed what specific programs HEW will recommend to the White House. He is opposed to adopting national health insurance before the medical care system is set up to handle the extra load.

As debate ensues on the Kennedy Bill and HEW's eventual proposals, it is vital that the medical profession's traditional antipathy toward "socialized medicine" does not obscure the issue. Something dramatic must be done to lower the rates of illness, disability and mortality, and to check spiraling costs.

That something may be uniquely American, but it has to work.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Labor Press, Sept. 3, 1970]

THE DOCTOR'S IMAGE

The July issue of the Rehabilitation and Health Newsletter contains two interesting items on the same page.

One tells about a modest government appropriation of $432,000 to establish an inner-city group practice of doctors and dentists to aid in alleviating medical and dental problems in the core.

On the same page, another story tells of recent action by the American Medical Association which approved a five-year $10 million public relations campaign to "improve the image of the American doctor".

In other words, to fight national health insurance.

It is ironic that there is so little money to alleviate suffering by the poor in the ghetto area, but no problem to appropriate millions to preserve the status quo of the medical profession.

These two sets of figures again establish the inescapable conclusion that the only way to meet the American health crisis is through a national health program.

[From the Bloomsburg (Pa.), Press, Sept. 16, 1970]

NEXT HEALTH STEP

The national health insurance bill, presented by Senator Kennedy on behalf of a bipartisan group of 14 senators, stands no chance of passage at this session of Congress, but it undoubtedly is coming, perhaps within four or five years.

It will come simply because the cost of medical care has gone so high that few families can afford a serious illness. This is true despite the assistance given by Medicare and Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Provision of prescription drugs under Medicare may come sooner. Private health insurance plans are out of reach of millions.

Americans get less for their money than citizens in other highly technologically advanced nations. The United States ranks first in the total and per capital amount spent on health and medical care. But in return for a yearly investment of $63 billions or $294 per person, America ranks 13th in infant survival, 13th in maternal survival and 18th in male life expectancy. Sweden, which ranks first in the field of national health, spends $45 a year less per person than does the United States.

Not all medical problems will be solved by a national health insurance program and a rapid plunge into such an endeavor might worsen the problem. It will be wise to study what has been done elsewhere and select the best.

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe, Sept. 17, 1970]

HEALTH CARE PATH

In the few years that federal medicine has existed in this nation, costs have zoomed many times over what they were predicted to reach to this time. Also costs of private health insurance plans have increased to the point where they now are major items on family budgets. Hence, many Americans pay higher taxes to underwrite mushrooming government programs, while paying the necessary higher costs of their private insurance.

The out-of-control expenses of medicare and medicaid should raise a big question mark as to whether federal medicine is the answer to problems of America's medical care. Allan C. Brownfeld writes in Private Practice that any shortcomings in the delivery of medical care are not a result of the system of private practice. For under this system Americans have probably the best and most advanced health care in the world.

Against this background of progress under private plans but runaway costs under government programs, there's good reason to look askance at health insurance schemes that have been, or will be soon, introduced in Congress. The one recently presented by Senator Ted Kennedy is a case in point.

This national health plan would in effect bring socialized medicine to the United States. There would be no partial socialized influence on medicine and health care as experienced during the second half of the Sixties. But proposed government cradle-to-grave health protection would be total, while disregarding how the great advancements made under private programs came about.

Americans should ponder long and carefully as to which path is wise to follow in future health care, remembering meanwhile the sorry record scored so far while trodding the federal government health protection path.

[From the Levittown-Bristol (Pa.), Courier-Times, Sept. 16, 1970]

AS BLUE AS BLUE SHIELD

There is a physician we know of in Lower Bucks County who has grown gray in the service of his patients, who is dedicated to giving them the best possible care and who a few weeks ago put a salve on an incidental patient's minor burn, bandaged it and billed Blue Shield for $15 for "surgery".

Not long after that a bill was delivered at this patient's home revealing that the cost of Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage had gone up again—20 per cent this time and a full 100 per cent within the past four years.

Cause and effect? Not in this isolated instance, surely, but multiply that instance a hundred times across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and without doubt this is a factor.

Most of our physicians are scrupulously honest and above any such step. Unfortunately, they are doing nothing through their professional organizations to police their ranks.

The cost of health insurance is increasing so seriously that it is now beyond reach for many an individual; adequate health care without it is beyond the reach of thousands of persons.

A national health insurance program has been introduced in the Senate by 15 members; it will be enormously expensive but it could be one answer.

Socialized medicine could be another answer.

Both are steps toward socialism and toward more and more governmental regulation over what up to now has been private concern. But one or the other will be esssential unless there is a drastic turnabout in the approach that is taken by professionals to those escalating costs.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press, Sept. 15, 1970]

GETTING DOCTORS TOGETHER

However unlikely it might have seemed five years ago, both Congress and leaders in the medical profession are now promoting the idea that doctors should practice in medical groups.

Historically, doctors have been loners—treating patients their own way, keeping their own books and generally mistrusting anything that sounded even vaguely like "socialized medicine."

But the Senate passed a bill the other day that would authorize health insurance companies serving federal employes to offer prepaid medical care to anyone who wanted it. Involved in this was a frank attempt to bring doctors together into medical groups offering a wide range of services at reasonable cost.

The same day the Senate acted, the president of the American Medical Association suggested that both the AMA and the federal government help young doctors set up group practice clinics, especially in areas where doctors are in short supply.

Earlier this year, the House approved changes in Medicare and Medicaid that would encourage doctors, hospitals and insurance companies to set up broad medical groups offering prepaid health care to patients of all kinds.

The family doctor concept was perfectly valid only when specialists were rare and fees were modest. And it still is valid for families that have both the access to treatment and the means to pay for it.

But the doctor shortage and the high cost of hospitalization have made new forms of medical care almost mandatory. Getting doctors to pool their skills is a good way to start.

[From the (Washington, D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 3, 1970]

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE MOVES ONTO CENTER STAGE

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Suddenly, and unexpectedly, a new political issue (national health insurance) has been drawn that could well affect the outcome of the next presidential election.

Public support for some kind of a national health system has been gathering such momentum in the last year or two, that until several days ago few in Washington guessed that the administration was about to declare an all-out, undisguised war on the proposal. Yet it has; and the reaction has been swift and sharp. The fight is on.

Several weeks ago, a formal bill to provide cradle-to-grave medical service to all Americans by 1973 was introduced by a group of 15 senators, and it is this bill that the administration has abruptly opened fire on. Senator Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., one of the chief sponsors, now predicts that the proposal will become the "hottest" domestic issue in Congress early next year—and, if that happens, perhaps the hottest domestic campaign issue in the 1972 election.

The administration's strategy is, for several reasons, puzzling even to Republican congressional leaders. First, the health bill, while primarily Democratic, has bipartisan support, with Senator John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky., and Senator William Saxbe, R-Ohio, among the cosponsors. Second, Nixon's Family Assistance Plan, providing a minimum national income, which the administration is pushing so hard, is every bit as "radical" as the health plan, and much less popular.

Finally, if there is a sure way of reuniting labor at one stroke behind the Democratic party, opposition to national health protection is it. It is a strange strategy for an administration which is obviously trying to cultivate organized labor and lure blue-collar workers into the GOP.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, lost no time making it clear how strongly he feels about the legislation. After a round of golf at Washington's Burning Tree with his new chum, President Nixon, Meany dashed to Capitol Hill to tell a Senate committee that labor is prepared to do anything short of an illegal act to put over the health plan—regardless of how the White House feels. The United Auto Workers, who defected from the AFL–CIO three years ago, are even more ardently behind the bill, as are all the other independent unions.

It had been assumed in political circles that if the administration did not embrace some kind of federally funded health program of its own, it would at least be cautious, if not ambiguous, in its opposition to the newly introduced one. They were surprised, therefore, when an administration spokesman, John G. Veneman, undersecretary of health, education and welfare, promptly denounced the proposal as neither "a proper or workable approach to the health problems of this nation." The administration, he said flatly, was against it.

The sponsors are indignant over Veneman's assertion that the plan would cost $77 billion in its first year of operation. Veneman was accused of using this figure for "shock value" in trying to kill the program. Leonard Woodcock, the new head of the United Auto Workers, accused the administration of a "shabby trick" in grossly exaggerating the cost of the plan. The sponsors estimate a cost of roughly $57 billion, as against the $61 billion going for the inadequate, unplanned care Americans now receive.

Briefly, the bill would establish a vastly broadened Medicare plan for Americans of all ages. This insurance would pay about 75 percent of all their medical expenses. It would be run by a new federal agency like the Social Security Administration, and would be funded by general tax revenues and contributions from both employees and employers.

It is easy to see why union leaders are lining up so firmly behind the proposal, for, as Meany has just told the Senate, they are feeling "pressure from the bottom." Like Kennedy, Meany sees the plan becoming a paramount issue in coming elections, with the American working man solidly behind it.

After World War II, support for government-financed medical care played a key part in the British Labor party regaining power. This immensely popular reform could likewise benefit the Democrats in 1972 if Nixon continues his opposition without offering an acceptable alternative.

THE IRS AND PUBLIC INTEREST LAW FIRMS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service recently announced that it is reconsidering the tax deductible status of gifts to any new public interest law firm or other private organization which sues on behalf of consumer interests or the environment. It is possible, then, that gifts to groups who pursue this type of litigation on a nonprofit basis will no longer be tax deductible. Since in many instances gifts are the only source of revenue for public interest law firms, the risk is there that they will disappear from the American scene as the tax deduction serves as a strong incentive for charitable donations.

Because of the public outcry that followed an accompanying temporary suspension of tax deductible status of such gifts, the IRS has announced that interim gifts before the final decision is made would be deductible so long as the grants are for "support for current operations under the rulings." While this is a welcome development, it is temporary only and limited in scope. New funding for long-range commitments was discouraged and the risk is still present that the IRS will deny the tax exempt status that many feel is warranted.

One of the healthiest developments in American jurisprudence in the last few years has been the appearance of the public-interest law firm. Young men and women are now devoting their legal careers to the pursuit of the diffuse interests of the public, rather than the highly specialized and more lucrative interests of the business establishment. Rather than discouraging this trend, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should do what we can to encourage it. Interests that have never had a real voice in any decision-making arena in this country are finally finding outlet in the courts.

Recently Senators HART and McGOVERN, along with many of my colleagues in the House, cosponsored with me the Environmental Protection Act of 1970. This bill is designed to encourage developing environmental litigation by doing away with such questions as a citizen's "standing" to litigate environmental questions and by establishing a citizen's right to a clean environment, notwithstanding the absence of any economic damage to the individual.

Passing this legislation will not be in and of itself sufficient to give citizens a real voice in our fight to save the environment. They must have effective spokesmen to take the action before the courts. If the Internal Revenue Service does indeed suspend the tax-exempt status of gifts to public-interest law firms, it is my fear that the needed advocates for this worthwhile cause will simply not be available.

Because of the importance of this issue, Mr. Speaker, I would today include a reprint in the RECORD of an editorial from the New York Times and an article from the Washington Post which I believe correctly analyze the implications of the Internal Revenue Service's action. Along the same lines, I sent a letter to the Commissioner of the IRS, Randolph W. Thrower, spelling out my feelings on the ruling, I would also include this reprint in the RECORD:

IRS TO THE RESCUE

A remarkably encouraging development in recent years has been the emergence of public-interest law firms and of new citizens' groups which appear before regulatory agencies and the courts in behalf of consumers and of the environment. Instead of demonstrating in the streets, holding rallies and picketing, these lawyers and concerned citizens have been making use of the orderly processes of Government to make their protests against companies with a reckless "buyer beware" attitude toward their customers and toward the physical environment. Against this background, it is astonishing that the Internal Revenue Service has now come to the rescue not of the public-spirited lawyers and voluntary organizations but of corporate marauders who can well take care of themselves.

Commissioner Randolph W. Thrower of the I.R.S. has announced that it will not give tax deductible status to any new public-interest law firm or other private organization which sues on behalf of the consumer or the environment. Until its study is completed, those organizations that already have tax-deductible status will be under a financial cloud because contributions to them may or may not be ruled deductible depending on what I.R.S. decides.

Since most private agencies organized for general public protection cannot long survive if the donations they receive are not deductible, this decision is a powerful blow against Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law and the many other organizations which have sprung up in recent years.

Senator Mondale of Minnesota properly describes this I.R.S. decision as "outrageous." There was no public demand for this crackdown. On the contrary, ordinary people have repeatedly shown their enthusiasm for these citizen organizations. The ordinary person cannot afford to file a lawsuit against a wealthy corporation which can hire full-time, high-quality legal counsel. The only hope of fighting these corporate giants in the courts is to have a nonprofit organization or a group of public-spirited lawyers who will take on the case. The effect of the Internal Revenue's review is to intimidate these organizations by raising the spectre of the loss of their tax-deductible status.

It is specious for Commissioner Thrower to contend that it is unfair for the public interest side in a litigation to have tax-exempt status. He knows perfectly well that all corporate legal expenses and a good share of lobbying expenses are incorporated in the regular operating costs of business and thus become part of the price base to the consumer.

The logic of the I.R.S. action goes counter to the expressed philosophy of the Nixon Administration, which seeks to encourage decision-making by individuals and voluntary organizations rather than by Government

agencies. Russell E. Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, has protested to Mr. Thrower that "private litigation before courts and administrative agencies has been and will continue to be an important environmental protective technique supplementing and reinforcing Government programs."

The Internal Revenue Service has previously harassed the Sierra Club on the grounds that the club's public service advertisements on environmental issues constitutes lobbying. Now the I.R.S. is extending its intimidation and harassment to a much wider range of organizations. It is time for I.R.S. officials to relax their tender solicitude for the big polluters and come to the rescue of the ordinary citizens who pay their salaries.

LAWS, LAWYERS AND THE SYSTEM

(By Colman McCarthy)

For some time now, many parents, teachers and politicians have been telling young activitists of conscience that the way to change the system is to work peacefully within it. Don't riot in the streets, throw bombs, shoot cops or tie up professors; the system only hardens with those no-win stunts. Instead, get on the inside and work for social change from there. You'll be surprised what you can pull off.

Among those taking that advice were a growing number of law students and young lawyers. For the past three or four years, they have formed or joined what are called public interest law firms, often arguing cases against corporations that pollute the environment or cheat the consumer. Just as the establishment said, the young lawyers were surprised at what they could pull off.

Last week, public interest law firms were in the news. The Internal Revenue Service announced a 60-day study that will decide whether or not to revoke their tax exempt status, especially those taking corporations to court on pollution, consumer and other cases. The IRS move would leave the firms without money because contributors would get no tax deductions on their grants or gifts.

Among those firms which may be affected by the IRS decision is the Center for Law and Social Policy, a Washington-based group that opened shop in August 1969. Its director is Charles Halpern, a graduate of Yale Law School and the son of a late New York judge. Nearly everything about the firm suggests the utmost in decorum and discretion. Its board of trustees include philsox lawyers like Francis T. P. Plimpton, former president of the New York City bar association; Mitchell Rogovin of Washington's Arnold and Porter; Ramsey Clark; J. Lee Rankin, New York City chief counsel; Joseph L. Sax, a Michigan lawyer who wrote the Hart-McGovern bill that would allow class action pollution suits. In addition, the Center has arrangements with the law schools of Stanford, Yale, Michigan, Pennsylvania and UCLA whereby students come to Washington for six months for clinical training and legal education. A full semester credit is given by the schools. Prompted in part by all this establishment support, the Ford Foundation granted the Center $275,000 last July that will last 18 months.

"We are called public interest lawyers," said Charles Halpern, "but less pompously we're just lawyers for unrepresented people, the ones who are getting clobbered but with no one there to protect them. These people are all over the place—not just the poor, but also the victims of pollution, the victims of corporate arrogance or maybe just the odd guy who wants to eat his pickles without DDT in them."

Halpern's reference to DDT is not a joke. Earlier this year, on behalf of the Sierra Club, the National Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League and others, the center took on the Secretary of Agriculture. A petition was filed urging him to suspend the use of DDT and to begin canceling registration of products containing that poison. On May 28, the D.C. Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the center. In effect, the court restrained the government from barging ahead on the DDT question with no concern for the environment. Moreover, the court told Agriculture that the views of the citizens were crucial to governmental decisions, since the citizens were the ones who swallow DDT.

"We were delighted with the decision," said Halpern, "even though the stuff is still on the market. The court gave now power to the average guy dealing with the traditionally impassive government. Previously, only industry got the bureaucrat's ear."

A second center activity that has upset, even infuriated, a rich and tough industry involves the construction of the Trans-Alaskan pipeline system. The giant pipeline, 800 miles long and four feet wide, would present enormous technical and environmental challenges never faced before. The oil companies involved in the project include Union, Phillips, Mobil, Hess, Atlantic Richfield and Humble. On behalf of conservationists, the center brought a suit to stop the Secretary of Interior from issuing permits to the oil companies for construction. Last April, the District Court agreed with the center; a preliminary injunction was issued, based on the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

For now, the oil companies have put away their bulldozers and dynamite. A government-industry task force is examining whether or not TAPS can be built without ruining the countryside. According to a recent and slightly bitter article in Barron's Weekly, out-of-pocket loss to the oil companies is $100,000 a day, with $50 million worth of machinery and supplies sitting idle.

A third success for the center involves the largest corporation of them all, General Motors, Representing the Center for Auto Safety and others, a complaint was entered against the National Highway Safety Bureau to reopen a case involving a GM recall of 50,000 defective truck wheels. The center argued that 150,000 other trucks displayed the same defects and should also be called in. The court ordered the NHSB to reopen the investigation, rejecting the agency's view that it alone, with no citizen consultation, should decide recalls.

Although public interest lawyers like Charles Halpern cause unceasing bother and financial pain to both large and small corporations, they do it in the simplest and perhaps least dramatic way—using recognized, often dormant laws in established courts. As Halpern describes it, "it was really an open field. On one hand, you had the old line regulatory agencies—FTC, FDA, FCC, ICC and the others. They were created to protect the public and to keep a strict eye on the marketplace. But for so many years, the opposite was true. The agencies looked out for the industries and corporations, not the public. The adversary system, which was a big subject in law school, was nowhere to be found in Washington. The laws were on the books waiting to be used."

The origins of public interest law go back to a 1966 decision by a then little known Washington judge, Warren E. Burger, now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. A group of poor and black Mississippians challenged a Jackson television station on its biased news coverage. The Federal Communications Commission, which supposedly protects the interests of viewers—including the poor and black—tried to brush off the plaintiffs, on the grounds that it alone knew what was best. Judge Burger said no, the commission must listen to the complaints of the viewers in its administrative decisions.

Last week, following the announcement of the IRS, many lawyers at the Center for Law and Social Policy were dismayed. They saw the IRS study as a direct attack on public interest law, the agency being used by someone as a lethal political weapon against the forces for peaceful change.

A worry of Halpern went beyond the future of his own operation. He had just returned from a number of universities and law schools where he was often greeted as a sucker for the establishment—for believing that one can change the system from within and from below. Halpern had always thought he was something of a reformer, but next to some of the students he met, he was only a non-returnable dreamer. "What do I tell these people now?" he asked, referring to the IRS decision which forcefully confirmed their cynicism. Halpern has no answer.

OCTOBER 14, 1970.

Hon. RANDOLPH W. THROWER,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER THROWER: The recent ruling by the Internal Revenue Service suspending the tax exemption status of gifts made to public interest law firms that do consumer protection and environmental litigation disturbs me. If the ruling is allowed to stand I fear that an important force in the pursuit of us all for equal justice under law will have been substantially impaired if not eliminated.

As I understand the status of the ruling at this time, the more established legal defense arms of the National Right to Work Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will not be affected by this ruling. What, may I ask, is the reason for giving different treatment to law firms that are involved in the newer public service litigation?

Whether one is pursuing the cause of civil liberties, civil rights, more equitable treatment for the American consumer or a cleaner environment, it seems to me there can be no differentiation made either in logic or in law between these different categories, so long as no profit is being turned by the parties involved. The advocates in each instance are giving help to those in need for altruistic reasons and gifts to those advocates should be treated accordingly by the IRS.

I need not point out to you the impact uneven treatment by the IRS can have no citizens in this country. There is perhaps no government agency that is involved in each of our lives to the degree that the Internal Revenue Service is. I know you would agree with me that it would be unwise for the IRS to take upon itself the task of resolving conflicts between different groups in our society. If the ruling concerning public interest law firms is allowed to stand, I am afraid that in this case that is precisely the impact your agency's activities would have.

I appreciate your taking the time to hear me out on this. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL.

IMPACT OF URBANIZATION ON MAN'S ENVIRONMENT

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in one of the most remarkable documents I have yet seen on the whole issue of bettering our environment, the United Nations in cooperation with the United Auto Workers—UAW—recently published the statement and conclusions of their recent symposium on the "Impact of Urbanization on Man's Environment."

The premise is startling:

There can hardly be one country in the world that is now coping adequately with the problems of urban life and growth in both a human and ecological sense. The urban crisis is global, affecting both the industrial nations and those somewhere on the road toward industrialization, but the burden of population increase and new waves of migration from the countryside is most acute and overwhelming in the poorer developing lands.

After a full discussion of the central issues affecting the human environment as a result of urbanization and growth of urban settlements throughout the world, the symposium, led by the able director of the UAW's international affairs department, Mr. Victor G. Reuther, recommended international as well as national action measures. A declaration on the human environment was also drafted and included in the record.

I recommend to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisles and in both Houses of Congress that they read this document. I believe it is one of the most forward looking accounts dealing with the complex and dangerous dilemmas of our environment to have been compiled.

I ask unanimous consent that the concluding statement of the symposium be inserted in the RECORD.

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

SYMPOSIUM ON THE IMPACT OF URBANIZATION ON MAN'S ENVIRONMENT: STATEMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

(Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, and UAW Family Education Center, Onaway, Mich., June 13–20, 1970, sponsored by the United Nations in cooperation with the International Trade Union of the United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW))

1. THE CRISIS OF HUMAN COMMUNITY

There is a worldwide crisis of the human environment, and the impact of urban settlements on that environment takes place within the broader context of international instability and the difficulty, in highly industrialized and less developed countries alike, of transforming human settlements into true communities. The precarious condition of human life and the human community has resulted in a sharpened sense of solidarity. Society, however, has not yet found the capacity to install that sense of solidarity at the center of attention or in the making of decisions and the carrying out of policies, although such policies may conceivably destroy man himself, either through sudden nuclear annihilation or through a slower but ultimately total destruction of the web of life. Even if man escapes those fates, he nevertheless may well suffer the unhappy future that has been foreseen if world society does not mend its ways: that of the living death of long-term adaptation to a steadily declining quality of life.

Little or nothing can be done about the natural disasters and tragic contingencies of life. Men can, however, and for the rest of this century must, act within and among the nations in both a corrective and preventive way against man-made follies and disasters which fragment societies and foster world conflict. The human community together must wage two campaigns which in practice cannot be separated. Their objective must be to bring sanity and harmony into man's relations with man, and into man's relations with his natural habitat. The crucial engagements of these campaigns for sanity and harmony will have to be won, because the flood of human life into old and new cities of the world, particularly in less developed regions, will accelerate during the next 30 years, and by the year 2000 a majority of the world's people will be living in urban areas.

There can hardly be one country in the world that is now coping adequately with the problems of urban life and growth in both a human and ecological sense. The urban crisis is global, affecting both the industrial nations and those somewhere on the road toward industrialization, but the burden of population increase and new waves of migration from the countryside is most acute and overwhelming in the poorer developing lands.

Incapable now of meeting the minimal needs of most of these wanderers and squatters for urban shelter and employment, how can the structures of government and society in the poorer nations survive and withstand the shock of human tide that will continue to mount throughout the next three decades? The truth is that a situation that is unmanageable now will become more desperately unmanageable with each advancing year unless man can effect a transformation in the values, priorities and behavior of the international community as fundamental as the transformation that will have come about in human existence by the end of the century as a result of the world increase and urban concentration of the earth's population.

The crisis, internationally and nationally, is one of priorities. The dominant priority has been hot and cold war and preparations for war, and national budgets and economies have reflected that priority, with the result that the human and physical needs of urban settlements in the industrially advanced countries as well as those in the rest of the world have suffered from prolonged neglect.

Mankind must turn from war and preparations for war to the tasks of peaceful and environmentally sane development.

The symposium addresses this statement first to itself and to all mankind which shares this now precarious fate. As a growing species on a dwindling globe, men must act as individuals, groups, associations and community of nations, but must think as one. The categorical imperative is to gather the energies of diversity so that men can work at a scale in harmony with the global environment which is a single system.

Divided so long—professionals, trade union leaders, students, citizens of the world—have decided this time to speak without dissent: to say as human beings that it is time for man to be unified with himself and his environment.

2. APPROACHES TO COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING FOR THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

There are three facts which clearly indicate the urgency of human condition: (1) urban population will increase five-fold over the next generation; but (2) urban facilities are already overloaded and the environment dangerously polluted; therefore (3) each increment of urban growth will lead to a further deterioration of the environment.

What those facts suggest is the changing of structures and life-styles and technologies—the very systems by which we have proposed. The following basic questions must now be asked: (a) whether the human race can any longer afford continuous and accelerating growth; (b) whether valid and satisfactory ways of evaluating growth presently exists; and (c) whether present knowledge and tools in urban planning are adequate.

One way out of the present dilemma may be the vesting of government with more powerful levers: economic leverages, economics of scale, and the energy of participation. Examples of the first are: taxing leaded gas more than non-leaded; a price to be charged for air, and higher prices for water; taxation of urban land. Under economies of scale falls the concept of new towns. Those who plan for the human environment should be spending major shares of their time mobilizing and releasing the energies of the public through a variety of devices ranging from education to a direct citizen control.

One of the main reasons for the delay in effective action against the deterioration of man's environment is the problem of human adaptability—man's adaptation to changing physical conditions is at a much slower rate than the speed at which his environment deteriorates.

People can and must do a great deal themselves without waiting for governmental or international action. While the comprehensive approach is probably a must, it is the quality of the people behind all the schemes that is of greater importance.

The environment should be visualized in terms of time, space and resources. Man must become aware of his own environment if he is to be able to develop himself in a comprehensive manner. This task is made more difficult by the constant change in scale of time, space and resources. It is the architect and planner's task to build an environment in which the interrelation of these three components may be more readily grasped.

The planner has discovered what the beleaguered citizen has always had to live with: everything these days relates to everything. This raises the question many a city and many a nation is puzzling over: where in the structure of government should be the responsibility for comprehensive planning be placed; whose responsibility is supposed to relate everything to everything?

A lot of structural solutions have been tried and found wanting: departmental status; interdepartment committee; cabinet secretariat; executive staff. The underlying reason may well be that comprehensive planning is not so much a differential function, as it is—or should be—a general state of mind. The same can be said of the Systems Approach, which essentially is systematic thinking brought up to date.

If there is any art that is crucial to comprehensive planning, it is the art of the question—question that starts with a restless probe of relevant (and sometimes seemingly

irrelevant) information, and then proceeds with equal restlessness and some impertinence to ask whether any given or proposed decision will on balance enhance or further degrade the livability of the environment.

This art of the question cannot be lost in the confinement of one discipline, one guild or one department. It should be practiced at every level and sector of the governing structure, and throughout the entire society.

The current move toward the formulation of national urban policies is an encouraging response to the crisis of man's environment. It will not be an easy task, for all the reasons cited above. But livable solutions to environmental problems will not emerge until nations individually and together make the commitment which is symbolized by the attempt to devise urban policies—the commitment to try, and in the very act of trying, to ensure an integrity that augurs well for human survival.

3. PERSPECTIVES ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The protection of the environment must be considered in its proper perspective for the developing countries of the world. The great importance and urgency of economic development in these countries should not be overlooked. The recommendation for the protection of the environment may not be the first priority for countries that still need to solve their more basic problems, such as food, shelter, education and health.

Two-thirds of mankind, who live in the developing regions of the world, do not share the same concern about their environment, urban as well as rural, as the other one-third who live in the more affluent regions. They have little interest in the purity of the air they breathe, the freshness of the waters of their lakes and rivers, the natural beauty of their mountains. They have more immediate problems—the struggle for the bare necessities of life—which is becoming increasingly difficult for them because of the rapid growth of population. The total Gross National Product of these countries amounts to only 12.5% of the total world's GNP, while that of the developed countries is 87.5%. Sixty-six percent of the world's population, on the other hand, live in the developing countries, and only 34% in the developed countries.

What interest can such people have in questions of environment? The governments that represent them are preoccupied with the pressing problem of raising their standards of living and of providing their basic needs. The highest priority is given to economic progress. How can they be asked to adopt measures such as preventing industrial waste from polluting rivers, restricting the use of insecticides like DDT, controlling the emission of smoke and fumes from chimney stacks, and stringent land use controls which will increase the cost of economic development? This must be kept in mind when recommending measures which the developing countries should take to protect their environment. Recommendations that curtail or restrict economic progress and dampen the rising expectations of the people of developing countries for a better life would be unacceptable to most governments of these countries.

But some action to achieve compatible industrial technology will produce immediate benefits and is essential to safeguard the environment for future generations. This can best be achieved by establishing priorities for the protection of the envrironment, beginning with those aspects which will not impede economic development and which, at the same time, are vital for the future well-being of inhabitants. For example, the location of industries to minimize environmental impact and to be more compatible with human needs and amenities, the protection of the watersheds, the tropical rain-forests which ensure pure supplies of fresh water in the rivers and the lakes; the protection of natural parks and game reserves; the protection of places of historical archaeological interest; the protection of places of tourist interests like lakes, mountains and upspoiled sea beaches. Yes, even land that will be needed for future urban settlements.

When these countries have generated sufficient economic growth, they will be enabled to turn to more sophisticated measures to prevent pollution and the destruction of the environment. But by taking steps *now* to safeguard the *vital* features of the environment, they would have laid a very useful framework for building up a national environmental policy.

Regional action should be taken by developing countries to protect some of these essential features of the environment. Watersheds often cut across national boundaries—the Mekong River, the Indus, the Nile and the Amazon are examples. Not only is it necessary to ensure that these great rivers have a full supply of fresh waters, but it is also necessary to protect them from pollution that destroys fish which is essential for human consumption as well as for the elimination of organisms and insects that are carriers of disease. Here international action is needed and this is where the United Nations can take an important role.

There is another aspect of environmental preservation which transcends national boundaries. National parks and game preserves are today becoming increasingly of international interest not only as tourist attractions, but also as sanctuaries and breeding places of wild life and birds and insects. Man is beginning to realize, rather late, that birds, beasts and insects play an important role in preserving the human environment. Then there are the great archaeological sites, the Angkor Wat in Cambodia, the Pyramids and Temples, the Hindu, Buddhist cities and monasteries of Ceylon, the Aztec Pyramids of Mexico. These are the heritage of all mankind and some international action and assistance is needed to assure their preservation.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

Human settlements, which are the setting for man's economic and social activities constitute the most important component of his environment. One is now forced to consider, not only their impact on man, but also their impact on the natural environment.

In the most industrialized countries, the major environmental concerns revolve around controlling air and water pollution and waste disposal, because the problems in these areas have reached alarming proportions. There is, however, less recognition of the more fundamental preventive measures which seek to remove the causes of degradation, rather than concentrating on the effects.

Most of the measures being advocated can at best only eliminate a percentage of pollutants by chemical or mechanical means. The increasingly high density of population and the extremely large sizes which primary cities are expected to reach, raise questions as to the limits that the physical environment can support. For example, in dealing with the problems created by the combustion engine and the private automobile, the solutions advanced are aimed at improvements in combustion and the combustibles to be used and/or replacement by other types of engine. While these can reduce the emission of the most toxic pollutants, they do not solve the concomitant problems of noise, dust, disposal of obsolete vehicles, congestion in the streets, and demand for circulation space (highways, streets, parking spaces) which lacerate the natural environment.

A degraded environment is one in which not only the air and water is polluted but also one which is degrading to its inhabitants because it denies them the opportunity for the development and utilization of their full potential and subjects them to stresses and strains to which they cannot adjust. It is necessary that economic development and environmental protection be pursued jointly since they are both necessities and not competing alternatives.

Progress in the solution of environmental problems is difficult because of the relative paucity of knowledge regarding the environmental aspects of spatial planning and the complexity of the total environmental problem. It is the responsibility of the professionals and technicians to develop knowledge and skills to provide guidance needed to create a satisfactory environment. The process of developing knowledge and skills in this area has, however, been largely impeded by extreme professionalism and fragmentation of interests and efforts. This situation now seems to be improving with the emergence of new disciplines such as biochemistry or bio-geology which combine aspects of two or more of the older disciplines in the attempt to solve new problems.

A large part of the inability of planners to solve the problems of the environment has also been due to the lack of political and administrative frameworks capable of permitting the planner to perform his functions efficiently. Political and administrative reforms incorporating provisions for land utilization for the welfare of all, therefore, must be considered as some of the actions necessary for achieving a desirable environment.

With particular reference to developing areas, the integration of economic and social development programs with environmental improvement programs through the use of regional planning is needed. Although urban and industrial decentralization and urban concentration have been major issues throughout the world, the fact remains that few countries have adopted any co-ordinated policies, and urbanization is allowed to take its course unchecked. It must be made clear at this point that urbanization per se not only is inevitable but can be beneficial to human development. Both in theory and practice, a policy of antiurbanization is neither feasible nor desirable. Only in some type of urban environment does it seem possible to raise living and working standards and provide the educational and cultural facilities and programs which can emancipate man from the dull drudgery and meagerness of peasant life. The city has become an attractive magnet because it offers an alternative. Even where rural jobs exist the drift to the cities is occurring because the city offers a promise of social mobility and an opportunity for realization of one's potential as a person and a citizen.

Present urban structures and the directions in which they are developing are not the only alternative to a predominantly rural village-society. Modern technology permits the conception of different urban forms and patterns. Advances in transportation, communication and power distribution provide the potential for flexibility in industrial lo-

cation and urban patterns which have not yet, except perhaps in the Soviet Union, been taken advantage of. It may be necessary to curb the ubiquitous drift to the largest urban concentrations by offering alternatives in the form of new urban magnets of smaller dimensions which singly or in clusters can provide equivalent urban advantages under more manageable conditions.

It is no longer necessary that the urban environment have degrading effects upon its occupants and on the natural features of the territory it occupies. The price of a poorly planned and managed environment is too high in terms of its social costs and the threat it poses to the destruction of natural resources. Governments must now think in terms of the rational planning of the urban environment and assign a higher priority to human environmental needs. This involves, first, the planning of urban activities in locational patterns which offer the maximum of human convenience, comfort, pleasure and peace of mind; with minimum congestion health hazards and other disturbing influences. Second, it involves increased expenditures for the essentials of such an environment: housing, water supply, sewage disposal systems and other community services and facilities; more open space and recreational opportunities. Increased public expenditures will be needed to properly manage and maintain these facilities.

In the natural area within which urban development takes place and which it influences, the rational management of the resource base is needed. This implies both the managed use and the conservation of these valuable resources. Although human intervention results in constant change to the total natural environment, this disturbance must be minimized, and where necessary must be repaired to maintain the natural balance that existed before such intervention took place.

5. IMPACT OF URBANIZATION AND INDUSTRIALIZATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

As happens in all industrialized and developed parts of the world, changes in social structure and rapid economic development in the developing countries bring with them some new and important problems.

The growth of population, industrialization, urbanization, levels and diversification of consumption, new technologies, increase in transport and tourism activities, and the need of recreation all have some serious impact on the daily life of individuals and communities. They also impose important environmental problems, the intensity of which may certainly vary from country to country throughout the world.

The benefits and advantages of rapid economic growth may be enjoyed by individuals and communities if the negative environmental conditions created by this rapid growth itself may be overcome.

Among the positive aspects of urbanization are the following:

1. It reduces pressure on rural areas;

2. It creates expectations and raises the level of aspirations;

3. It permits a new social structure by facilitating greater social mobility;

4. It encourages industrialization;

5. It facilitates provision of better services to a large percentage of the population;

6. It can help create a national effort to solve some problems by decreasing regional isolationism and encouraging greater political and economic participation.

Among the negative aspects are the fact that in the developing countries urbanization often takes place in advance of industrialization and the creation of sources of urban employment. Consequently, urbanization has indirect and negative repercussions in the tertiary section.

To deal with urbanization under prevailing conditions, it is necessary to define policies of urbanization at an international, national and macro-regional level. Such policies must define the roles and functions of each of the more important urban agglomerations that form the urban-regional system and try to integrate regional development with the process of urbanization. The creation of institutions permitting public control of urban and suburban land, co-ordination of investments, directing the flow of credit through trade unions and non-profit organizations in a massive way and the provision of technical assistance to regional and municipal agencies in charge of regional and local policies of urbanization, are representative policies.

A. Housing needs, policies, and program

The most serious and urgent environmental problem in urban settlements is the shortage of suitable living accommodations and their necessary supporting infra-structure of water supply, sewers, roads, electricity, and health, welfare and other social services.

World housing conditions are deteriorating at an increased rate. In most developing countries, still less than two houses per 1,000 inhabitants are being built each year. Some countries are building at less than 10% of their requirements. In Latin America, the housing deficit is about 20 million units; in Asia and the Far East it is about 22 million in urban areas and 125 in rural areas (as of 1960), and investment in housing is around 1.5% to 2% of the national income as against the estimated 4.6% required.

The sheer scale of financial need has tended to discourage a realistic approach to the solution of the shelter problem. Much must be produced by individual initiative. If the effort is to be successful, people in developing countries must earn wages high enough to enable them to invest their own money in their dwellings. Creating new channels of savings and mortgage funds is both a necessary and a feasible international action, and one which should cost very little.

With private funds and energy added to public investment, housing can become an important contributor to national economic growth. Furthermore, the housing industry trains labor not simply for the construction trades but for other occupations as well. These economic benefits are not counterbalanced by social costs such as those accompanying the manufacture and use of automobiles.

Past experience shows that land and other development costs rise with the size of the city, and land near large urban centers may be six times as costly as in a small city. These costs influence decisions about construction, and force the building of high density housing at the city center, even though high-rise blocks are more expensive to build than low structures. They also subject the rural migrant to a radically different organization of space and living conditions. Crowded living conditions, elevators that do not work, unfamiliar or inadequate refuse disposal methods, the noise, crowds, and anonymity of big city life can produce a rumbling effect of despair and claustrophobia. In city after city, the central slum is the first staging post for the new rural migrant. And it is also the worst.

An increasing percentage of the world's population is living in squatter settlements, and the fabric of urban life and contemporary society in many developing countries is threatened as these populations come to occupy 30 to 50% or more of urban areas, as they do in some cities of Latin America and elsewhere.

The uncontrolled settlements on the periphery of cities that were formerly viewed as detrimental because of their haphazard construction and their unsanitary conditions, have been discovered to have some positive advantages. Their scale and life style provides a more familiar environment and a sense of community to the rural migrant. The trend to squatter settlements, which appears to be an inevitable part of spreading urbanization, can be controlled and converted into a positive development factor instead of an impediment to healthy urban growth.

If new urban settlers are given secure tenure of a piece of land, they can live there, earn their livelihood by participating fully in the growing economy of the city, and slowly build themselves homes with their savings. Building plots could be initially provided with only basic amenities, and the authorities could plan the full development of settlement areas and expand the community services and facilities as the areas develop. Educational programs for new city-dwellers should be provided to help them adjust to the urban environment, and to take advantage of new opportunities and amenities available in the urban setting. Such training should be available as soon as migrants reach the city.

B. Problems of rural areas

Attention must be given to how the acute pressures of ever-accelerating urbanization and the deterioration of the urban environment in non-industrialized countries can be reduced through measures for the improvement of human settlements in rural areas, which will assist in reducing the rate of migration from such areas.

The deterioration of the environment produced by man in rural areas may be much larger than in the cities, with more dangerous repercussions for the country as a whole. In many parts of the tropical zones there cannot be progress in the smaller human settlements unless the environment is improved and built up by eliminating environmental health risks due to biotic hazards. This is important, first, to improve cultivation, and, second, to reduce migration to the cities.

Urban planners are pressed by the problems produced by rapid growth of the cities and the only way to bring them some relief is to improve environmental and economic conditions in the rural areas. Most non-industrialized countries still must increase food production in order to improve the diet of their populations and to diminish the amount of foreign currency required for importation of agricultural products.

Increased cultivation brings economic development to the rural areas and therefore is one of the important measures to be taken in order to reduce migration to the cities in many underdeveloped countries. In the tropics, for such increased agricultural production, large amounts are required of insecticides and other pesticides which are pollutants dangerous for man. The industrialized countries could help by fostering research in order to find less toxic products with short-lived molecules, which disintegrate after their use.

One important measure to produce improvement in rural human settlements is to separate the governmental agencies in charge of urban and rural affairs, because city problems, due to their urgency, have a

tendency to dominate the picture with a consequent loss of attention for the solution of the rural settlement problems.

6. INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA

The provision of an adequate environment in human settlements will involve a greatly increased allocation of world financial resources to the basic necessities of urban life. The greatest increases in urban population during the coming decade will be in developing areas where vast numbers of people already endure severe inadequacies of such essentials as housing, water and sanitary facilities, as well as health, education and other public services. Neither pollution control nor urban and regional planning can cope with these conditions without more adequate national funds supplemented by international financing programs.

At the international level the problem must be dealt with by the family of nations working through the United Nations and regional organizations with a view to first defining the problem and establishing standards or objectives for the quality of the biosphere. These standards need to be translated into systems of treaties with adequate provision for monitoring and enforcement.

International development agencies such as the World Bank can assist in this process by introducing environmental criteria in their project lending. Such criteria should at least consider the impact of projects on their surrounding ecological regions and these international agencies can have enormous influence in using their lending activities as a means of improving the decision making of their member countries with respect to the environment. It is hoped that international development agencies will take the lead in promoting and doing the research and analysis so that the international community will have rational basis for concerted action.

At the national level nations can begin in the near future, and without waiting for international action, to establish standards for the future growth of settlements, and that these standards minimize environmental pollution and maximize the quality of life for the bulk of the urban inhabitants through a better organization of land uses consistent with economic and social development objectives. Environment must explicitly be introduced as a criteria for human welfare without necessarily becoming the only concern in societies where employment, incomes and social amenities are grossly deficient. National programs can eventually be made consistent with international standards when these have been established and formalized.

7. RECOMMENDED INTERNATIONAL ACTION MEASURES

Although this Symposium has been primarily concerned with the Impact Urbanization on Man's Environment, the participants are fully aware of the major global issues involved in the protection of the Biosphere for future generations, and the need to share full responsibility for the quality of human life on the planet as a whole. It has been noted, for example, that the United Nations is convoking other conferences with respect to the growth of world population and the relationship of this growth to available resources. The Symposium requests the United Nations to study the following items concerned with the defense of the environment in relation to human society.

(a) International jurisdiction of the United Nations over both polar regions, as well as the internationalization of the sea bottom, including the exploration of the resources and the forms of exploitation of these seabed resources.

(b) Support of the conservation of the most important extensive forests, seashores and similar areas, as well as mountain regions 1,000 meters above sea level.

(c) Preservation of potential recreation areas for future human use as well as of natural landscapes of importance for man's knowledge of the original environment.

(d) Formulation of standards for the transport of oil and other fluid and gas material and other materials considered to be of potential danger for the human and physical environment.

(e) Formulation of international standards for the control of pollution of chemical and similar industries.

(f) The establishment of international inspection concerned with the above items.

1. The Symposium endorses the concept and scope of the World Conference on the Human Environment, to be held in Stockholm in 1972, and recommends to the United Nations and other international bodies that immediate assistance be provided for preparatory measures that will make the conference fully productive and of maximum utility, including the following:

(a) Technical assistance, where necessary, for the preparation of country reports and case studies that will be fully representative of the environmental conditions in all countries of the world.

(b) The convocation of regional and subregional meetings on environmental problems, including those on the impact of urbanization.

(c) Efforts to formulate and discuss overall global measures for the preservation and enhancement of man's environment that will be appropriate to the situations of both developed and developing countries.

Also in the course of the proceedings of the Symposium, there was repeated reference to the important part that socially motivated groups, particularly trade unions, the young people of member nations and women's organizations will play in the evolution of plans for environmental management, the necessary adaptation of social institutions, and the parallel changes in traditional attitudes and values.

The participants in the Symposium urge that serious consideration be given to the important part that these vital sectors of society can properly play in the successful planning and realization of the conference.

It is recommended that the participation of these groups can best be realized by their representation on all preparatory committees and by their playing important parts at the conference itself.

2. The Symposium recommends the establishment of Urban Pollution Standards (UPS), appropriate for the different types of ecosystems within metropolitan areas. The establishment of such Urban Pollution Standards (UPS) will require agreement between nations, and will be based upon the following:

(a) A world research program to be coordinated by the United Nations at the international level. National and regional governments or agencies should be assisted to undertake the field operations and analysis necessary for the implementation of such a globally significant effort.

The program should give attention to:

(1) The impact of urbanization and human settlements on surrounding areas, including their reciprocal relationships to rural settlements.

(2) Requirements for the specific urban and land use functions in relation to the urban environment.

(3) Community design and organizational concepts for the enhancement of the quality of life.

(b) The establishment of a world system of observation and monitoring stations in all major metropolitan areas to assist in recording and controlling important changes in the natural environment (land, water and air) of global and/or regional importance.

(c) A system of Environmental Data Banks under United Nations jurisdiction.

3. The concept of Urban Pollution Standards (UPS) should be introduced into the methodology of financial analysis of all international finance institutions, such as the World Bank, the Regional Development Banks, and other banking systems. Linkage between the data collected through the world monitoring system and the operations of international financing agencies should be developed and actively promoted.

Loans or grants to urban areas should consider financial incentives to those which maintain pollution levels below the agreed-upon Urban Pollution Standards (UPS).

4. An international Environmental Charter or Declaration should be formulated for the guidance of the world's peoples. (See attached Draft Declaration—Appendix.)

5. The United Nations, the United Nations Development Program, and the International financial institutions should jointly organize a concentrated research and development project for the design and production of public utility systems waste and sewage disposal methods, etc., that will incorporate efficient systems of recycling and preservation of the environment, and suitable for manufacture and installation in the majority of urban areas of the world.

6. The United Nations, through its specialized agencies concerned, should intensify its assistance to Governments to help them establish, within the framework of the national health plans, programs related directly to environmental health problems. Distinctive environmental health hazards have appeared with the growth of large urban agglomerations, which should be more strongly reflected in the program of international health organizations, and in their assistance to national health programs.

7. The United Nations Development Program should undertake an urgent program for research into the problems of management, government organization and structure, as they affect the development and conservation of urban environment in the metropolitan areas of the world.

8. With increasing influence of international conglomerate corporations and other powerful investors on the utilization of resources and environmental factors in many countries of the world, a concern of international trade unions, the Symposium believes that it has become necessary to create a system of international law, as well as appropriate international judiciary processes particularly relevant to environmental cases.

9. The need for international educational activities about the environment should be furthered by the establishment of an Environmental Education Committee under United Nations and UNESCO auspices to develop an international instruction program and series of courses concerned with the urban environment, using satellite relays for global coverage of such a project.

10. Economic development measured in terms of Gross National Product growth rates is meaningless unless it is related to a broad concept of well-being. This depends

not only on the quantity of goods and services but also on a whole series of environmental human conditions. The Symposium urges that the United Nations seek international agreement upon alternative standards and indicators which will also reflect the quality of the human environment.

11. The Symposium recommends an Environment Day or Week be established by the United Nations, in concert with all government to focus world attention on the problems of human environment.

12. The Symposium urges that planning begin now during this Second United Nations Development Decade for the convening in 1980 of a major Environmental Assessment Conference, to reveiw the results of environmental protection efforts during the decade.

13. The Symposium suggests that the Secretary-General of the United Nations include in his Annual Report to the General Assembly an asessment of world environmental conditions.

14. Technical cooperation should be extended and expanded in the field of environmental protection for the establishment of research institues at national and regional levels; for the convocation of regular meetings among inter-professional grouping of public and private sector interests concerned with the environment and for the fundings of comparative studies on successful practices and programs carried out in both developed and developing countries.

15. At the international level, a determined effort should be made to secure the involvement of a wide variety of efforts by non-governmental organzations, including youth, women, professional groups, universities, etc., for the formulation and execution of activities related to environmental protection and enhancement. Particular note should be taken of the important role which can be played by the trade union movement for the initiation, development, and support of major activities, projects and programs related to the industrial, urban and natural environments.

16. In view of the present environmental crisis, the Symposium recommends to the National governments to request the United Nations Development Program urgently to establish a special fund or account to be used in a flexible day for the undertaking of environmental research, training and related studies to raise the capacity in all nations to deal with problems and to manage programs concerned with environmental protection in a time of rapid population and urbanization growth.

Further, and in view of the constructive proposal advanced at the Symposium by the President of the International UAW, the participants agreed on the basis of their professional estimates that the financial and technical resources needed for an adequate approach to global problems of urbanization cannot be made available without the elimination of international competition in armaments and a radical reduction in expenditures for arms.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

1. National urban policies:

(a) In view of the growing concern regarding the conservation of the planetary biosphere, the governments of both developed and developing countries must now take upon themselves important responsibilities for the adoption and establishment of National Urban Policies involving the rational growth and distribution of human settlements, as it is clear that the urban environment is becoming the increasingly dominant element of the human environment as a whole. Such policies must form an indispensable part of all national development plans.

(b) The adoption of such policies, unlike the efforts of the past, must lead to determined measures for their implementation, particularly with regard to the adequate commitment of resources for housing and community infrastructure from both public and private sectors as well as major new steps for the acquisition and reservation of urban land by public authorities. Other measures must also be adopted to discourage speculation in land and to make it available for development especially for the benefit of the low-income groups of the population.

(c) Urbanization must be increasingly looked upon as a tool for modernizing and accelerating socio-economic development, as a means of achieving more balanced regional development and for more equitable distribution of national wealth and resources. The role of urbanization must be considered as one of social integration, providing opportunities for communication and interchange, and for promoting co-operative action toward human objectives. This is particularly important in the achievement of environmental goals in situations where mass societies are getting bigger, and where man has become alienated from man.

2. National governments must provide science and technology with a sense of social purpose and a sense of human commitment. That governments have the capacity to set agendas for science and technology is illustrated by the military and space programs. In the field of urban environment, governments now have the obligation to aggregate markets or otherwise to underwrite sufficient demand to induce technological innovations. The Symposium recommends that national governments take special interest in promoting accelerated Research and Development or "break-through" projects for the design of innovative approaches and public works and facilities required for the improvement of the urban environment.

3. The Symposium recommends that all national governments sponsor natural resource inventories and regional resource development studies as a fundamental approach to identifying present and future environmental problems related to human settlements.

4. National governments, as part of their National Urban Policies, can no longer postpone identification of urban growth and settlement areas that will merit more concentrated planning and allocation of resources required for their development. This process of identification must include careful reviews of socio-economic objectives as well as ecological Urban Pollution Standards (UPS).

5. As many large urban centers throughout the world are in a period of progressive decline with regard to the standards of services offered to their inhabitants, in both quantity and quality, the Symposium recommends that all national governments must now give serious consideration to basic questions of governmental organization, management and priorities, particularly at the metropolitan and local levels. More efforts by private and non-governmental organizations to influence and stimulate the action and reaction of governments in behalf of environmental planning and preservation measures are strongly recommended. Greatly increased and vigorized efforts must be implemented for training and for the development of public administrative and management skills and understanding appropriate to the dynamics of today's society.

6. Socially responsible organizations such as labor unions have an important role in the promotion of measures and campaigns for environmnetal improvement including the convocation of seminars and symposia involving the unionists, citizenry, public officials, and representatives of industrial and business groups concerned with pollution problems.

7. All national governments should establish permanent agencies or institutions which will serve as links and information centers on environmental problems, and coordinate national participation in international activities on these subjects.

8. All countries have the obligation to create models of urban development, to provide examples for the improvement rather than the diminishing of the quality of life in the urban environment. In this connection, the Symposium suggests that all efforts be accelerated for the creation, at every appropriate level and scale, of new patterns of urban life, through the building and development of new settlements which can serve as demonstrations and laboratories for evaluation, information-exchange, and comparability on a world-wide basis, taking into consideration local ecological conditions.

9. The Symposium forcefully suggests that it is only through the participation of people and their opportunity to protest when institutions fail to respond to their needs that any form of planning can be considered a success. In building coalitions for action on environmental problems and in the implementation of comprehensive plans we must consider that employers and national and international trade unions have great potential for dealing with these vital questions of social justice and acting on the local, national and international scene. The Symposium noted that environmental questions are beginning to be raised at the bargaining table in discussions with employer groups, and expressed the hope that such groups would also take leadership in confronting environment issues. The energies of the workers, students and of all citizens must be involved on the local level to implement new approaches to environmental improvement.

(a) To mobilize all available professional manpower and those allied disciplines concerned with environmental planning, design and management, and to deploy and utilize such manpower more effectively;

(b) To establish effective training programs and curicula for personnel who are essential for development work in improving environmental conditions; such programs should emphasize participation in development and physical planning projects where experience can be gained in producing actual results.

(c) To strengthen existing training and research organizations and institutions—at local, regional and international levels—with greater emphasis on preventive action with regard to pollution and other impacts or pressures on the quality of the environment.

(d) To sponsor, promote and disseminate relevant research and technology including the employment of all developed methodologies and systems, for the advancement of urban conditions and environmental sciences.

(e) To give priority for the above actions in countries where existing expertise and resources are limited.

APPENDIX

DRAFT OF PROPOSED SECTION RELATING TO URBAN SETTLEMENTS: DECLARATION ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

PREAMBLE

Man has suddenly awakened to the dimensions, to the rapidity and to the mass effects of productive processes on the physical endowment and configuration of this planet and on its basic biological balances. To produce at any cost, without due consideration to effects on the environment, can no longer be the central preoccupation of man. Control of the effects of productive processes will require new economic thinking, new legal instruments, new administrative measures and new governmental priorities.

The whole question of the pace and the goals of economic development must be examined in the light of environmental problems. Developing nations should not be encouraged to repeat the mistakes of the advanced countries. Nor should they be the victims either of the abuses of the environment committed by advanced countries, or of the measures which their new awareness of their mistakes may cause the advanced nations suddenly to take. In the interest of all peoples of the world, it is essential to evolve a new balance between economic development and the increase of the gross national product on the one hand and the human and social requirements of men and a reasonable use and conservation of the world's resources on the other.

Whatever the rate of economic growth, and whatever sectors may be accorded priority, massive economic development will be taking place throughout the next decade and the growth of cities will be an inevitable part of this development. In the developing nations, urbanization will continue with or without economic growth. Most of this urban growth will manifest itself in a physical sense, and must be directed and shaped to create desirable human environments.

The world crisis in urbanization and the human environment will demand an effort roughly four times that expended on it during the past decade. Greater ingenuity and resourcefulness must be applied to meeting this problem at every level. All resources must be mobilized and directed at carefully stated goals and priorities. Investments in housing and urban sevrices must be planned to build towards sound patterns of urban growth, in which the indigenous needs and resources of each nation and region will have to play a much larger part. A comprehensive strategy of urbanization is needed to harness economic and physical resources to achieve the social goals of urban growth.

SITUATIONS, TRENDS, AND CRITERIA

1. A degraded environment is one in which not only the land, air and water are polluted, but also one which is degrading to its inhabitants; depriving them of the opportunity to develop and utilize their full potential; denying them the minimum necessities of housing and sanitation; subjecting them to strains and stresses which they cannot adapt to without adverse effects on their health and well-being; and not fulfilling their cultural and spiritual needs for repose, beauty and contact with nature.

2. The deterioration of the environment may be related to three basic causes; accelerated population growth, increased urbanization, and an expanded and new technology, with their associated increases in demands for space, food and natural resources, and their accelerating production of waste products.

3. Urbanization is a world process with different potentials in different regions. It is the result of overall population growth as well as migration from less to more developed regions and between nations. Urbanization is spatially expressed in a changing distribution of functions, investments and people. Its impact on the environment is reflected in the growth of cities, metropolitan areas and conurbations and transcends national boundaries.

4. The rate of urbanization is relatively faster in developing than in developed countries. Developing countries are still largely rural and subject to rapid increase of population, while developed countries are already predominantly urban and will experience comparatively smaller population increases. Consequently, their environmental problems are different. Developed countries face problems derived from pollution of the land, air and water. These issues have a lower priority in most developing countries where unemployment, housing and health problems, food shortages and limited utilities and social services are extremely serious.

5. Urbanization is changing the social, political and economic structure of all countries, as well as profoundly affecting their environment. It is therefore particularly imperative that in all countries higher priority should be given to the legislative, financial, institutional and technical actions necessary to guide urbanization with full consideration of its environmental implications. This is particularly important for many developing countries and regions, which, although less able to afford the adverse effect of pollution and the poor quality of urban settlements, may not have adequate measures to cope with them effectively.

6. The maintenance and enhancement of the natural landscape is of the greatest importance in all societies if natural features are to be maintained or introduced in an urban environment and if the biological conditions essential to man's survival and cultural development are provided. Environmental considerations will not necessarily increase the cost of development and may, in fact, result in long term savings.

7. Human settlements must respond to the nature of man by offering:

(a) A healthy environment with adequate and safe housing, clean air and pure water, parks and open spaces, agreeable streets and minimized noise and other disturbing elements.

(b) A variety of economic opportunities with healthy working and living conditions, job security and fair rewards.

(c) The opportunity for each individual to realize his role as a member of an identifiable community, by participation in social, political and cultural activities.

(d) Recognition of and provision for human needs at all life stages: from infancy to childhood, child to youth, dependency to self-maintenance; for young people, access to what fulfills their potential; for the elderly, the opportunity to live within and enjoy useful activities in their community of choice.

(e) The scope for social and economic mobility, learning and cultural enrichment, and creative use of leisure time.

(f) Well-designed buildings and spaces, and continuing the cultural heritage by preserving buildings and areas of architectural and historic significance in appropriate settings.

(g) Access to places of natural beauty and wilderness.

NATIONAL MEASURES

Governments should:

1. Establish respect for the inter-relationships of man and nature and promote the stewardship of society for the environment.

2. Establish responsibility for a comprehensive environmental approach to urban development at all levels of government.

3. Promote standards and agreements to enhance the quality of urban life and to secure the best uses of technology in creating new and improved urban settlements at a price within the reach of all members of the community.

4. Develop legal and financial measures to insure that those damaging the environment are made responsible for providing effective remedies.

5. Utilize economic forces and fiscal and monetary policies to mobilize resources and guide investment and to insure that the housing and land required to shape and improve urban areas is provided at reasonable and socially justified cost.

6. Develop measures to protect features of value, such as buildings, landscapes, watersheds, forests, coastlines and lakes, based on fact-finding inventories and surveys.

7. Optimize the economic use of resources and minimize pollution and environmental degradation by recycling and re-use of urban and industrial waste products.

8. Reclaim and re-use poor quality, derelict and waste land for urban purposes, such as houses, factories, recreation, and wildlife and amenity areas.

9. Strengthen the administration of, and services offered by, public health systems.

10. Select areas for new and expanded urban settlements with full regard to ecological considerations and the particular values and functions of urban and rural settlements.

11. Seize the opportunities afforded by the growth potential of urbanization, the power of modern technology and the increased productivity in agriculture to develop urban settlements in numbers, functions and sizes with particular reference to national and regional strategies and existing imbalances.

12. Meet the aspirations and rising expectations of people everywhere, generated by urbanization, to particpate in the formulation of environmental policies.

13. Encourage the carrying out of projects for combating urban squalor and pollution and improving the environment by individuals and voluntary bodies, including youth and women's organizations and trade unions.

14. Promote measures of education and information to create and maintain awareness of the importance of the environment for man's survival and quality of living.

15. Develop policies and priorities, facilities and methods for the training and operation of inter-disciplinary teams in the planning, management, conservation and development of the human environment.

INTERNATIONAL MEASURES

Governments should cooperate to:

1. Establish a system of environmental standards appropriate for different types of human settlements, based upon the following:

a. A world research and training program to be coordinated and assisted by the United Nations at the international level, giving attention to:

(i) The impact of urbanization and human settlements on surrounding areas.

(ii) Requirements for the specific urban and land use functions in relation to the urban environment.

(iii) Community design and organizational concepts for the enhancement of the quality of life.

(iv) The problems of management, government organization and structure, as they

affect the development and conservation of human settlements and their surroundings.

b. The establishment of a world system of observation and monitoring stations in all major metropolitan areas to assist in recording and controlling important changes in the natural environment (land, water and air) of global and/or regional importance.

c. The development of cooperative programs and techniques for identifying and foreseeing ecological, demographic, economic, technological and other trends and changes affecting the human environment.

d. The establishment of a system of Environmental Data Banks under Nations jurisdiction.

2. Develop alternative standards and indicators to the Gross National Product for the measurement of economic development which will also reflect the quality of the human environment. Such revised standards should be introduced into the methodology of financial analysis of all international finance institutions, such as the World Bank, the Regional Development Banks and other banking systems. Linkages between the data collected through the world environmental monitoring system and the operations of international financing agencies should be developed and actively promoted.

3. Create a system of international law, as well as appropriate international judiciary processes particularly relevant to environmental cases.

4. Review and promote the coordination of the environmental responsibilities of international specialized agencies and examine the desirability of creating a body under the United Nations to guide and supervise these responsibilities.

5. Initiate and promote programs for the conservation and preservation of extensive forests, waters, seashores, wetlands and similar areas of natural significance, as well as places of historical and archaeological interest, with consideration of their recreational and touristic potential.

6. Promote and assist national health programs directly related to the environmental problems of human settlements.

7. Undertake international educational activities concerning the human environment to inform decision makers and the general public of the issues at stake, including:

a. An international instruction program and series of courses.

b. The establishment of a world environment day, week and/or year.

BACKGROUND TO THE SYMPOSIUM

The Symposium whose concluding statement is here presented was convened to review a number of central issues affecting the human environment as a result of urbanization and growth of urban settlements throughout the world.

The Symposium was aimed to serve partly as a first step towards identifying the major issues, assembling information and preparing documentation for the United States Conference on the Human Environment, to be held in Stockholm, Sweden, in June 1972.

At the Symposium, there were assembled more than 125 participants, observers and staff persons from more than 23 countries. The meetings were formally opened at U.N. headquarters, transferred to the UAW Family Education Center in Onaway, Michigan, then returned for its closing session to U. N. headquarters.

The occasion was especially noteworthy in that it marked the first occasion on which a trade union (the UAW) had hosted a United Nations Conference. Consequently, excellent international trade union participation in the deliberations was assured.

CONVENERS

Philippe de Seynes, United Nations.
Leonard Woodcock, United Auto Workers.

DIRECTORS

Victor Reuther, United Auto Workers.
Joseph Crooks, United Nations.

TECHNICAL SECRETARY

Frederick Gutheim, UN–UAW.

COUNTRY PARTICIPANTS

R. E. Boote (U.K.), European Conservation Year.
Harry J. Cole (Brazil), Planning Consultant.
Yochanan Elon (Israel), Israel Institute of Technology.
Lars-Goran Engfeldt, Swedish Mission to the UN.
Arnaldo Gabaldon (Venezuela), Ministry of Health and Welfare.
Cesar V. Garces (Venezuela).
Jorge E. Hardoy (Argentina), Yale.
Heikki von Hertzen (Finland), National Housing Foundation.
Chong Keat Lim (Singapore), Architect.
Rajko Rajic (Yugoslavia), Inst. for Town Planning.
Raymond Serradeil (France), French Embassy, Washington, D.C.
Austin P. Tetten, (Ghana).
Leandro Viloria (Philippines), University of The Philippines.
Sadao Wanabe, (Japan), University of Tokyo.
Oliver Weerasinghe, (Ceylon), Ambassador, Washington, D.C.
Isolde M. Winter-Efinger (Fed. Rep. of Germany) Ministry for Town Building and Housing.
Zbigniew Wolack (Poland), Inst. for Urbanism and Architecture.
Eric Bolinder (Sweden), National Trade Union Center.
Jim Conway, (U.K.), Amalgamated Union of Engineering and Foundry Workers.
Karl Hauenschild (Fed. Rep. of Germany), German Chemical Worker Union.
Lauri Hannikainen (Finland), Finnish Embassy, Washington, D.C.
Toshikatsu Harii, (Japan), General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (SOHYO).
Mikko Laaksonen (Finland), Federation of Finnish Trade Unions and Members of Parliament.
Olga Madar (USA), UAW.
Dennis McDermott (Canada) UAW.
Chuji Shinta (Japan), General Council of Trade Unions of Japan (SOHYO).
Dusan Stefanovic (Yugoslavia), University of Belgrade.

CONSULTANTS

B. V. Doshi (India.
Richard May (USA).
Hans A. K. Palmstierna (Sweden).
W. Steigenga (Netherlands).
Nevzad Yalcintas (Turkey).
Paul N. Yivisaker (USA).

UN PARTICIPANTS

Michael Potrubatch.
Michael Kocharianz.
Darshan Johal.
Rafael Mora-Rubio.
Eric Carlson.

SPECIAL OBSERVERS

Aron Aizenstat (UNIDO).
Andrew A. Allo (West Cameroons).
Abdoul Barry (Guinea).
Virgil Ioanid (Rumania).
John A. Volpe (USA).

DEEP SEA EXPLORATION STALLED

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, October 27, Navy Day, is an appropriate time to take stock of the assets which in the past have assured our country of pre-eminence on the world oceans. We can no longer take for granted the comfortable assumption that the U.S. Navy will automatically continue as the dominant seapower. Existing Soviet challenges will require the utmost in technical competence and the ability to utilize our human and material resources to the best possible advantage.

Deep submergence—ocean bed exploration is in many ways more complicated than the probing of outer space, and its funding to date has been only a fraction of that allocated to the space program.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, N.H., has made a signal contribution to the deep submergence program in the design and construction of *Dolphin*, the Navy's deepest diving, operating submarine to date. This very sophisticated ship is able to explore the deep ocean areas where acoustic conditions are favorable for listening, collect scientific data in these hithertofore unexplored regions, and develop a viable weapons system. The engineering plant has been built to cope with very high sea pressures and to prove the essential features of combat deep divers of the future.

Our greatest assets at this time lie in the human skills which have demonstrated a capability for the design and development of these most complex mechanisms of our time. These must be safeguarded and continued on programs that are vital to the life of our Nation—if allowed to go by the board, they will be virtually unrecoverable, and it would take years of painstaking training and the expenditure of a great deal of money to replace them.

I commend to your attention the following editorial from the October issue of Navy, the magazine of seapower, published by the Navy League of the United States:

DEEP SEA EXPLORATION STALLED

It probably will be news to many of you that the vital U.S. program for exploration and exploitation of the ocean depths has recently been curtailed to a point that it is all but static. The major reasons are all to familiar—budget cuts and rising costs. Another reason is that difficulties have been encountered in the deep submergence development program that are more complex than originally anticipated.

Everyone knows about most of the other heavy cutbacks in defense and other fields—the U.S. Fleet, the civilian space program, military manpower, weapons programs and force levels of all the services—stemming from Government plans to spend more in other areas and to fight inflation. Many of the

reductions ordered in the important deep sea development program, however, have been unannounced and are largely unknown to the American people. The full extent of the downgrading of "deep submergence" did not emerge until we began planning this edition devoted largely to development plans for "the Navy of Tomorrow."

One decision has put the successful Sealab program on the shelf before the third of the series was even tested by nine-man teams working in and out of the habitat 300 feet down. The Sealab II descent to the ocean bed had been held up pending an investigation of the death of an acquanaut during preparations for the operation. The fatality was found to be the result of a personnel error but once the project was halted the budget squeeze brought orders for an "indefinite delay" in the test, and the dispersal of most of the Sealab team.

Other forward-looking Navy plans for exploring the continental shelf and beyond into the deepest parts of the oceans were heavily slashed as Pentagon planners carefully scanned every project with a doubting eye. There had been approved plans for the building of 12 Deep Submergence Rescue Vehicles (DSRVs), designed to save crews of disabled submarines to a depth of 3,500 feet and four Deep Submergence Search Vehicles (DSSVs), designed to locate and recover (with mechanical arms) such objects as lost H-bombs from the ocean bed down to 20,000 feet. Private enterprise was encouraged by the evident Government interest in putting its own money into exploring "inner space" as it had "outer space," albeit on a bargain basement budget. Companies developed a considerable number of commercial Deep Submergence Vehicles (DRVs). The navy also built the conventionally-powered USS *Dolphin*, a deep-diving research submersible, and the NR–1, an atomic-power experimental sub.

PROJECTS CURTAILED

It was a very modest but encouraging starter for exploring the mysteries of the ocean depths, which are less known, more dangerous and hold more promise militarily, economically and scientifically than the high-cost moon landing program. Ocean research, however, is less glamorous, and hence got only a fraction of the support of NASA's huge space program after the Soviet Sputnik aroused the country and Congress. But the authorizations were encouraging.

Today, much of this has gone, eliminated by the budget cutters. The 12-vehicle DSRV program was cut off at the existing two craft already built. The DSSR program was cancelled outright. Many of the Commercial DSVs are lying idle and their companies' research and engineering teams have been broken up and moved on to other work. The Deep Submergence Project Office of the Naval Material Command, responsible for developing and building the vehicles, has been deactivated.

All is not lost. The USS *Dolphin* was finished before the cutback came, and Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, whose influence on Capitol Hill is great, managed to complete his nuclear NR–1 despite cost-growths in face of the flailing budget axes. Faced with this drastic curtailment of a highly important advanced research program and to maintain Fleet operating forces, new weapons development and measures to keep top-notch Navymen in service, at least at a bare adequacy, the Navy created the post of Deep Submergence Systems Program Coordinator under the Chief of Naval Operations. Rear Admiral M. H. Rindskopf, a brilliant and level-headed submariner, was named Coordinator.

RUSSIAN PROGRESS

In an article which follows, he reports on the extensive work the Russians are doing in the deep submergence field and is pessimistic about our own immediate future. He declares that "the primary function of the Deep Submergence Systems Program Coordinator is to husband the funds made available . . . avoid duplication and concentrate on those projects which promise to give us the most return for our effort." His title of "Coordinator" sounds to us like that of a "conservator of resources" often named to hold financially hard-pressed commercial companies together short of bankruptcy.

In addition to the Navy's reorganization of its deep submergence effort, President Nixon has proposed to Congress the creation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), which would consolidate most of the civilian oriented U.S. oceanographic activity under the Department of Commerce. All this reminds us of the normal tactical doctrine followed when a commander is hard hit in the field—drop back and regroup.

The importance of exploration of the ocean depths, by man-in-the-sea projects such as Sealab, as well as deep diving submarines, should be obvious to all. Militarily, as we move our all-important deterrent forces to the sea, we must assure that our Polaris-Poseidon-ULMS submarines remain largely invulnerable. Deep submergence development is vital to make certain our missile submarines are not attacked and encircled from below, by deeper-diving, faster enemy killer subs, like fighters coming down on the tail of bombers. Or that research in the murky depths does not produce other defenses, now unknown, against submarines. The exploding world population makes it necessary that we exploit the ocean beds for food, minerals and petroleum. Unlocking the mysteries of the deep seas will greatly increase U.S. scientific knowledge of our planet, among many other vital advantages of such research. This is no time for cutbacks in deep submergence.

CENSUS REPORT

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, this year was, of course, the year for the official U.S. census. Although the final figures have not been tabulated, some of the preliminary results might be of interest to you. The Bureau of the Census has informed me that the final results will not differ substantially from the figures quoted here.

As of April 1, 1970, the population of North Carolina was 4,961,832. This figure represents an increase of 405,677, or 8.9 percent, above the 4,556,155 population recorded in 1960, the year of the last official census.

For the eight counties comprising the Fifth District, the population was 445,192. Individual county totals were: Alleghany, 7,815; Ashe, 18,768; Davidson, 94,366; Davie, 18,718; Forsyth, 207,880; Stokes, 23,204; Surry, 50,112; Yadkin, 24,329.

Our population in 1960 was 414,365, which means our eight counties showed a combined increase in population of 6.9 percent this year.

Here are some other interesting findings of the 1970 census:

More than three-fourths of the national growth occurred in metropolitan areas with suburban rings showing rapid and substantial population growth. Suburbanites now outnumber those living in central cities.

The farm population declined by approximately one-third since 1960, dropping from about 15 million to some 10 million.

Migration patterns continued as in the past—from the middle of the country toward the coasts, and from the South to the North.

California led all States in the amount of growth, with a population increase of approximately 4 million persons.

New York, with a population of 7.8 million, still is by far the largest city in the country. Its nearest competitor is Chicago, which still ranks second, at 3.3 million. Others in the top 10 are Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, Dallas, Washington, D.C., and Indianapolis.

North Carolina rank 12th in total State population, behind California, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida, Massachusetts, and Indiana.

CONGRESS, ADMINISTRATION WILL RETURN FOR SHOWDOWN OVER NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress recesses for the next 4 weeks, I think we should take stock of what we have accomplished and what we must still do before we finally adjourn the 91st Congress.

I take great satisfaction in many of the achievements of the past 2 years. We have passed legislation and authorized programs that will go a long way toward solving some of the many problems facing our Nation today. Unfortunately, we have an administration which does not seem to share our sense of priorities in attacking these problems.

Presidential vetoes of our appropriations for education, veterans' care, hospital construction, and housing programs have drawn the battle lines in this fight over priorities. I think the highlight of this session came when the Congress courageously voted to override the President's vetoes of the education appropriations bills.

Many of us fought hard to cut the President's budget requests in other areas, particularly on money for the controversial supersonic transport—SST—for the questionable anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM—for the outlandish give-away farm-subsidy program, and for the Pentagon's unending demands for military hardware. We also tried to eliminate the oil-depletion allowance and other loopholes used by the rich and powerful to avoid tax payments. We have had some success in these attempts, and we must continue the fight in the future.

Probably the greatest single problem we face today is to rescue our economy from the disastrous plunge of the past 21 months since President Nixon took office. Four times in two decades we have suffered such economic recessions, and every one under a Republican administration. Each time, we have seen the unemployment rate rise about 5 percent, and millions of Americans left without jobs. The Republican philosophy seems to be that inflation is best fought by throwing millions out of work.

This philosophy has not worked in the past, and it will not work now. Inflation still continues its terrible pressure on the homeowner, the consumer, and the retiree. Interest rates have reached a 100-year high, adding new pressures to the inflated economy. Taxes are already intolerable, and new taxes are being considered by desperate local and State officials, whose budgets have been thrown out of kilter by inflation. The cost of housing has been driven so high that few young people can afford to buy homes. Construction has fallen off, and employment in the building trades has dropped to dangerous levels. Production of consumer goods is falling, adding to the unstable job market. Overtime has virtually disappeared.

In the face of this economic chaos, we have an administration which sends its No. 2 man throughout the country playing word games. It may be fun to make up cute phrases but it does not solve any problems. The people of this Nation want constructive action, not destructive demagoguery.

The administration is wrong if they think that loud noise will make the American people forget about high prices, high taxes, high interest, and high unemployment.

We in Congress certainly cannot forget them, Mr. Speaker, and these are some of the challenges that we must be prepared to face when we reconvene on November 16.

MRS. LYDIA HOWARD CELEBRATES 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mrs. Lydia Howard of Montclair recently celebrated her 100th birthday.

This is a memorable occasion and a joyous milestone. I wish Mrs. Howard continued happiness and the enjoyment of life's blessings.

AN INCURSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today the chairman of the House Internal Security Committee (Mr. ICHORD) is releasing to the press a list of so-called radical revolutionaries who have been speakers on college campuses. This is a product of a nationwide survey the committee has conducted of persons speaking during the past 2 years at our colleges and universities.

The chairman of the House Internal Security Committee first wrote to selected schools in all of the Nation's 50 States in July of this year requesting a list of the names and dates of appearances of all guest lecturers, the groups sponsoring these speakers, and the amount of the honorarium given them. The committee explained in its letters to the colleges that:

Preliminary data received by the committee indicated that organizations, who by their activities would effect changes in our government by force, violence or other unlawful means . . . made numerous appearances on many college and university campuses, and have received honorariums which would be of significance in funding their activities.

On July 15 I wrote to the colleges in my congressional district, the 17th of New York, contacted by the House Internal Security Committee, advising them that the action of the chariman in requesting such information was beyond the scope of the committee's power and an incursion on academic freedom.

The warnings contained in my letter, which was similar to the letter sent by our distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), who is a member of that committee, to colleges in his district, has unfortunately been fulfilled by the chairman's actions today. I do not know who is on the chairman's list, and frankly, it makes no difference because no matter what their political philosophies, academic and first amendment freedoms give universities the right to invite speakers of all persuasions to their campuses. The effect of publishing such a list is to chill dissent and is simply another step taken by the HIS committee, which changed its name from HUAC, but continues the same kind of suppressive investigations and activities to prevent free discussion in the universities and elsewhere.

The House Internal Security Committee will employ the very real fear that exists because there are nihilistic and anarchistic elements now engaged in criminal activities throughout this country to frighten the American public. All of us want such persons apprehended, tried, and if found guilty, jailed. But, while we protect ourselves against criminal activities, we must not fall into the trap to which Chairman ICHORD is leading us—one to inhibit the exercise of free speech. What good will it do to protect our society from its foes if we use totalitarian methods and convert our society into the very kind of government which should be an abomination to every one of us?

I am very proud of the fact that one of the plaintiffs in a lawsuit brought to prevent the publication of the committee's list is Nat Hentoff, a constituent.

The decision of U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard A. Gesell in blocking the Government's printing of the list is one worth reading, particularly in the context of the statements made by Chairman ICHORD this afternoon. I ask who really speaks for democracy in this House—the chairman of the House Internal Security Committee or District Judge Gerhard A. Gessell? I have no hesitation in selecting the latter.

My letter of July 15 to the college administrators and Judge Gesell's decision follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 15, 1970.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that the House Internal Security Committee has recently sent you a letter requesting information regarding guest speakers who have appeared on your campus during the past two years and the amount of remuneration they have received.

This is to inform you that Rep. Louis Stokes, a Member of the Committee, considers this action "both beyond the scope of the Congressional mandate which delineates the Committee's powers, and a direct incursion on academic freedom." I agree with my colleague and I share his opinion that you are free to ignore the Committee's communication.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

[U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA]

Nat Hentoff, et al., Plaintiffs v. Richard H. Ichord, Claude Pepper, Edwin W. Edwards, Richardson Preyer, Louis Stokes, John M. Ashbrook, Richard L. Roudebush, Albert Watson, and William J. Scherle, as Chairman and Members of the Committee on Internal Security of the United States House of Representatives, et al., Defendants

Civil Action No. 3028–70

[Washington, D.C., October 13, 1970]

The above-entitled cause came on for hearing on Plaintiff's Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief before the Honorable Gerhard A. Gesell, United States District Judge, at 2:00 p.m.

Appearances: Lawrence Speiser, Esq., Hope Eastman, Esq., Counsel for Plaintiffs.

Joseph M. Hannon, Assistant United States Attorney, Counsel for Defendant Donald G. Sanders.

COURT'S RULING

Proceedings

The CLERK. Civil Action No. 3028–70, Nat Hentoff, et al. v. Richard H. Ichord, et al. Mr. Lawrence Speiser and Mrs. Hope Eastman for

the Plaintiffs. Mr. Joseph M. Hannon for the Defendants.

* * * * *

The COURT. Gentlemen, in view of the time factors that are involved and knowing that this matter will unquestionably be taken this afternoon to the Court of Appeals, the Court is going to undertake to give its ruling orally at this time.

The Court has before it in this case a complaint for injunctive and declaratory relief framed as a class action seeking a temporary injunction to enjoin a proposed report of the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives, captioned, "Limited Survey of Honoraria Given Guest Speakers for Engagements at Colleges and Universities."

The complaint verified by its counsel in general terms indicates that the proposed report is scheduled to be published at noon tomorrow.

Initially the Court is confronted with the claim by amicus that there has not been the appropriate notice under Rule 65. The Court feels that in view of the presence of the various officials here in Court today, the urgency of the situation and the fact that Plaintiffs were lulled into a belief that Mr. Hannon represented all of the Defendants, that the spirit of the rule has been met and, accordingly, the Court will entertain and consider the issues presented on the merits.

The first matter the Court must determine is whether or not there is in this case subject matter jurisdiction. The complaint states a claim under the Constitution, clearly raises a Federal question. There is also clearly alleged an imminent threatened injury, and the issue presented, as the Court sees it, is concrete, a specific real and live issue tendered for specific adjudication.

The merits presents a question involving separation of powers which is always a very difficult question for the Court to confront, as it arises particularly these days with increasing frequency.

Obviously, this Court must accord deference to the Committees of Congress, a coordinate branch of the Government and to their authority to conduct investigations and proceed in the conduct of Congressional affairs. But it is clear under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Powell case, which the Court believes overrules a number of the cases cited by amicus, as interpreted by our Court of Appeals in the Davis case, the Court is not barred from considering a constitutional issue of this urgency and specificity merely because it may involve some intrusion into the delicate area of separate powers under our Constitution. Thus the Court feels the matter must be resolved in accordance with traditional consideration of equity following the standards that are appropriate in a situation of this kind in the exercise of the Court's discretion.

There is not presented here any challenge to the authority of the Committee to engage in the work of the Committee under the various general assignments it has had from the Congress. The more specific question presented is whether there is a valid legislative purpose with respect to this particular document which is before the Court. In other words, is this report pursuant to a valid legislative purpose of Congress conducting its traditional role or is it merely, to use the language of such cases as Watkins v. United States, "an attempt to expose the private affairs of individuals for the sake of exposure alone?" That is the initial question which the Court must confront here.

The issue also, as the Court sees it, is not, as the Plaintiffs suggest, whether or not the report in it entirety should in any way be enjoined but more specifically the question of whether or not an injuction should issue with respect to the publication of the names of listed speakers that are set forth in various lists in the proposed report because it is in that respect that there may an intrusion into the rights of individuals threatening their rights of free speech and assembly under the Constitution for the sake of exposure rather than for any legislative purpose.

While the Committee apparently undertook to inquire into whether or not various subversive organizations, socalled, were receiving funds from speakers on the various campuses of the United States, it made no definitive investigation into that issue as far as this report is concerned but merely satisfied itself with obtaining a list of speakers, then checking various private and public lists available to the Committee for the purpose of determining whether there was any indication that any of these people in any way had any connection with organizations which the Committee considered in some manner extremist, revolutionary or distasteful to the members of the Committee. The purpose in publishing the names is clearly suggested in the galley where it is stated that:

"The Committee believes that the limited sampling made is sufficient to alert colleges and university administrators, alumni, students and parents to the extent of campus speaking in promoting the radical revolutionary movement." Clearly a non-legislative purpose.

It appears to the Court that the Plaintiffs here have a legitimate grievance and that the Court should permit all of the interested parties full opportunity to be heard on the matter. The Court appeals to the conscience of the Congress and feels that the traditional methods which have long applied in the Federal Courts of this land should apply in this case just like any other case, and that there should be a careful examination into anything that purports to be, as this does, an indirect attempt to inhibit and deter freedom of speech under the First Amendment in a manner which is contrary to constitutional principles and chilling in its effect.

The Court is well aware that there is no practical remedy if Congress, in its wisdom, chooses directly or indirectly to ignore the Court's order.

Basic rights of Plaintiffs may be infringed as the Court sees these papers and our Constitution demands that they be given their day in Court. Hence the Court has concluded that a temporary restraining order must issue and that the matter should be set down for a hearing on a preliminary injunction at the earliest possible moment. Under the rules it can be set down in two days if the Defendants wish to take advantage of the provisions of Rule 65, to which reference has been made.

The Court feels that considerations of fairness and proper regard for the rule of law requires this result and the Court earnestly hopes that the Defendants will accept the necessities of orderly procedure.

There is no consideration of the public interest that has been brought to the attention of the Court that necessitates any immediate release of the challenged document. It is the traditional role of the Court of equity to preserve the status quo which is preserved by enjoining the release of these names and the Court feels that the Plaintiffs have a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits.

There is no effort here to impede investigatory activities of the Congress and there is no effort in any way here to restrict what Congress may say or do on the floor of the Congress. There is nothing here that affects speech and debate by Congressmen.

The Court will issue a temporary restraining order permitting the publication of this report but enjoining any publication in the report listing the speakers. The names of the speakers as listed shall not be published and any publication of those names is legally unauthorized.

I have before me a proposed form of restraining order which has been submitted by the Plaintiffs. I think it can be readily adapted to the ruling of the Court, limited to the names of the speakers.

I say to you, Mr. Hannon, that this matter will be set before a Judge of this Court within two days or next week, in accordance with whatever is the wish of the Defendants in that regard. If you wish a forty-eight-hour hearing, it will be granted.

I would ask counsel to look at the proposed restraining order which was handed to the Court and make the necessary changes in it consistent with the ruling the Court has just made. When you have done that and have reached some conclusion as to the date of the hearing, I can endorse the order accordingly.

I want to express my appreciation for the presence of the distinguished gentlemen here from the Congress. I have attempted to do what a Federal Judge always should do in circumstances such as this, to do what is fair and right in connection with the serious constitutional issues raised and I feel certain that upon a full hearing as to these matters all of the rights and interests of the parties can be fully developed.

Mr. HANNON. I don't believe Your Honor was reading from an opinion?

The COURT. No, I have no opinion in front of me.

Mr. HANNON. Is this going to be written up as the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Court?

The COURT. This would constitute my findings of fact and conclusions of law as required under the rule. I will direct the court reporter to transcribe it immediately for the benefit of all concerned. I have no opinion here.

Mr. HANNON. Yes, Your Honor.

The COURT. I have simply had an opportunity to look at these and make a few notes.

Mr. HANNON. I appreciate what Your Honor has told me and we would like a copy of the Court's findings.

The COURT. Yes.

Mr. HANNON. I suggested to the Court that you had no jurisdiction over the members of the Congress. The Supreme Court has said so twice. Although Your Honor was very careful in your opinion, I did not catch who the Court is going to enjoin, who you are going to enter the restraining order against. You didn't mention who it is Your Honor is restraining in that. I would like that, please.

The COURT. I would think the injunction should run to all persons other than the named Congressmen, themselves. It would run to the printer and to all of the staff and all of the people that would necessarily be involved in the publication.

Mr. HANNON. Not to the members of the Congress but to the staff, the other Defendants named and their agents, is that what I understand, Your Honor?

The COURT. That is what I have in mind. I see no need of enjoining the members of Congress. They are free to publish this report in so many ways anyhow there is no point in trying to get involved in that. They can make speeches on television; they can talk everywhere they wish.

Mr. HANNON. If Your Honor is clear in his mind, as I am in mine, that the Court does not have jurisdiction over these Congressmen by virtue of Powell v. McCormack, which Your Honor adverted to, and Dombrowski v. Eastland, would the Court at this time sua sponte dismiss this lawsuit as to the members of the Congress?

The COURT. No.

Mr. HANNON. Thank you, Your Honor.

The COURT. You gentlemen can bring back the order to chambers when you have it in shape.

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, Ida Z. Watson, certify that I reported the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on October 13, 1970 and that the foregoing Pages 1 to 10, inclusive, constitute the official transcript of the Court's Ruling.

IDA Z. WATSON.